

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

When the MSS. were made out, it was my expectation to publish the book myself. I was unable to do so. Bro. J. C. CLYMORE, of New Columbia, Johnson County, Illinois, then came forward and assumed the responsibility of publishing the book. He has furnished the means and assumed the financial burden of its publication and sale. He did so, believing that its publication was necessary to the success of our cause in Southern Illinois. He should then receive the thanks of the brotherhood for whatever good the book may do. I owe him a debt for his kindness, I can not express and can never repay. His name should have been placed on the title page instead of mine. It would have been done had we thought of it in time.

Thanks are due to Mr. W. C. GRAY, of the Elm Street Printing Company, Cincinnati, for his liberal and honorable course in the mechanical execution of the book. I can cheerfully recommend him to all who have books to publish as all that one could desire in one with whom he may have dealings. Whatever inaccuracies may be seen in the book have been caused by the peculiar circumstances of its publication and are no fault of his. All who patronize the Company may rely on first-class work, promptly done, and honorable dealing.

My thanks are due to Dr. T. J. CONANT, of Brooklyn, N. Y., author of "Baptizien," who has aided me in the matter of the Appendix by his valuable suggestions. Also to Bro. PETER VOGEL, of Du Quoin, to whose careful scholarship the reader owes the translations of the Appendix.

CLARK BRADEN.

DEBATE  
ON  
THE ACTION OF BAPTISM,  
THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM,  
THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM,  
THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,  
THE DISCIPLINE OF THE M. E. CHURCH,  
AND HUMAN CREEDS.

HELD IN VIENNA, JOHNSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS, BEGINNING  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, AND CLOSING THURSDAY, AUGUST  
27, 1868, IN ALL NINE DAYS.

BETWEEN

CLARK BRADEN,

OF CARBONDALE, PRESIDENT OF SOUTHERN ILLINOD<sup>3</sup> COLLEGE, IN BEHALF OF  
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,

AND

G. W. HUGHEY,

OF VIENNA, PRESIDING ELDER OF THE CAIRO DISTRICT, IN BEHALF OF THE  
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

HON. A. J. KUYKENDALL, PRESIDENT MODERATOR; ELDER MONROE LINN, AS-  
SISTANT FOR MR. BRADEN; JUDGE J. B. SMITH, ASSISTANT FOR MR. HUGHEY.

REPORTED BY ALBERT SUTLIFFE, COVINGTON, KENTUCKY, ASSISTED BY REV. W. C. DICK-  
SON, OF VIENNA, ILLINOIS.

---

CINCINNATI:  
PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN & RICE, FOR C. BRADEN.

ELM STREET FEINTING COMPANY, PRINTERS AND BINDERS.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by  
CLARK BRADEN,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the Southern  
District of Ohio.

---

# PREFACE

---

It is unnecessary to publish the voluminous correspondence that preceded the following discussion, or to go into an account of how the discussion was brought about, any further than that it was by mutual agreement. The following is the final agreement between the parties before entering into the discussion:

"WHEREAS, Messrs. G. W. HUGHEY and CLARK BRADEN have entered into an agreement to enter into a public debate, or discussion, at Vienna, Johnson County, State of Illinois, to be begun at 10 o'clock, A. M., August 18, 1868, and to be governed by the following rules and regulations, to-wit:

"1. Each disputant shall select a Moderator, and these two shall select a third, who shall be President Moderator, whose duty it shall be to preserve order, keep the time, and see that the rules are observed during the discussion.

"2. The opening and closing speeches on each proposition shall occupy one hour each, and the intermediate speeches one-half hour each; the negative closing the debate on each proposition.

"3. The debate on the first proposition shall occupy two days and one night session. The second and third, two days each. The fourth, one day and one night session. The fifth and sixth, one day each.

"4. The debate shall open at 10 o'clock, A. M., and close at 12 o'clock, M.; and at 2 o'clock, P. M., and close at 4 o'clock, P. M., each day. All night sessions shall open at 7 o'clock, P. M., and close at 9 o'clock, P. M.

"5. Extra sessions may be held, as may be agreed upon between the parties, while the debate is in progress; and each session shall be opened with prayer and closed with the benediction.

"6. On the final negative on each proposition, no new matter shall be introduced.

"7. The parties agree to adopt as Rules of Decorum, the rules of debate found in Hedges' Logic, pages 159 to 162.

"8. These rules may be altered or amended by mutual consent of both parties.

"AND WHEREAS, It is further agreed between the parties that the following shall constitute the

PROPOSITIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

"1. Pouring or sprinkling water on a proper person, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is Scriptural Christian Baptism. Hughey affirms.

"2. Christian Baptism is for the remission of the past sins of the penitent believer. Braden affirms.

"3. Infants are scriptural subjects of Christian Baptism. Hughey affirms.

"4. In the work of conversion and regeneration, the Holy Spirit operates immediately or directly on the heart. Hughey affirms.

"5. The Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church contains doctrines and enjoins church usages, contrary to the word of God. Braden affirms.

"6. Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion among Christians, or as guides in the administration of church discipline, are unscriptural and anti-christian. Braden affirms.

"Now, therefore, in consideration of the cost and expense of carrying out this agreement, each of the parties, Hughey and Braden, does hereby bind himself to the other in the penal sum of five hundred dollars, lawful money of the United States, payment of which sum is well and truly to be made, if he fails in the performance of the aforesaid or of the following agreements, terms, and conditions as far as they relate to himself:

"1. The said Braden is to have a full, true, and correct *verbatim* report of the debate made, at his own expense, by a competent reporter, who shall be present at and during the whole discussion.

"2. The debate is to be published in a book by said Braden, at his own expense, within twelve months after the discussion, just as it was reported, except that each party may make verbal corrections, not affecting the substance.

"3. Each party is to revise his speeches as reported, and have them ready for publication within three months from the time of receiving them from the reporter, unless prevented by sickness, or some hindrance over which he has no control; in which event, he is to have them ready as soon as possible after the removal of the hindering cause.

"4. Hughey is to receive one hundred dollars, in copies of the

book, at wholesale prices, as soon as it is issued, for his time and labor.

"5. After all and every expense of the debate and the publication of the book has been defrayed, Hughey is to have thirty-five per cent, of the net profits of the sales, in books at wholesale prices.

"6. Neither party is to make any publication of the debate, nor any part thereof, except as herein provided for, within three years after such publication.

"In testimony whereof, witness our hand and seal. Done this 27th day of February, 1868.

"G. W. HUGHEY. [L. S.]

"CLARK BRADEN. [L. S.]"

According to the above agreement the debate was held in Vienna, and the result is before you. It was attended by a large and attentive audience. In consequence of sickness of both parties, the publication has been delayed. The character of the report also made it necessary to rewrite much of the debate. Both parties were very rapid speakers, and the numerous quotations rendered the reporting unusually difficult; but it is believed that the arguments presented are, in substance, in the following pages.

The Moderators were, Elder Moses Linn, on the part of Mr. Braden, and Elder J. B. Smith, on the part of Mr. Hughey. Hon. A. J. Kuykendall was chosen President Moderator; but in his absence the first day of the discussion A. H. Norris, Esq., presided, and the last two days Elder Calvin Beard, of the Universalist Church, acted as Moderator.

With the earnest desire that it may aid in establishing what is Scriptural Truth, and that the cause of Christ may be advanced by its publication, the Book is submitted to a discriminating public.

CLARK BRADEN,

G. W. HUGHEY.

# MODE OF BAPTISM.

PROPOSITION FOR DISCUSSION.

*Pouring or Sprinkling Water on a proper person in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is Scriptural Christian Baptism.*  
HUGHEY affirms.

TUESDAY MORNING, 10 o'clock, August 18, 1868.

MR. HUGHEY'S OPENING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I rise before you this morning to open the discussion on the propositions that are before us. The questions to which our attention will be called during the present discussion, are not like the political questions that are now engrossing such universal attention and creating so much excitement in the public mind. Those questions are ephemeral in their nature, and will pass away, and be forgotten. But the questions before us are of imperishable interest. They are questions concerning our future and eternal, as well as our present well-being, for our future destiny must depend upon the character that we form in the present life; and while the endless vigils of eternity shall be rolling on in the limitless future, the importance of the questions now under consideration will be still increasing and looming up before the mind. Under these circumstances how important that we should enter upon the discussion of these great questions upon which our immortal destinies hang with that spirit that will enable us to weigh the argument, and search after the truth in the love of it, and with the desire of heart to practice it to the honor of God, and the salvation of our own souls. And I trust such will be the spirit that shall actuate us in our inquiries, and actuate you while listening to the arguments presented on the questions to which we shall call your attention during the present discussion.

There are many persons who are very much opposed to religious controversies, and who tell us that they only engender strife and hard feelings, that they are not productive of any good; but I never shared in this opinion. I believe it is untrue—wholly untrue. Indeed, truth can not be arrived at by any other means than by investigation or controversy, and all those great truths in philosophy, in general science, in theology, and in political economy, that we hold so dear, have been reached only through the instrumentality of controversy. It has been by this means, and this alone, that all the great truths now universally admitted in all these departments of human knowledge have been settled and established upon their firm basis. Truth has nothing to

lose by investigation. The more you examine truth the more beautiful and bright it will appear. The more you examine into the foundations of truth, the more will its immutability be made manifest; and he who has truth for his object never fears the test of controversy—he never shuns the most rigid investigation into the grounds of his faith.

In regard to the present controversy, it is one that I had no hand in bringing about. It is true, for the last three years I have been more or less engaged in controversy with the brethren of my opponent; but the manner the present discussion was brought about was on this wise : About a year ago, or at the time I was engaged in discussion with Dr. Lucas, at Golconda, Illinois, there came out an article in the *Herald of Truth*, written by his uncle, the editor of that paper, offering to debate with me certain propositions in the town of Vienna; and added, "provided my little black-eyed nephew leaves enough of Mr. Hughey for me to get hold of him with a pair of tweezers." In my reply to that article through the same paper, after offering him certain propositions, I said that I would debate them with him, " provided he would bring along with him the faculty of Carbondale College, that I might *clean them out* as I had the faculty of Princeton College in the debate with his nephew." This my friend Mr. Braden took for a challenge to "mortal combat" to him personally; and the first thing I knew he sent me a list of propositions, and his friends were very anxious that I should accept them. I was not anxious, as my friend can testify, from the fact that I was then expecting to go into another discussion with Elder J. S. Sweeney of the gentleman's church. I promised, however, that if I did not have the discussion with Mr. S., I would then consider the propositions of Mr. Braden.

Time rolled on, and Mr. Sweeney and myself had agreed upon every thing connected with the discussion, except one, and that was this : I required of him a bond and security of one thousand dollars compelling him to faithfully carry out the agreement between us. This he peremptorily refused to do ; he said the thing was unreasonable, and he would have nothing further to do with me. Then, of course, I was left free to consider Mr. Braden's propositions; and after considerable correspondence on the subject, we finally agreed to discuss the propositions before us.

The proposition before us this morning is, "Pouring or sprinkling water on a proper person in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is scriptural baptism." We do not mean by affirming that pouring or sprinkling is scriptural baptism, to affirm that nothing else is baptism. We do not affirm that pouring or sprinkling is the only scriptural baptism; but we do affirm that pouring or sprinkling is scriptural baptism. It is well known that we hold that no specific mode is essential to the Christian ordinance. Baptism, we contend, may be performed properly and scripturally by a diversity of modes, either by pouring, by sprinkling, or by immersion, once, twice, or thrice. The mode we consider not essential to the thing. Baptism is one thing, while its mode of administration is quite another thing. But while I admit that immersion may be scriptural baptism, I do not admit that it is scriptural in the sense of it being an apostolic institution. I do



not admit that John the Baptist ever immersed anybody. I do not believe that it was ever practiced in apostolic times; and the only ground upon which I can admit it to be scriptural, is that the scriptures leave the mode undetermined. Prove to me that the scriptures settle the mode, and I will never immerse another man while the world stands; for I am satisfied I have scriptural authority for pouring but none for immersion. It is upon this ground, and this alone, that I admit the scripturality of the practice of baptism by immersion. The affirmative of this proposition properly belongs to my opponent. He affirms that baptism is mode, and nothing else. I deny it. This places him in the affirmative, and me in the negative; and this will make my work on this proposition the more laborious; for, in the first place, it will be necessary to remove the rubbish of error before I can proceed to lay the foundation of the fair fabric of truth in the affirmative argument in support of my proposition. In all religious controversy much depends upon the proper understanding of the terms used in the scriptures, and especially is this the case in regard to the controversy on the mode of baptism. Indeed, almost the entire dispute turns on the meaning of one single word, *baptizo*. Our opponents say that it always signifies to dip or immerse—that it never has any other signification. I say that this is the position that our opponents usually take; but many of them differ from this position. While we affirm that the word is generic, not a specific term; that it expresses the thing done, without giving the manner of doing it; and that it admits of a variety of signification. I shall, in the first place, give you the position that some of the learned advocates of the position that my opponent takes, and the position that his church occupies on the proposition now under discussion.

Our opponents claim that *baptizo* is a specific word, and that it has but one meaning; yet when they come to give us that specific meaning, they differ widely as to the specific meaning of their own specific word. I will notice the different definitions that leading writers in favor of immersion give us of their specific term. A tract published in the time of Roger Williams, A. D. 1644, bore the title, "Dipping is Baptizing, and Baptizing is Dipping."—Dale's Classic Baptism, p. 33. Here the position is clearly taken that baptize and dip express the same act. Dr. Gale, who was a very eminent and learned Baptist writer, tells us that the word *baptizo* "does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water or the water comes over it."—Carson, p. 21. Here the specific meaning of dip is abandoned, and the state of being under the water substituted in its place.

Dr. Carson, however, repudiates Gale's theory, that *baptizo* signifies state or condition, and says, "My position is that it (*baptizo*) always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode."—Carson on Baptism, p. 55. Here Carson flatly contradicts Gale, and affirms that instead of *baptizo* meaning state or condition, it never has that signification at all. According to Carson it means mode, and nothing but mode!

A. Campbell goes beyond Carson, and, discarding the word mode, substitutes action. He says, "*Baptizo* indicates a specific action, and

consequently as such can have but one meaning. For if a person or a thing can be immersed in water, oil, milk, honey, sand, earth, debt, grief, affliction, spirit, light, or darkness, etc., it is a word indicating specific action, and specific action only."—Campbell, on Baptism, pp. 118, 119. What this specific action is Mr. Campbell tells us in his debate with Mr. Rice, pp. 77, 78. He says, "But *baptizo* permits the subject to stay under the water but a very little time, and then emerge again. In the etymology and philology of the Greek language, the word *baptizo* never can be shown to mean going to the bottom and staying there." Here it is plain that Mr. Campbell's specific action expressed by *baptizo* is being put momentarily under water, and then raised out of it again. Thus Mr. C. contends, in opposition to Gale, that both immersion and emersion are expressed by *baptizo*—the radical *hap* puts the person or thing under the water, while the termination, *zoo*, brings him or it up again. This is Campbell's specific act. Prof. Morrell takes square issue with Dr. Carson, and repudiates Campbell entirely, and goes even further than Gale. He says, "that the word *baptizo* uniformly signifies to dip, I will not venture to assert or undertake to prove! I believe, however, that it is generally admitted on both sides, that the word does mean to dip; that this is its generic meaning, and its most usual meaning. But it appears quite evident that the word also bears the sense of covering by superfusion. This is admitted by Dr. Cox, who says, "a person may be immersed by pouring! but immersion is the being plunged into water or overwhelmed by it. Was the water to ascend from the earth, it would still be baptism were the person wholly covered by it. Thus far we surrender the question of immersion, and in doing so feel no small pleasure in finding ourselves in such good company as that of Dr. Cox."—Dale's Classic Baptism, pp. 58, 59.

Here are two eminent Baptist writers wholly surrendering the specific meaning of *baptizo* claimed by Carson and Campbell, and admit that a man may be immersed by superfusion; yea, that he may be baptized by pouring! How these learned men agree in regard to the specific meaning of their own specific word!

Dr. Fuller agrees with Gale, Cox, and Morrell. He says, "A fourth case is presented by pedobaptist authors from Aristotle. It is produced to show that *baptizo* does not always denote the act of plunging. My position is that *baptizo* means to immerse, it matters not how the immersion is effected! Suppose a man should lie in the baptistery while it is filling, the pouring of the water would not be immersion, yet an immersion would take place if he remained long enough!"—Dale, p. 60.

Here he gives up the specific idea of dip, and admits a man may be immersed by pouring!

Dr. Conant is perhaps the ablest writer on the side of immersion since the death of Carson, and we close up this review with him. He substantially agrees with Gale. He says:

"The idea of emersion is not included in the Greek word. It means simply to put in or under water, without determining whether the object immersed sinks to the bottom or floats in the liquid, or is immediately taken out."—Dale, p. 96.

Conant flatly contradicts Campbell in an essential element of the meaning of their specific word. Thus we see the want of agreement among leading immersionists in regard to the specific meaning of the word upon which their whole theory is founded. Now, before they come forward and demand that we shall receive their mode of baptism, let them agree among themselves in regard to the import of this word, upon which so much depends. The truth is, when you examine the writings of the most eminent advocates of exclusive immersion, you will see that each one finds the position of his predecessor is untenable, and he undertakes to find a stronger position upon which to base his argument; but the more he struggles the deeper he sinks into the difficulties and absurdities of his exclusive theory, and Dr. Conant is a fair illustration of this remark.

We, upon the other hand, contend that the term is not a specific term. The idea of action is not in the word, and we affirm that there can be no correct conception of any specific action formed from the meaning of the word *baptizo*. Mr. Dale, after examining some hundreds of examples where the word occurs in classic usage, says that a "blind man could more readily select any demanded color from the spectrum, or a child could more readily thread the Cretan labyrinth, than could 'the seven wise men of Greece' declare the nature, or mode, of any given baptism by the naked help of *baptizo*."—Classic Baptism, pp. 353, 354.

We will now inquire, What was the original signification of *baptizo*; and what was the sense in which the New Testament writers used it? It is admitted on all hands that *baptizo* sometimes has the meaning of to dip or immerse; but it is claimed by all pedobaptist writers that it also means to pour, or sprinkle, or a partial wetting. The question, then, is: What was its original or radical signification? Upon this question the learned are divided; some holding that the radical primary and proper meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo* is to dip, and that their secondary meaning is to dye; while others contend that the radical primary and proper meaning of these words is to dye, while as secondary meanings they have to dip, to wash, to wet, to pour upon, to sprinkle—because dyeing can be done in any one of these ways.

I here take the position that the radical primary and proper meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo*, is to dye, while as secondary meanings they embrace every mode of application by which dyeing can be accomplished, from the slightest distillation of the dews of heaven to the sinking of a ship to the bottom of the ocean.

Dr. Dwight, who was perhaps the most learned biblical critic this country has ever produced, speaks as follows in regard to the radical import of the term *baptizo* and its root *bapto*:

"Concerning the former of these subjects I observe—1. That the body of learned critics and lexicographers declare that the original meaning of both these words is to tinge, stain, dye, or color; and that, when it means immersion, it is only in a secondary and occasional sense, derived from the fact that such things as are dyed, stained, or colored, are often immersed for this end. This interpretation of the words, also, they support by such a series of quotations as seem un-

answerably to evince that this was the original classical meaning of these words."

Albert Barnes, as fine a scholar as is now living in the United States, says in his comment on Matt. iii. 6:

"The word baptize signifies originally to tinge, to dye, to stain, as those who dye clothes."

But I have the testimony of some who will weigh more with my opponent than Dr. Dwight or Albert Barnes. Dr. Carson, in his great work on Baptism, p. 23, has the following: "Not long before the death of Professor Parson, says Dr. Newman, I went over to see that celebrated Greek scholar at the London Institution. I was curious to hear in what manner he read Greek. He very condescendingly, at my request, took down a Greek Testament, and read perhaps twenty verses in one of the Gospels, in which the word *bapto* occurred. I said, 'Sir, you know there is a controversy among Christians respecting the meaning of that word.' He smiled and replied, 'The Baptists have the advantage of us.' He cited immediately the well-known passage in Pindar, and one or two of those in the Gospels mentioned in this letter. I inquired whether, in his opinion, *baptizo* must be considered equal to *bapto* which he said was to tinge as dyers. He replied to this effect, that if there is a difference, he should take the former to be the strongest."

Here, mark you, Parson says that "*bapto* signifies to tinge as dyers." He did not say, you will observe, that there "was a difference," but he puts it hypothetically, "if there be a difference, he should take the former (that is, *baptizo*) to be the strongest." Prof. Parson was admitted to be the greatest Greek scholar of his time. But I have another witness:

Dr. Robinson, of Cambridge, who was an immersionist, says, "that *baptizo* is a dyer's word, and signifies to dip, so as to color."—Carson, p. 22. The testimony of these four learned witnesses bearing on this point is sufficient for the present, and I will now proceed with my argument.

That the original or radical meaning of the words *bapto* and *baptizo* was to dye, and not to dip, is manifest from the fact that the meaning to dye, or steep, or imbue, or some modification of this idea, inheres in all the words of the family derived from the parent *bap*, which is thus proven originally to mean to dye; while some of the words of this family are applied exclusively to the dyer's art, dropping out the idea of dip entirely: as, *bapheion*, a dyer's house; *bapheus*, a dyer; *baphike*, the art of dyeing; *bapsimos*, to be dyed. So, in Latin, *baptēs*, frog-colored. So we have *bapteen*, one must dip or dye; *baptees*, one that dips or dyes; or *baptai*, the priests of the goddess Cotytto, because they stained their faces with paint. *Baptizo*, to dip, to bathe, to steep, to wet, to pour upon, to drench, etc., including the idea of dye or color. *Baptisis*, a dipping, a bathing, a washing, a drawing of water, and by implication a dyeing, a coloring, or steeping, as Prof. Stuart justly remarks, page 42; *baptisma* and *baptismos*, the same as *baptisis*; *baptisterion*, a bathing place, swimming bath, and by implication a dyer's vat; *baptistes*, one that dips, a dyer, a baptizer; *baptos*, dipped, dyed, bright-colored; *bapto*,

to dip, to dye, to dye the hair, to temper steel, to steep, to color, to glaze earthen vessels.

Here the idea of to dye inheres in all these words, while the idea of dip is dropped out of some of them entirely, and is thus shown not to inhere in the radical *bap* as dye does. But when we come to the *usus loquendi* of the term we shall find numerous examples of *baptizo* where the idea of dip is wholly out of the question; and this must forever settle the question as to the primary and original meaning of the radical syllable *bap*. This shows that dye, which can be performed in any mode, and not dip, is the radical meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo*.

This radical meaning of the root of this word comes out fully in the Christian ordinance, for it imports a moral tinge, stamp, hue, or color, that is the image of Christ in the soul; and thus does the radical meaning of *baptizo* harmonize with the symbolical import of the Christian ordinance, and shows the beauty of selecting the term to give name to the initiatory rite of Christianity.

The position here taken is fully demonstrated by the fact that the Greek word which properly signifies to dip is not *bapto*, nor *baptizo*, nor any word of the family of *bap*; but *dupto*, as Dr. Webster shows in tracing out the etymology of the English word dip. The word *dupto* is derived from *duo*, which primarily signifies "to impel, or thrust, to go in, or under."—See Parkhurst, Scapula, Schrivellius, and Liddel and Scott. So the derivatives from this root, both in their simple and compound forms, express the radical idea of going in or under; hence, "*dupto*, to duck, or dive," properly, to dip; "*duptes*, a diver"—Latin *mergus*, properly, a dipper; "*dusis*, a sinking, a dipping under;" "*dusme* and *dusmai*, a setting of the sun, sinking, going down;" "*katadusis*, a going down, a descent—as of the stars setting;" "*kataduo*, to go under, to sink, to set."

Here the idea of going down, under, or into, inheres in all these words which spring from the common root *duo*; while *dupto*, according to Dr. Webster, is the exact synonym of the English word dip, and means to put into a liquid and withdraw, the express and specific action which my opponent calls baptism. This word, or some word from this common root, should have been used expressive of the Christian ordinance, if the specific action of immersion was to be enjoined. But neither Christ nor his apostles ever used any of this family of words expressive of the Christian ordinance; yet, when the Greeks began the practice of immersion, these were the very words they used to express that act, as we shall see in due time, thus proving beyond all controversy that *baptizo* does not express that specific action.

I have said this much to take away from my opponent the seeming advantage he might gain by the admission that the radical signification of *baptizo* is to dip. I am satisfied that such is not the case, and I do not intend he shall have the advantage of an admission not founded in fact. But the original or etymological meaning of a word can not settle its meaning, at any given period of its history, for words are constantly changing their signification, and etymology can not be relied on as a criterion in ascertaining the meaning of words.

Dr. Carson, the ablest Baptist writer that ever put pen to paper, says (see Carson on Baptism, p. 46):

"Language has not logical truth for its standard, and therefore against this it can not trespass. Use is the sole arbiter of language, and whatever is agreeable to its authority, stands justified beyond impeachment."

Dr. George Campbell, in his "Philosophy of Rhetoric," takes the same position. On p. 164, he says:

"Only let us rest on these fixed principles, that use, or the custom of speaking, is the sole original standard of conversation as far as regards the expression, and the custom of writing is the sole standard of style; that the latter comprehends the former, and something more; that to the tribunal of use as to the supreme authority, and, consequently, in every grammatical controversy, the last resort, we are entitled to appeal from the laws and the decisions of grammarians: and that this order of subordination ought never, on any account, to be reversed.

Again, on p. 191, he says:

"It is never from an attention to etymology, which would frequently mislead us, but from custom, the only infallible guide in this matter, that the meanings of words in present use must be learned. And, indeed, if the want in question were material, it would equally affect all those words, no inconsiderable part of our language, whose descent is doubtful or unknown. Besides, in no case can the line of derivation be traced back to infinity. We must always terminate in some words of whose genealogy no account can be given."

But not only is "use the sole arbiter of language," but present use is the rule that we must be governed by in fixing the present meaning of words; consequently the usage of the Jews, who spoke the Greek language at the time of the Saviour's personal ministry upon the earth, must determine the meaning of New Testament Greek. I will read again from Campbell's "Philosophy of Rhetoric," pp. 170, 171:

"But there will naturally arise here another question: Is not use, even good and national use, in the same country, different in different periods? and, if so, to the usage of what period shall we attach ourselves as the proper rule? If you say the present, as it may reasonably be expected that you will, the difficulty is not entirely removed. In what extent of signification must we understand the word *present*? How far may we safely range in quest of authorities? or at what distance backward from this moment are authors still to be accounted as possessing a legislative voice in language? To this I own it is difficult to give an answer with all the precision that might be desired. Yet it is certain that, when we are in search of precedents for any word or idiom, there are certain mounds we can not overleap with safety. For instance, the authority of Hooker or of Raleigh, however great their merit and their fame be, will not now be admitted in support of a term or expression not to be found in any good writer of a later date." . . . "It is not by ancient but by present use that our style must be regulated; and that use can never be denominated present which hath been laid aside time immemorial,

or, which amounts to the same thing, falls not within the knowledge or remembrance of any now living." . . . "To me it is so evident either that present use must be the standard of the present language, or that the language admits no standard whatever, that I can not conceive a clearer or more indisputable principle from which to bring an argument to support it."

"And with regard to etymology, about which grammarians make so much useless bustle, if every one hath a privilege of altering words according to his opinion of their origin, the opinions of the learned being on this subject so various, nothing but a general chaos would ensue."—Ibid. p. 172.

On pages 173, 174, he remarks:

"Thus I have attempted to explain what that use is which is the sole mistress of language, and to ascertain the precise import and extent of these her essential attributes, reputable, national, and present, and to give the directions proper to be observed in searching for the laws of this empress. In truth, grammar and criticism are but her ministers; and though, like other ministers, they would sometimes impose the dictates of their own humor upon the people as the commands of their sovereign, they are not often so successful in such attempts as to encourage the frequent repetition of them."

The principle here laid down is so obvious that those pedobaptists who are so strangely inclined to immersion are compelled to acknowledge that the latter, or Hellenistic, usage of the word *baptizo*, favors baptism by pouring or sprinkling. Dr. Schaff is an illustration of this remark. See his "History of the Apostolic Church," p. 569.

All candid biblical critics admit that ancient classical usage will not do to follow in interpreting the New Testament. This is a point fully established among them, and is admitted by Hinton, an eminent Baptist writer, in his "History of Baptism." I will read from this work, pp. 18, 23:

"It is manifest, however, that the meaning of a word in any given case is not to be determined by its original sense, but by its actual ordinary meaning in the language in which the author wrote, and at the time of his writing; unless the circumstances in which the word occurs require a figurative or technical signification (which may also include the ordinary) to be attached." . . . "It does not appear to me, however, in the slightest degree important to the argument that no case of variation of meaning should be found. What word can be more specific than the Saxon word *dip*? And yet we have the dip of the magnetic needle, which has certainly nothing to do with plunging. Could several instances of extension or dilution of meaning be found among the profane Greek writers, it would not affect the question, which is, In what sense did Christ and his apostles use the term *baptizo*, and what did they design the disciples then and now to understand by it?"

In ascertaining the meaning of *baptizo* in the New Testament, we are bound by every law of language to confine ourselves to that period of the history of the Greek language covered by the three centuries immediate before Christ and the three or four following him. This will give us as wide a margin as can possibly be demanded, and we

must confine ourselves mainly to Hellenistic and Christian usage, as found in the New Testament, the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, and the writings of the early Christian Fathers.

I will now begin with the New Testament usage of the word *baptizo* where the ordinance of Christian baptism is not spoken of, and see what is its import in those passages; then I shall show that this usage agrees perfectly with the usage of the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, and the early Christian Fathers.

The first passage I shall adduce is Mark vii. 2, 3, collated with Luke xi. 38. "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say with unwashed hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders."—Mark vii. 2, 3. "And when the Pharisee saw it he marveled that he had not first washed before dinner."

Here the washing in both instances is that practiced by the Jews before eating; and in Mark the Greek word used is *niphontai*, in Luke it is *ebaptisthe*, showing that these words are interchangeable in the Greek language, and that *baptizo* consequently in the New Testament often signifies a very slight and partial wetting.

I now call attention to a passage from Clement of Alexandria, who lived about A. D. 190, and who spoke the Greek language, in illustration of these passages of scripture. It is found in Leiss, "Baptist System Examined," p. 120. The Doctor says:

"The first passage we adduce is from Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 387, Lugduni Batav., 1616. He is "here speaking on the subject of *baptism*. He traces it even in the lustrative rites of the heathen world. He says there is '*rikoon baptismaios*, a picture, image, representation of baptism which has been handed down from Moses to the poets;' as for example 'Penelope, having (*hudraino*) moistened or washed herself, and having on clean apparel, prays.'—Odys. iv. 759. Telemachus, having (*nipito*) washed his hands in the hoary sea, prayed to Minerva.—Odys. xi. 261. This was the Jewish custom (*hoos baptizethai*), to be baptized in this way, even often upon the bed or couch." Here Clement declares that the Jews often baptized themselves upon their couches, by washing their hands!

Here it is demonstrable that *baptizo* is used in the sense of a slight and partial wetting; and that the Jews baptized themselves before eating by simply washing their hands while reclining upon their couches.

The second passage which I shall notice is found in Mark vii. 4: "And when they come from the market, except they wash (baptize themselves) they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold as the washing (baptism) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables." The word here translated "tables" is *klinoon* which signifies not a table to eat from, but a couch upon which individuals reclined while they were at their meals. Then *klinoon* were frequently elevations of the floor around the sides of their rooms, and were not such objects as admitted of immersion. The cups, and pots, might have been immersed, that is, it was possible to immerse them; but the tables, or *klinoon* could not have been; they could only have been baptized by sprinkling, or at most by affusion.



In Alford's Greek Testament, I find the following remarks upon this passage: "These *baptismoï* as applied to *clinton* (meaning probably here couches (*triclinia*) used at meals) were certainly not immersions, but sprinklings or affusions of water." Dr. Scott, in his commentary on this passage, remarks: "If we suppose that they always bathed the whole body, after they returned from the markets, which is not very probable, we can not conceive that they plunged their couches in the water also. The Pharisees blamed Christ's disciples for "eating with unwashed hands," and not for not immersing their bodies in water; so it seems undeniable that by the words baptize and baptisms, a partial application of water was intended in this as well as in several other places.

The third passage in the New Testament to which I shall refer is found, Hebrews ix. 10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings (baptisms) and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation." Here all the various ablutions of the law of Moses are called baptisms; and among them in the following verses are specifically enumerated the various purifications by sprinkling enjoined by the law. This passage like the former is decisive, for here all the purifications under the law of Moses are called baptisms, and many of these baptisms it is affirmed were performed by simply sprinkling. The whole law consisted of these "diverse baptisms," but where were the "diverse immersions?" You may search for them in vain throughout the law of Moses. Not one single personal immersion was ever enjoined in the law, and yet the law had "diverse baptisms" among the things which it enjoined!

The fourth passage to which I shall call your attention is 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

The Israelites, in this instance, were not immersed, either "in fact or in figure;" yet we are told by the apostle that "they were all baptized." Our immersionist friends will have it, however, that they were immersed figuratively! When I was a boy I saw a Baptist minister once illustrate how this figurative immersion took place. He took two books and set them up on edge, and laid another book on top of these, and told us that the waters of the sea stood up as a wall on either side, and the cloud rested on these walls above, and the Israelites passed under the cloud and between these walls of water, and were thus figuratively immersed. But, at best, this was only a half a figure; for there was no water before, behind, and underneath them, and such a half immersion will not answer nowadays with our immersionist friends. But this figurative immersion is all imaginary; for the cloud was not above the Israelites at all during their passage through the Bed Sea. Before they entered the sea, the cloud went over before them, and stood behind them, between them and the Egyptians, and continued there until they passed over the sea. I will read to you from Exod. xiv. 19-22, inclusive, the account of their passage through the Red Sea:

"And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel,

removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them:

"And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night.

"And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided.

"And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left."

The baptism which was performed by the cloud did not take place while the Israelites were in the sea at all. They were baptized by the cloud, while they were under the cloud, but they were not under the cloud while they were passing through the sea. The preposition "*en*" here translated *in*, is used in the instrumental sense, and should have been translated "by," as the cloud was the instrument by means of which the baptism was performed; this is the proper meaning of the preposition "*en*" in this passage. The question then, is, When and how was the baptism by the cloud performed? We have the answer to this question in the 68th Psalm, from the seventh to the tenth verses inclusive, which I will read:

"O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness; Selah.

"The earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel.

"Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary.

"Thy congregation hath dwelt therein: thou, O God, hast prepared of thy goodness for the poor."

Here we find the cloud "sent as plentiful rain," whereby the children of Israel were confirmed, in which state of confirmation they continued to dwell. What, then, was that state of confirmation into which they were brought by this "plentiful rain?" Paul says, "they were all baptized unto Moses by the cloud," and it was this baptism unto Moses that confirmed Israel in the dispensation of Moses. What the psalmist here calls a "confirmation by a plentiful rain," Paul calls a "baptism unto Moses." This baptism of the Israelites was not a baptism by dipping, but by pouring or sprinkling with the rain from heaven. Where, I ask, did God ever send a shower of rain on the Israelites during their journeys in the wilderness to supply their natural wants? He "smote the rock and the waters gushed out" to supply famishing Israel; he sweetened the bitter waters of Marah; but where did he send the rain from heaven for this purpose? This is the only instance of a rain shower coming on Israel in all their journeyings, and it was to baptize or confirm them unto Moses.

In the 77th Psalm, verses 16-20, we have the same transaction spoken of, and the same circumstances mentioned. The psalmist says: "The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out waters:

the skies sent out a sound: thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven: the lightnings lighted the world : the earth trembled and shook. Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known. Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron." In both these passages the rain from the clouds is so connected with the "thunder and earthquake" which took place at the giving of the law at Mt. Sinai, as to clearly determine that it was at that time that Israel was confirmed by the "plentiful rain," or, in other words, "baptized unto Moses."

The usage of the New Testament scriptures agrees exactly with the usage that is found in the Septuagint and in the Apocrypha. In the Septuagint—the translation of the Old Testament which was made into the Greek in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt—we have, in 2 Kings v. 14, the passage where Naaman is directed by Elisha to go and wash himself seven times in Jordan. We have here the words *baptizo* and *louo* used interchangeably. The command of the prophet was, "Go and (*lousai se*) wash thyself (it was not, dip thyself) seven times." The translators render the passage, "He went and baptized himself." They plainly use the terms *lousai*, from the verb *louo*, and *baptizo* interchangeably in this passage. The command was not dip, but wash. Naaman went, and, as the translators say, "baptized himself," hence they used these terms, the one as expressing the meaning of the other, and all the world knows that *louo* is not a specific word, and does not express mode at all. But there is another fact I do not want you to forget. In cleansing the leper according to the law of Moses, dipping was never used in the mode of application—but sprinkling always. And do you suppose that a Hebrew prophet would direct a leper to go and dip himself seven times, when the law required that the leper should be sprinkled seven times in order to be cleansed? See Lev. xiv. 7. The case is not at all supposable. Naaman was commanded to go *lousai*, wash himself, seven times; the law required that the leper should be sprinkled seven times. Naaman did as he was commanded, and this is called baptism.

A second passage occurs in Isaiah where the evident meaning is to terrify or affright: "My iniquity baptizes me," or, "My iniquity affrights me." Here reference seems to be made to the effect produced, while the idea of modality is dropped entirely out, showing conclusively that the idea of mode is not in the term. The idea of dip, or immerse, never entered the prophet's mind when he uttered this language.

We have two examples of the use of *baptizo* in the Apocrypha, and only two. The first is found in Judith xii. 7: "Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her; thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and washed (*ebaptizeto*, baptized) herself in the camp, at the fountain of water." She baptized herself at the fountain of water; but she did not immerse herself in the fountain of water : nor, as some of our immersionist friends would have us believe, did she plunge herself in a large stone trough that was perhaps at the fountain! She baptized herself according to the Jewish custom by sprinkling, or by

washing the hands, as they did in baptizing themselves upon their couches.

I will give but one passage more as my time is nearly up. In Sirach xxxi. 25, we read, "He that is baptized from a dead body and toucheth it again, what is he profited by his washing." Here the word *baptizo* is used with *apo*—"He that is baptized (*apo*) from a dead body." Now, you can immerse a thing into a liquid; but to immerse a thing from a thing is impossible. If *baptizo* is a word of action, and specifies action only, and that specific action is to dip, it is certainly used in the wrong connection here. The cleaning from a dead body is here called a "baptism," and if you will turn to the 19th chapter of Numbers, and 19th verse, you will see how this baptism was performed. "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even." Here then is a baptism that includes sprinkling as the principal part. If the washing applies to the person cleansed, then the baptism embraced both sprinkling and a general Washing; and, if so, *baptizo* can not be a word of mode at all; for a word that includes both these modes, can not specifically mean either. But, if the washing applies to the person who sprinkled the unclean person, which is, I think, probable, if not certain, then the baptism was performed by simple sprinkling.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I esteem myself happy in being permitted to appear before you, by the good providence of God, in defense of what I conceive to be the truth—the highest order of truth—scriptural truth. We are told in the word of God that he made all things good; then, of course, all things were in accordance with the truth. "But the heart of man sought out many strange inventions." It has become liable to err, and liability to err has given rise to differences of opinion; these have caused investigations and discussions, as was so beautifully and appropriately said by my opponent.

I believe impartial investigation to be the duty of each and every individual, for by it alone do we reach the truth, which should be the great desire of every heart. "If the truth make you free, you are free indeed." That discussion may be necessary, there must first be a difference of opinion; and to render such discussion profitable, there must be, not only a sincere desire to reach the truth, but there must be a received standard of authority—a standard accepted by both parties. There is, on the present occasion, an honest difference of opinion between my brother and myself; and there is a common standard of authority. We both accept the word of God as our only, perfect, and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. To it we appeal, and its decisions must be accepted as conclusive of the whole matter.

It is the duty of each disputant to state his views fairly and clearly, and show that they are in accordance with this standard; and to examine the views of his opponent, stating them fairly, giving them all

the weight they deserve, and show that they are not in accordance with this common standard. On the present occasion, I shall endeavor to show that my opponent's views are not in accordance with a fair interpretation of the scriptures; and that my own are in accordance with them.

I appear before you then, on the negative of this proposition, and my friend on the affirmative as he should be; as I shall show you before I close. I hope the discussion will be conducted in a gentlemanly and Christian spirit, and that investigation and search for the truth—an honest desire to reach the truth, may control us in all that we do. We should remember that we meet here as Christians, and that our reputation as Christians is at stake. My friend, from his reputation and the position in which his brethren have placed him, stands before the world as a recognized exponent of Christian courtesy and doctrine, as well as the exponent of the views of his brethren. The same is true to some extent of myself. It is then incumbent on us to conduct this discussion in such a manner, that the cause of Christ may not be wounded by our conduct; and, God helping me, I shall so conduct\* it on my part.

It should also be borne in mind that our words and actions are to be fairly and fully reported and published, and probably read by thousands all over this part of the State, and that they will affect our reputation for years, and perhaps after we have passed off the stage of action. Let us then bear in mind the importance and sacred character of the themes we are discussing, the prominent position in which our brethren have placed us, and conduct this discussion as such an investigation should be conducted by professed ministers of the Gospel. I can cheerfully subscribe to all my brother has said on these points, and am truly glad that the discussion has opened so pleasantly.

Some eighteen hundred and thirty-five years ago, a little band were one calm Lord's Day morning standing on a mountain not far from Jerusalem. In their midst stood one who said, "All authority in heaven and in earth is given to me. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and I will be with you always, even to the end." He, in these words, gave to these persons around him the apostolic commission, a commission that was destined to work the mightiest religious and social revolutions the world has ever known. He gave them authority to do, and commanded them to do three things, "disciple," "baptize," and "teach." In regard to the first and last things commanded, there is no dispute. There is a difference of opinion, however, in regard to the second. We see men performing three entirely distinct and different acts, as acts of obedience to the second command. I claim that but one of these acts is obeying this command of Christ. My brother acknowledges that this is obedience, but claims also that the other two are equally acts of obedience to this great command. I deny that these acts are in any sense obeying the command our Saviour gave, when he said, "Baptize all of the nations who have believed." That places him properly in the affirmative.

In the correspondence that passed between my opponent and myself while arranging for this discussion, I proposed this proposition. My friend thought I should affirm, "Immersion of a proper subject, in water, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is the only mode of Christian baptism." This I positively refused to do, because I neither believed nor taught it, nor did my brethren. I do not teach that immersion is a mode of baptism, but that it is baptism. I asked him would he negative such an affirmative. "Oh no," said he, "for I believe that too. But I believe that pouring and sprinkling are also baptism." "Very well," I replied, "I deny it. Will you affirm it? I will affirm all my practice. You will not negative it. I will negative your practice. Will you affirm it?"

Now, were I to affirm that immersion is the only action called baptism in the scriptures, when I had proved that it was baptism, my friend would say, "Well, I don't deny that; but you have not shown that pouring and sprinkling are not baptism." Or, in other words, he insists on my proving a negative—a thing no rule of fairness or logic requires me to do. As I wish to place this matter clearly before you, I will use this illustration: My friend and I have a suit in court concerning a lot of land; I claim that I am sole owner; he asserts that there are two others, in whose behalf he enters a suit against me, who are joint owners with me. We come into court; the judge says to Mr. Hughey, "Do you admit Mr. Braden's right to the land?" "Yes, sir; but I claim that my two clients have an equal right." Turning to me he asks, "Do you admit his claim?" I reply, "No, sir; I deny it *in toto*." "Well," says Mr. Hughey, "let him prove that he is the sole owner!" Would the judge require this of me? No; he would say to Mr. Hughey, "You assert your clients have a right in the land; prove your allegation." And further, unless he established his claim, I would remain sole owner, as he had admitted my ownership in the land.

Now, here we have this disputed piece of property—this ordinance. My friend admits that immersion is baptism, or, as he says, a mode of baptism. I have not to prove that—it is not in dispute. He claims that pouring and sprinkling are also baptism. This I most emphatically deny. Now, let him prove his affirmation—prove his practice to be scriptural. I have not a single word of argument to make on the affirmative of my practice, for my opponent admits that to be right. I have merely to show that he fails to sustain his practice by the scriptures. If I do more, it will be really a work of supererogation.

My opponent thinks he stands in an awkward position. I know that; hence I drew these when arranging preliminaries. But it is awkward, not because his position in the affirmative is not logically his position, but because there is so little to make an affirmative out of, on his side. Our brethren, I know, have always been ready to affirm this negative my friend wanted me to affirm; too anxious to show that pouring and sprinkling were not baptism. The result has been, that our opponents have had only to stand back and bring up a multitude of weak objections, and throw dust, and becloud by petti-

fogging an argument that is absolutely impregnable. This course may do very well where the design is to obscure the point at issue. It is easy to say that an argument is flimsy and far-fetched, and all that; but such arguments or evasions would make a very poor basis for an affirmative argument. Hence the reluctance of my opponent to take the affirmative. It is awkward to attempt to build up an argument out of cavils and flimsy negations.

Let me illustrate this further; for I want to have this matter fairly understood. I will suppose my opponent and myself stand before a pile of building material. A dispute arises as to what kind of house can be built of the material. I say a stone house, and that alone. He admits that a stone house can be built, but claims that a brick or wooden one can as readily be built. To settle the dispute, we agree to take the material and build a house of the kind we contend for. I build a large stone edifice of splendid proportions and perfect symmetry. My opponent comes forward and admits that it is chiefly stone, or may be, perhaps, all stone; but then there are two or three pieces that are of the same color as brick, and he calls attention to these, and claims them as belonging to him, to be used in his brick house—at least they are not stone, and he attempts to take them out. He hammers and defaces them until, though they are but a very insignificant part of the great structure, he calls all attention to them. People no longer look at the magnificent building, but gaze at the few little spots he has defaced, so that they are blemishes in the beautiful edifice.

Now, since he admitted that a stone house could be reared, it seems to me, that it would be best to set him to work to build up a brick one. I would have only to examine these few little pieces he claimed in my building, and show that they were not brick, and even were I to give them to him, a dozen little pieces would make a poor show toward erecting a temple. In like manner our brethren have taken all the material, and have built a magnificent argument for immersion. Our opponents have fastened on two or three passages, and attempted to show, not that they prove sprinkling or pouring, but that they do not mean immersion. In this way what is an almost farcical basis for an argument for pouring or sprinkling, is made to make an important figure in beclouding and disfiguring an universal affirmative argument for immersion. It is time immersionists ceased to give such unfair advantages to their opponents. I know well that my opponent feels how few and weak are his arguments for his practice. By constant and vociferous reiteration, he could make them make some show in a negative, but he feels that they will cut a poor figure in an affirmative.

He has not this morning presented a single argument, a single affirmative argument. If what he says has any point, it is all merely a negative of what he anticipates I will say. He has not yet brought a single argument to prove that sprinkling and pouring are baptism, that has any bearing on the question. He has not brought forward a single passage of scripture, or a single classic quotation, or a single illustration that bears on the point at issue. He is already affirming, not that pouring or sprinkling is baptism, but that there are places where

baptism is mentioned or referred to, in which we can not see how it can mean immersion, or it may mean something else. Should I grant all he has said, it would not give him a syllable of proof for his practice of pouring or sprinkling.

He has said something about liberality of opinion. This is a very fine sounding phrase, and one that is quite popular now. But there is a false and true liberality. We believe in being as liberal as the truth, and no more so. Truth has but one form. Error has as many as Proteus. The action of baptism is not a mere expediency left to human choice or taste. When Christ laid down the organic law of his kingdom, he regarded these things as of sufficient importance to be incorporated into it. This is one of the three. It is then of paramount importance, not only in intention, but also in action, or our great law-giver would not have incorporated it into the organic law of his kingdom, and placed it at the threshold of his church, and enjoined it on all his followers. We desire to be as liberal as Christ, and the word of God, and no more so. Baptism is not to be placed on a level with the petty disputes of modern ritualism, without direct insult to him who placed it in the constitution of his church.

Another thought: This action called baptism is performed but once—once for all time and eternity—at the entrance into the most important relation we ever assume—that of a child of God; and it does seem to me that a sincerely converted person would be anxious to perform the very act Christ commanded. He will inquire what did Christ command, and will do that; and not begin his life as a Christian, by assuming that something else than what God commanded will do just as well.

A few words of explanation in reference to the nature and importance of positive commands and ordinances, may not be amiss, at this point. We term baptism a positive ordinance, or command. Positive commands require the performance, in a certain way, of some specific act, not before meritorious, and for some definite end. This makes of the act, when performed in this way, an ordinance. The merit is not in the act itself, but in the obedience to proper authority. As they enjoin a specific act, that act is essential to obedience of the command. The act performed in a certain way is the ordinance; hence there can be no obedience without that act. No other act will do just as well, for this act is the thing commanded—the command.

Let me here call the attention of my opponent and the audience to this fact, which overturns his entire position. No instance can be given where a positive ordinance could be obeyed by three entirely different specific acts. Will he name one? Then, if this be true, his position, that the three entirely different specific acts of immersion, pouring, or sprinkling, are equally acts of obedience to God's positive ordinance of baptism, is utterly untenable. Such a position is untrue from the very nature of positive ordinances. The scriptures enjoin a specific action, and when performed in a certain manner, it is an ordinance. The specific action is essential to an ordinance, for the act thus performed is the ordinance.

Positive ordinances are for the purpose of securing a proper spirit of obedience to the government, and respect for its authority. They



exhibit the obedience, submission, and loyalty of the subject. Hence governments are always tenacious in exacting strict obedience to the very things enjoined in their positive commands; for they are tests of obedience, and there can be no obedience without the very act commanded. God has also ever been tenacious about exact obedience to the very thing required by his positive commands. The Bible is full of lessons on this point. Cain was rejected because he thought that the fruits of the earth alone, a mere thank-offering, were sufficient. Abel was accepted because he brought what God demanded, a sin-offering, a lamb typical of his need of a Redeemer. Lot's wife and family went forth out of the doomed city of Sodom into the plain. The command was, "Thou shalt not look back or tarry." Lot's wife probably reasoned, "Now, if we go to Zoar, that is all that is needed. It makes no difference how we go, whether we look behind us or not." She violated this positive command, and stands a monument on the pages of God's word, of his regard for his positive commands.

Moses was commanded to smite the rock in the wilderness. He did not do it as God commanded, and never entered the promised land, because of not doing just what God commanded. Korah, Dathan, and Abiram caviled concerning the positive command of God, and the earth swallowed them up. Nadab and Abihu offered a strange fire unto the Lord—did "something else just as good," as no doubt they reasoned, but God destroyed them for tampering with his positive command.

Saul was sent forth to execute a positive command of God. His "heart was all right," and when he changed God's commands he did it for the good of religion. God told him "obedience was better than burnt-offering," and rejected him from being king of Israel. The men of Beth-shemesh no doubt thought that after they had offered sacrifices, it would make no difference about looking into the ark of God. That was a positive ordinance and a "non-essential." They violated God's positive law, and were slain, eighteen thousand of them. Uzziah stretched forth his hand, disobeyed a positive command of God, and was stricken dead for touching the rocking ark. We see from all this that God is tenacious in exacting exact obedience to what he has commanded in his positive ordinances. He says, "That which I have commanded you, is the only thing I will accept."

Let no one say that we make God unreasonably jealous in regard to his law. Our government has its positive requirements, which it exacts of the alien, and they must all be done, and the very things commanded must be done, or he is never accepted as a citizen by the government. Will not the God of heaven be equally exact in requiring the alien sinner to do the thing he requires as the initiatory rite to an entrance into his kingdom? Yes, we must do just what he requires or we never will be accepted. "Well," says one, "a drop is just as good as an ocean, if the heart be right." Yes, if God commanded the drop as well as the ocean. If he commanded the ocean, nothing but the ocean will be obeying him, and that alone will be accepted. "If the heart is right, it makes no matter about the mode." But if the heart be right, *it* will make matter about the mode, and not rest satisfied till it is right in mode as in everything else; es-

specially since the act is the ordinance, and there can be no obedience without that very act. The heart that is right will ask, "What does God command me to do? What is the act enjoined in this ordinance of baptism?" and it will do that and nothing else—be satisfied with this and nothing else. Then we are tenacious because God's word is tenacious. We are liberal as his word—we dare to be no more so.

In giving revelation, God used human language as the medium to convey his ideas to men. He used words in their usual and accepted meaning. This is especially the case in his positive commands. They have to be very plain and explicit. He does not in them enjoin a new act, but he takes a well-known action and requires it to be done in a certain way, and makes this act, when so performed, an ordinance. He gives no new meaning or action to the word. The action thus performed is an ordinance, "but the act is the same, not a new act.

In recording the three acts commanded by our Saviour, the Holy Spirit uses three well-known Greek verbs; each of these had a clearly-established meaning, and the Holy Spirit used them in that meaning. About the first and last there is no dispute.

Let me here, before entering into the direct examination of, how we should determine what was the specific act commanded by the Holy Spirit in using *baptizo* to express the second act enjoined, dispose of two or three subterfuges, often resorted to by our opponents to becloud the question, and to raise doubt in the mind of those who listen to them. The first is confounding *bapto*, the primitive word, with *baptizo*, the derivative, and attempting to make the latter as extensive in meaning as the former. Campbell, in his debate with Rice, made a great mistake here. He introduced this source of caviling and error by his argument on the root *bap*, virtually admitting these words to be synonymous. Now, Carson, Moses Stuart, and all late eminent lexicographers, take this position: The original meaning of *bapto* is, to dip: its principal secondary meaning is to dye, because we dip things to color them. Under this secondary meaning, dye, *bapto* takes such meanings as stain, color, tinge, etc.; but *baptizo*, its derivative, always follows the primary meaning, dip, and never takes any of the secondary meanings which come in under dye. Hence we shall accept and notice no argument that is not based on *baptizo* alone; for that is the only word used to express the act which Christ made an ordinance in his church. We shall not notice far-fetched figurative renderings of *bapto*.

*Secondly.* We shall not enter into an argument as to whether words in the New Testament have a classical and sacred meaning. We will admit that some words have a sacred and a classical use. But they are words of a moral and spiritual meaning, and classical heathen usage did not reach the spiritual sense. Words expressing physical action did not, however, have any such double meaning. *Baptizo* expressed a physical act, and never needed or had a sacred sense different from its ordinary meaning. The manner and the object of performing the act gives it its moral sense. The act is the same. But before this argument, or cavil rather, can have any weight it must be shown, 1. That *baptizo* has a classical and a sacred sense. 2. That these differ. 3. That sprinkle or pour is the sacred meaning. Until

this is done, or attempted, we shall pay no attention to sacred and classical usages of *baptizo* or any other word.

*Thirdly.* We are told that words often change their meaning, and take secondary meanings. Here Campbell allowed Rice to lead him away to the discussion of entirely irrelevant matter. We will admit this; but before it can make any figure in the question we are now discussing, it must be shown, 1. That *baptizo* has ever lost its primary meaning. 2. That immersion was its primary meaning thus lost. 3. That pouring and sprinkling were secondary meanings then taken up.

Matthew, in recording the commission, uses for the second act a well-known Greek verb, one that had a clearly-established and well-defined meaning; and used it with just that meaning. This verb was used to express one clearly-defined physical act, and hence it was a specific word and expressed a specific act. Christ made this act, performed in a certain way, an ordinance in his church; but he did not change the meaning of the word or the action expressed by it. The inquiry then resolves itself into this, "How did the Greeks use *baptizo*?"

As the language is no longer spoken, we appeal to the lexicons of the language. These are compiled by men who have made the language a study—who collate all the passages where the word occurs—who examine Greek authors and writers as to the use of the word, when they testify on the point—who examine languages into which the word was translated—and who also examine the context; and by these make out the meanings of the word, and arrange the results of their labors in lexicons. We use lexicons as standards, and reject all theological books written in the interest of either side, just as we would reject the arguments and assertions of lawyers, and accept only the witnesses and the law, as recorded by the statute and impartial jurists.

Then, we appeal to determine the meaning of *baptizo*, to, 1. Lexicons of the Greek language. I learn my opponent often affects great contempt for lexicons, and assures his hearers that he goes to the fountain-head—the sources from whence they were taken. No doubt he will reject the lexicons, for they are all against him. But how does he go to the sources from whence the lexicons were taken? By means of the lexicons he affects to despise. I have heard of a man who set up a ladder in an open field, and climbed to the top of it, and then took up the ladder with him; but the gentleman is the first illustration I ever saw of that feat. He can not to-day construe a sentence, without relying on the authority of the lexicons. We will hardly believe that he can climb to the top of the ladder of lexicons, and then kick the ladder over without the fall that always overtakes pride. Men that have spent a lifetime in studying the Greek, know more about it than my young friend.

We appeal, 2. To men learned in the Greek language, as, *First*—Authors of lexicons of other languages, who have borne testimony in reference to the meaning of this word; *Second*—Historians; *Third*—Theologians; *Fourth*—Commentators; *Fifth*—Encyclopedists; *Sixth*—Writers on classical subjects; *Seventh*—Translators of the scriptures into other languages. We take the testimony of these on the use and

meaning of *baptizo*, as their study of the language and the history of the ordinance has prepared them to speak of it understandingly, and we accept their incidental testimony, because it is impartial.

3. We then confirm their decision by an examination of the use of the word in all passages where it occurs. From these we learn whether the renderings given to *baptizo* make sense, and agree with the context in every case.

4. We next appeal to the early fathers of the church, who were nearly cotemporary with the institution of the ordinance. They will certainly be able to tell us how it was handed down to them.

5. We appeal to the history and description of the ordinance, as given by learned men and historians.

6. To the places where the rite was performed. If these were always such as were necessary to immersion, we have a strong collateral proof of immersion.

7. To the prepositions always used with the word. If these are invariably such as require immersion, we have another strong collateral proof.

8. To the figurative use of the word. If the figures are like an immersion, and never like a pouring or sprinkling, we have another strong collateral proof.

9. We appeal to the law of substitution or convertibility. If pouring and sprinkling are baptism, we can substitute them for it, and make sense. If we can not, they are not baptism. If we can substitute immersion and make sense, it is baptism. Such is the course we would pursue were we on the affirmative, to prove that immersion is baptism. Is it not the only fair and legitimate way? Will it not apply as well to our attempt to prove that pouring and sprinkling are baptisms? In our own language, when we wish to learn the meaning of a word, we appeal to the lexicons and learned men, and to its use. Should not we do so in Greek? The meaning of *baptizo* settles the question, for that is the word used to express the ordinance called baptism, and no other. Let us then have a clear and fair exposition of what *baptizo* means. I will allow no other word to be lugged into the discussion, not even *bapto* its parent word. Dr. Moses Stuart says, on pp. 59, 60, of the work I quote:

"The reader is desired to notice what has been stated, viz: that while most of the words derived from *bapto* have a twofold sense, that of immersion and of dyeing, yet some of them are employed in one sense exclusively, either that of immersion or dyeing. We shall see in the sequel that *bapto* and *baptizo* have distinctions of meaning precisely analogous to these distinctions, which are never confounded by usage; while they both agree in one common and original meaning, that of dipping, or plunging, or immersion."

He then proceeds to give long and numerous quotations to prove that *baptizo* always takes meanings derived from dipping and never from dyeing—are the secondary meanings of *bapto*.

My friend quotes Dr. Carson, and represents him as saying that the lexicons and authorities are all against him saying that *baptizo* means to dip. Carson has been misrepresented so for years, by hundreds of pedobaptists. His language is, "I claim that *baptizo* is a verb of mode.

I know that the lexicons are all against me in this"—that is, in making it a verb of mode, not in saying it means dip, as my friend misrepresents him as saying. Dr. Carson uses nearly the same language as Stuart, affirming that *baptizo* always means dip, and never dye.

My friend would have dye as its primitive meaning. What an argument to prove that it means pouring or sprinkling! But he violates a plain rule of common sense in so doing. Did you ever know an effect placed before its cause? What is the effect? Dyeing or coloring. What caused the coloring? Dipping, of course. Then dipping is the original meaning, and dyeing the effect, the secondary meaning of *baptizo*. But, as we have proved from Stuart, Carson, and might quote others, *baptizo*, the word used for the ordinance, never takes the meanings which come in under dye, or even dye itself as a meaning.

Has my opponent brought up a single passage or authority to prove that pouring or sprinkling is baptism? Not one. He has brought forward some passages to show that some Jewish purifications were performed by sprinkling; but is sprinkling therefore baptism? I can not see the connection between the passages and the point at issue. Let me here remind him that these purifications never sprinkled water. Where water was used in them it was in a bathing or immersion of the entire person. God never commanded water to be poured or sprinkled on any one, for any purpose, ceremonial or religious.

He has not brought forward a single author who has ever dared to give pour or sprinkle as even secondary meanings of *baptizo*. We appeal to pedobaptist authorities, those who practiced pouring and sprinkling, and we find they never render *baptizo* by pour or sprinkle. They invariably give dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, as words which require this action. The question may arise, Where then do they get their authority for pouring or sprinkling? Either by claiming, with the Catholic Church, that they can change the ordinances, or by saying, with my friend, that if the heart be right, it makes no matter as to mode. As scholars, they all testify that *baptizo* means immerse, and that ancient baptism was invariably immersion. There is not a single passage which my friend or any one else dare translate, rendering *baptizo*, pour or sprinkle. He can not find a case of pouring or sprinkling for two hundred years after the time of Christ.

We appeal to lexicons, and we find that *baptizo* is a word expressing, as all positive commands must, one specific act. It expresses an act, not a result reached by several different acts. Let us explain what we mean. Travel is a verb of result; it can be accomplished by the specific acts of walking, riding, etc. Kill is a verb of result, and cut, stab, shoot, choke, are the specific acts by which this result is reached. We may, by a metonymy of the result for the cause, use stab and kill for each other, but we can never use choke and stab interchangeably. Inaugurate is another illustration, and one often referred to by our opponents who claim that *baptizo* is a verb of result. It (inaugurate) means to induct into office. This result may be accomplished by the specific acts of taking the oath, as in the case of our President; by crowning, as in case of kings of Europe; or by anointing, as in case of ancient Asiatic kings. Now, by metonymy,

swear may be taken instead of inaugurate, and inaugurate instead of swear, crown, or anoint; but they (crown, swear, and anoint) can not be used interchangeably, and when a man takes an oath he is not crowned or anointed.

Now, we take the position that *baptizo* is a verb which, in Greek, expresses the same specific act that is expressed, in English, by the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm. These are invariably its primary meanings, and it takes the secondary meanings, cleanse, wash, purify, because these effects are accomplished by this specific action, immersion. It takes these meanings by a metonymy of the effect for the cause; but it never loses the primitive action, dip; and in all cases dip, or a kindred word, can be substituted for such secondary meanings. If it means dip, it can not mean pour or sprinkle, any more than stab can also mean choke, or ride can mean walk. It may be asked, "How do you prove your position?" I have already told you how—by an appeal to lexicons, learned men, and classical usage. I here ask my friend, or any one, to show us a single word, in any language, which expresses three so entirely different and contrary physical acts, as immerse, pour or sprinkle. The very thought is absurd. My opponent is very chary of the primitive renderings of *baptizo*. We shall bring them in proper time, and settle the question.

Instead of appealing to the lexicons and showing that pouring and sprinkling are meanings of *baptizo*, he takes up a few passages, and shows that purifying or cleansing are the results of *baptizo*; and then, because persons are sometimes cleansed by pouring or sprinkling, he assumes that pouring and sprinkling are baptism. I can prove anything by such reasoning as that. He argues thus: Baptism wets or moistens; so does pour or sprinkle; therefore, pouring and sprinkling are baptism. Let me reason: Baptism washes; a gargle in the mouth is a wash; therefore, gargling is baptism! Baptism cleanses; we fumigate a room to cleanse it; therefore, fumigating is baptism! Baptism cleanses or purifies; sometimes they are the results of baptism; washing, scouring, scrubbing, rubbing, sweeping, and fumigating all are modes of cleansing, as my friend speaks of modes of baptism; therefore, they are all baptism.

My friend dare not appeal to primary meanings, for there he finds immerse alone. He skips these and takes secondary meanings. Even then he has not pour or sprinkle. He appeals to other methods by which these secondary meanings or results can be accomplished. Still he does not have pour or sprinkle. He only attempts to show that they may be accomplished by pouring and sprinkling. Let us take the well-known verb, to eat, to consume food. Now we are said to consume things when we burn them; rust is said to consume, so is canker; therefore, rusting, burning, and cankering are the same as eating—are modes of taking food! It is a well-known rule of interpretation, that words must be taken in their primary and commonly-accepted meaning, unless we are compelled, by the context, to give other meanings. So says Blackstone, Hedge, Whately, and all writers on such matters. God, in his commands, always so uses them. The gentleman will always so claim, except in the discussion of this question.

We object to the gentleman's position, 1. That it virtually asserts that a positive command can be obeyed by three entirely different and even contrary actions, which, as we have shown, is contrary to the very nature of positive commands. Will the gentleman notice this?

2. It virtually asserts that a word which expresses only physical action, can represent three entirely different physical actions.

3. That he virtually charges God with giving a most important command in ambiguous language.

4. He most carefully avoids the primary and real meaning of *baptizo*, and appeals to secondary meanings; or, rather, to other ways by which the results expressed by these secondary meanings or results can be accomplished. This is in direct violation of a well-known law of interpretation already quoted.

5. He confounds *bapto* and *baptizo*; and attempts to lug in far-fetched meanings of *bapto*.

We will also call our opponent's attention to our position, 1. Baptism is a positive command. Positive commands require one specific act, and the command is not obeyed unless that act is performed, for that action is the thing commanded. Can he name a single positive command of God that could be obeyed by more than one specific act?

2. That lexicons, learned men, such as lexicographers of other languages, theologians, commentators, encyclopedists, writers on classical subjects, translators of the scriptures into other languages, do, all of them, where they give a rendering or translation of *baptizo*, invariably give it as a word expressing but one specific physical act—that expressed by the words, dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm.

3. That no one, no matter how strongly in favor of pouring or sprinkling, has ever dared to give pour or sprinkle as a meaning, primary or secondary.

4. That when Christ used the word, he used it in its ordinary and well-accepted meaning.

5. That he made the act expressed by the word an ordinance, but did not change the act or meaning of the word expressing it.

6. That *baptizo* is a verb expressing an action, and not a result that may be reached by three entirely different acts. Baptism is an act, not a result. Hence, if baptism is pouring or sprinkling, it can not be immersion. If it is one of these, it can not be either of the other two.

7. That he can not name a verb which expresses three different physical acts. We repeat these thoughts to call his attention to them, and to impress them on your minds.

I know that my opponent is in the affirmative, and has a right to lead as he pleases; still I can show you what would be a proper and logical course of argument on the affirmative, and show how much he falls short of such an argument. I wish to criticise his argument, and show its defects, and not to dictate what he shall do. Will my opponent now fairly and squarely meet the issue, and show that pour and sprinkle are meanings of *baptizo*? We want lexicons and standards, impartial standards, and not theological disputants, or pettifoggers. We want definitions, primary and ordinary meanings, not possible meanings of secondary meanings of secondary meanings. We want

square work and not pettifogging. We ask, can it be possible that so important a command was expressed by God in language so ambiguous, that so able a man as my opponent has to hunt its meanings by routes so dark, devious, and tedious as he has indicated this morning?

We will now call the attention of our opponent to the following position: Just as we have in English certain verbs to express the action represented by dip, plunge, submerge, immerse, overwhelm, so the Greek has verbs to represent the same specific act. Will Mr. Hughey tell us what the Greek verbs are that represent this act? Are they not *bapto*, *baptizo*, *duoo*, and *duno*, and their compounds? Are not *bapto* and *baptizo* pre-eminently the words which, in Greek, represent this act? Has not the Greek words to represent pour and sprinkle? Is *baptizo* ever one of them?

If the entire Greek literature, now extant, were to be translated into English, the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, would occur several hundred times in such translation. In nine cases out of ten, the words in the original, thus rendered, would be *bapto* and *baptizo*. Pour and sprinkle would also occur several hundred times; but never once as a rendering of *bapto* or *baptizo*. Hence *bapto* and *baptizo* are pre-eminently the words which, in Greek, represent the specific action expressed in English, by the words dip, plunge, immerse, overwhelm, submerge; and they never, in Greek, represent the actions, pour or sprinkle. It does seem to me that this fact, which my friend dare not deny, settles the whole question.

Another great fact: The word *baptizo* occurs in the Greek that has been examined so far with reference to this question, three hundred and sixty-three times; in eighty of these instances it is in the New Testament applied to the ordinance, and is not translated but transferred. In the remaining two hundred and eighty-three times, it is translated by dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, two hundred and eighty times; by wash, cleanse, and purify, three times; because these are effects of the immersion which it always represents; and never once is it rendered by pour or sprinkle. Can it then mean pour or sprinkle in the ordinance?

Will Mr. Hughey translate pour and sprinkle into Greek? Dare he ever use *baptizo* to do it? He knows he dare not. He can and must translate immerse by *baptizo*, or *bapto*, or *duno*, or *duoo*. Let us take the three sentences, "I sprinkle thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" "I pour thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" "I immerse thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." How will Mr. Hughey translate each into Greek? Dare he translate "I pour thee," by "*Baptizo se?*" No: he would say, "*Chuo se.*" Would he dare translate "I sprinkle thee," by "*Baptizo se?*" No; he would say "*Rainoo se,*" or "*Rantizo se.*" But when he comes to translate "I immerse thee," he could and would say, "*Baptizo se.*" Then, if neither "I pour thee," nor "I sprinkle thee," mean, in Greek, "*Baptizo se,*" "*Baptizo se*" can not mean either "I pour thee," or "sprinkle thee," in English. If "I immerse thee," in English, means "*Baptizo se,*" in Greek, then "*Baptizo se,*" in Greek, means "I immerse thee," in English. This is an argument you can all grasp



and understand. It settles the question, and forever. Will the gentleman meet the square issue we make with him here? He claims that pouring and sprinkling are baptism. I ask him to translate pour or sprinkle into Greek by *baptizo*. He dare not do it. I affirm, baptism is immersion, in all cases, and I can and will translate baptism and baptize, in every case, into English, by immersion. I can translate *baptizo*, and all its various forms and derivatives, by immerse and its forms, in every case where it occurs in the Greek language; and it can be translated in no other way in nearly every instance. Does not this settle the question?

We can dispose of the gentleman's arguments in a few words. He quotes Gale, Dr. Carson, Alexander Campbell, Dr. Cox, Dr. Fuller, and Prof. Morrell, to show—what? that pouring and sprinkling are baptism? No; but that they differ as to the meaning of *baptizo*. Suppose they do differ; does it follow that pouring and sprinkling are baptism? By no means. Do they say pouring and sprinkling are ever meanings of *baptizo*? Never. What has he accomplished, then? Why, they differ as to unessential matters of criticism. They are a unit as to the only question in dispute here—a unit with all pedobaptist authorities—that it expresses one specific act, to immerse.

He next quotes Dr. Dwight, a theological disputant, not speaking as a scholar, to show that tinge, the effect, is the original meaning, and dip, the cause, a secondary meaning; thus violating every principle of common-sense—for we do not tinge things to dip them, but we dip them to tinge them. He quotes Dr. Parson, who says, "The Baptists have the advantage of us (pedobaptists) on this question"—the action of baptism—and that is all of his testimony that is relevant. He then goes to lexicons, not to show that pour and sprinkle are its meanings, or even that immersion is not its meaning, but to show in a roundabout way that perhaps it may mean something else, and that something else is not pouring or sprinkling. If pour and sprinkle were there, could he not have found them? Would he not have triumphantly quoted them?

He then quotes Dr. Robinson, to show that it sometimes meant to draw water, which we deny most positively. He quotes Liddell and Scott to prove the same thing; but they have thrown out these renderings in their later editions, as untenable. So have all scholars. Dr. Robinson is a Congregationalist, or Presbyterian, a professor in Andover Seminary, and not impartial authority. We sometimes speak of dipping water, when we really dip the vessel into the water. Does that prove that the meaning of dip is not to put under a fluid or substance! We all know such is not the case.

Then, with reference to *duplo*, *duno*, and *duoo*. They mean to sink and to dip, but that does not prove that they are the words which, in Greek, mean specially to dip or immerse, any more than because overwhelm and immerse have occasionally the same meaning, proves that overwhelm is specially the word which specially expresses the specific dip, and immerse is not.

Let me say in conclusion that we have not attempted a labored argument in favor of immersion, because our opponent admits that to be right. If he fails to prove pouring and sprinkling, then immersion re-

mains as the only apostolic baptism. We intend to hold him to an affirmative during the entire day, that his argument may stand out in all its flimsy meagerness. To-morrow we will give you a different affirmative from what you have listened to to-day.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, August 18, 1868.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I find it will be most difficult for me to follow my opponent in his reply to my opening speech, especially to make anything like a formal reply in my half hour. He told you that my speech was a "kind of going round Robin Hood's barn." Well, if my speech was a going round Robin Hood's barn once, I think that his reply traveled round that historical institution about one dozen times at least. I was satisfied with traveling round it once, but he wished to continue the operation, for his speech was but a continual repetition. His speech showed you clearly, as I told you in my opening speech, that he is properly in the affirmative, and I am properly in the negative. You saw the impossibility of my proceeding with my affirmative argument without first clearing away the rubbish which immersionists have heaped in the way. And then my friend condescended to inform you how I should have opened this discussion! This proves again that he is properly in the affirmative. I will however suggest, in reply to his lecture on the method I should have pursued, that I am the leader on this proposition, and that I have the right to select my own course of argument, and he has the right to reply to me or not, as he may see fit. I am not very particular whether he attempts to do what he told you he would do, that is, show that I had not proved my affirmative, or whether he spends his time in traveling around "Robin Hood's barn." He can make his own election, and I shall proceed with my argument.

You see that the difference between us is simply this—or rather, that the proposition before us is simply this: He affirms that in baptism there is specific action, and without that specific action there is no baptism. This I deny; and this puts him really in the affirmative and me in the negative. He tells us that we do not like to take the affirmative in this proposition. This is simply a very great mistake. This is the sixth time that I have discussed the mode of baptism. In three of those discussions I have affirmed the very proposition I affirm now; and the other three my opponents have affirmed that "immersion is essential to Christian baptism." In the celebrated debate between Alexander Campbell and Dr. Rice, Mr. Rice offered to affirm that sprinkling or pouring is scriptural baptism, and Mr. Campbell would not allow him this affirmative, but would himself affirm that "immersion is the only apostolic or Christian baptism." In reply to the gentleman's argument, I would remark that the only point that I discovered about a great portion of his speech, was an assumption of the question in debate. Now you will remember that my whole speech was taken up in ascertaining the meaning of the word *baptizo*. I did not say anything about *bapto*. I said nothing about figurative or sacred meanings of the word *baptizo*; but I was endeavoring to ascertain

the literal moaning of that word, as used in the New Testament. I said that our position is, that it is a word of denomination, not a word of mode; it expresses a thing done without the manner of doing it. He assumes that it signifies a specific action, and then asks me how can I translate the term *baptizo* to sprinkle or to pour! Now, I think my friend is not so dull that he can not see the difference between a word of mode and a word of denomination. Did he ever hear me affirm that *baptizo* and sprinkle are synonymous? Did he ever hear me claim that *baptizo* and pour are synonymous? Did he ever hear an advocate of sprinkling make such an affirmation? Why ask me then to translate *baptizo* pour or sprinkle? Simply because it affords him room to talk without meeting the question in debate, and to make the impression that he has answered my argument, when he never dared to touch it during his entire speech.

We affirm that in *baptizo* there is no specific action, and that it is not a word of specific action at all. You will remember that every example of the use of the word I brought forward, was brought directly to prove this one simple point. Did my friend reply to this? Not at all. He assumed that in *baptizo* there is specific action, and that specific action is immerse; and then turned round and asked me how I could translate *baptizo*, to sprinkle! Now, I want him to answer my argument, and show that it is a word of specific action, the very thing which I deny. He tells us that baptism is a positive institution, and that it therefore requires a specific action. Is not the Lord's Supper a positive institution? But does the word *deipnon*, which is used to give name to that positive institution, express specific action? He tells us words must be taken in their ordinary signification. Well, *diploic* means the principal meal of the day; does eating the Lord's Supper mean eating the principal meal of the day? There is a great deal of talk about positive institutions requiring specific action, that amounts to very little when you come to examine into the meaning of words. None will contend that in the Lord's Supper any specific action is required; whether it should be taken standing, kneeling, or reclining, is a matter of perfect indifference; and yet it is a positive institution, and depends for its authority upon the positive injunction of our Lord Jesus Christ. So his remarks about positive institutions requiring specific action, amount to nothing in the end.

But you will remember that I predicate my argument, not upon figurative or sacred meanings of the word *baptizo*. Now, I want you to understand that I am not here to prove that pouring or sprinkling is baptism, because *baptizo* has the figurative or sacred meaning of to sprinkle or to pour. I never thought of such a thing, much less intimated it. What did I say? I said that "use is the sole arbiter of language," and I brought up Dr. George Campbell and A. Carson, two witnesses that the gentleman will not call in question, to prove that this is true. Every man who has studied the rules of language knows that this is true. I then showed that present and national use must fix the present meaning of words. I then showed that the usage of the Septuagint, and the Apocrypha, and the early Christian fathers, agreed with the New Testament usage of the word *baptizo*. Then I established my position by the highest authority. You all remember

this. Did you hear me say anything about figurative meanings, or did you hear me say anything about sacred meanings of the word? I proved also by Dr. Hinton, a learned Baptist, that New Testament usage must determine the New Testament meaning of words; and I also showed that this New Testament usage was the common Jewish usage of *baptizo*.

Now, then, does *baptizo* express the specific action of dip? I say, it does not. It does not in classic usage; it does not in scripture nor in patristic usage. It does not, in any usage, have this specific meaning. Right here is the issue between me and my opponent. Let him meet this issue. But he does not like the way I discuss my proposition! I do not wonder at that. He will like it still less as we proceed, doubtless. He said that I should have gone first to the lexicons and encyclopedias. What is the use of this, when the final appeal is to use the supreme authority in fixing the meaning of words? I will give you an illustration: We have various kinds of courts—county courts, circuit courts, and supreme courts. Now, if I have a case that I can get into the supreme court in the beginning, there is no necessity for me to begin with the county or circuit court; for their decisions are not final. But the decisions of the supreme court are final; consequently, I will save time and cost by taking my case at once to the supreme court. But my friend wishes to take the longer method. I prefer, however, the shorter. But after the supreme court, usage, has decided against my friend, he appeals to the county court, the dictionaries! Dictionaries can not set aside the decisions of usage, however, as my friend has admitted, when he admitted that their decisions are founded on usage. Use, therefore, must determine the meaning of words.

There are two or three other things I wish to notice in the gentleman's speech before I proceed with my argument. He told us that Dr. Conant has produced near three hundred examples of the use of *baptizo* out of the classics, where it signifies to immerse. But in three-fourths, or nine-tenths of these examples it means to sink to the bottom and remain there! In the three hundred examples which Dr. Conant furnishes, you will find that in nearly every example where it means to dip at all, it means to go to the bottom and stay there. Now, he tells us that words must be taken in their most ordinary meaning. The most ordinary meaning of *baptizo*, in these examples, is to sink to the bottom and remain there. Now, do you suppose my opponent would make many converts, if he baptized them after this fashion? [Laughter.] There is no doubt about the usage here. He tells us that there is very little difference between Gale, Conant, Morrell, and Cox, who state that *baptizo* expresses state or condition, and Campbell and Carson, and those who agree with them, who affirm that it expresses action and action only. There is just this difference: Mr. Campbell says, "*Baptizo* permits the subject to stay under the water but a very little time, and then emerge again;" while Dr. Conant says, "The idea of emersion is not to be found in *baptizo* at all." Let these learned doctors agree as to the specific meaning of their specific term, before they demand that we shall accept their discordant jargon as the word of the Lord.

The gentleman told us that the lexicons are all on his side of the question. Will he tell you that the lexicons all agree with him in his position? I will put Dr. Carson against him. He says, "My position is that it (*baptizo*) always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary for me to say a word or two in regard to the authority of the lexicons." My friend says *baptizo* always signifies to dip, and gives the lexicons as his authority; but Dr. Carson says the lexicons are all against him! There is not a lexicon to be found that says it always signifies to dip, not one. There is another fact in regard to the lexicons I wish you to bear in mind: There is not a New Testament lexicon to be found that does not give, as the primary meaning of the term *baptizo* in the New Testament, to wash, etc., and immerse, etc., as the secondary meaning. All these lexicons give, as the primary Jewish or New Testament meaning, to wash; and the secondary meaning of dip, as immerse; and my friend knows it, for he is acquainted with the testimony of the lexicons.

You will remember that I showed from Dr. George Campbell, that present use must determine the present meaning of words, and all these New Testament lexicons say that the use of *baptizo*, in the time of the Saviour, was, primarily, to wash, without reference to mode.

But my friend is mistaken in regard to all the classical lexicons giving to dip or immerse as the primary meaning of *baptizo*. Gases, a native Greek, at the beginning of the present century, compiled a large and valuable lexicon of the ancient Greek language, which is now in general use among native Greeks. He defines *baptizo* thus: "*Brecho, louo, antleo.*" *Brecho* signifies to "wet, moisten, sprinkle, rain.—See Liddell and Scott. *Louo* signifies to wash; and *antleo, to draw, pump, or pour out water.*" Here, to wet, moisten, sprinkle, is given as the primary meaning, while he does not give dip or immerse, or any word equivalent, as a meaning at all.

Herychius, another native Greek lexicographer, who lived in the fourth century, gives only the root, *bapto*, in which he includes *baptizo*; and the word by which he defines its meaning is *antleo*, to draw, to pump, or pour out water.

Snidas, another native Greek lexicographer, who lived in the tenth century, gives as the definition of *baptizo*, "*pluno*;"—and, in Latin, *modofacio, lavo, abluo, purgo, mundo*—to wet, to lave, to wash, to cleanse, to purify."—Seiss on Baptism, p. 66.

Here are three native Greek lexicographers, neither of whom gives to dip or immerse as any meaning of *baptizo*, much less its primary meaning!

He tells us that my edition of Liddell and Scott is not the latest edition. Well, in my debate with Mr. Sweeney, he told me that the first edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon did not have the definition "to pour upon" in it; and now my friend tells me that the last edition has not that definition. They are very hard to please! Then the first edition did not have it in it; and now the last edition has not got it! There is something very strange about this matter; but the only edition I have ever seen produced has it, and this answers my purpose.

Now, I want to impress upon your minds one more thought: that is, when he asks me to translate *baptizo* by pour or by sprinkle, the reply I make is, *baptizo*, as a word of denomination, includes pouring, sprinkling and immersion, once, twice, or thrice; but it does not specifically signify any one of them, and can not always be translated by any one of them; and if you undertake to translate it uniformly by any one of them, you will be plunged into the greatest absurdities. The translators of the new version saw this, and they translated it "endure," four times, "undergo," once, and suppressed it four times! They dared not translate it immerse in those instances. The truth is, it can not be translated uniformly by any of these terms, while the whole history of the language shows that it indicates no specific mode of application.

But then there is another point that I wish to call your attention to in his reply. You remember that I gave you the case of Naaman the Syrian, who was cleansed by "baptizing himself seven times in the river Jordan." He tells you that sprinkling with water never purifies a leper. He said it was not simple water, it was the "water of separation" that was sprinkled on unclean persons, for the purpose of cleansing them. But this does not affect the argument in the least; for the sprinkling was the principal part of the cleansing, and without it (the leper) remained unclean. But Naaman was commanded to go and wash (*lousai*) himself seven times in the Jordan. He went and baptized himself seven times. The law required that the leper should be "sprinkled seven times." Washing, in a religious sense, is often represented as being done by sprinkling. Naaman obeyed the command by baptizing himself seven times, and every thing here indicates that Naaman sprinkled the waters of Jordan upon himself seven times. The translators in this case use *baptizo* and *louo* as interchangeable.

But there was one argument which he made, that looked a little plausible. He told us the man was "immersed from a dead body," in the same sense that we are "sprinkled from an evil conscience." But the cases are not at all analogous. In the one instance the sprinkling is metaphorical altogether; in the other the baptism is literal. You can not explain a literal passage by a metaphorical one; this would be a violation of every law of interpretation; so the gentleman's reply fails entirely. The "baptism from a dead body" was a literal baptism. How can a man be literally immersed from a dead body? The thing is impossible. The baptism here is the whole cleansing process, consisting of the sprinkling as the principal part.

Having said thus much in reply to the gentleman's speech, I shall now proceed with my argument. You will bear in mind, however, the position I have taken, and the examples I have adduced in support of my position, showing, in the passage in Mark and in Luke, that *baptizo* expresses the washing of hands. In Mark vii. 4, it signifies the sprinkling of water upon beds and couches; and, in Hebrews, it signifies all the various ablutions under the law of Moses. These different washings or sprinklings were all called baptisms. My friend has not noticed any of them.

I shall now take up the figurative meaning of *baptizo*, as used in the New Testament, and show that it sustains the position I have

taken. The first example I shall bring forward is found in those passages of scripture which speak of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. John said, "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."—Matt. iii. 11. Jesus said, "John verily baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."—Acts i. 5.

Now, you recollect I read a passage from Alexander Campbell, where he says that if a man may be baptized "in water, oil, earth, sand, debt, grief, affliction, spirit, light, *baptizo* indicates specific action, and specific action only." Now, what was the specific action by which the apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost? Mr. Campbell tells us that *baptizo* indicates specific action, and specific action only. Now, what was the specific action which was performed upon the apostles when they were baptized with the Holy Ghost? It was not immersion, but the "Holy Ghost was poured out upon them." Do the scriptures ever speak of spiritual baptism being performed in any other way, than as "a pouring out," "a falling on," "a shedding forth," etc.? When the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, it was the accomplishment of the Saviour's promise, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." When Cornelius and his friends were baptized with the Holy Ghost, Peter says, "The Holy Ghost fell on them as it did on us in the beginning." Jesus says, "John did baptize with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost"—the very same thing John did with water, I will do with the Holy Ghost; the only difference between us is, John used the element water, I will use the Holy Spirit. What did Jesus do when he baptized with the Holy Ghost? He "poured it out" upon the people; he "shed it forth" upon them; "it fell on them." Jesus says John did the same thing with water, that he was going to do with the Holy Ghost. Now, how did John baptize the people? He did it by letting the water "fall upon them," by "pouring it out" upon them, as Jesus did the Holy Ghost. Here the mode of the Spirit's baptism is specially set forth; it is by "falling upon them," not their being plunged into it!

Here the argument is to my mind perfectly conclusive. I admit that this is spiritual baptism, by which the souls of believers are baptized by the Spirit of God. But if *baptizo* is a word of specific action, and specific action only, as Mr. Campbell holds, my proposition is established beyond controversy; for here it does express the specific action of pouring, and nothing else.

I prove my proposition here in just so many words. "Pouring or sprinkling is scriptural baptism." Here was specific action, and here was a baptism, and it was pouring. My opponent must either say there was no specific action in this baptism, or that the specific action of pouring was the baptism, and either horn of this dilemma will gore him to death.

I said in my opening speech, that if modality were essential to Christian baptism, I would never baptize by immersion again. Prove to me that it is, and I am done with the practice of immersion. I know that baptism is scripturally performed by pouring; I do not know that it is scripturally performed by immersion, only as that may be one

of the modes of performing, not essential to the thing itself. The passages, Matt. xx. 22-33; Mark x. 38, 39; Luke xii. 50, prove the very same thing. Here the superfusions of Christ are called a baptism. In these passages modality is entirely lost sight of. Christ's sufferings are called a baptism, because of the influence they exerted upon his soul. The effect, and not the mode of action, is the idea expressed by the symbolical use of *baptizo*. And by these two examples of the symbolical import of the term, we prove, 1. That the idea of modality is not in the word *baptizo*; and, 2. If the idea of modality is in the word, as the mode of spiritual baptism is by pouring, then the mode of water baptism ought to be by pouring also.—[*Time expired*.

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My opponent complains that I do not notice all he said in his first speech. I will pay all the attention he can desire, before the discussion closes. He still persists in urging that I should be on the affirmative. He is evidently trying to place me there, for the whole point of all he has said, if it have any point, is, not to show that pouring and sprinkling are baptism, as he should, but that baptism can not always be immersion. I have illustrated this already so plainly that it seems almost an insult to your common-sense to notice it further. My friend admits that immersion is baptism. He practices it as such. He asserts also that pouring and sprinkling are baptism. His practice and teachings affirm this. I deny it. It is his business to prove it. It is as plain as sunlight that he is properly and logically on the affirmative. I have done now with that quibble.

He says my affirmation that *baptizo* is a word which represents a specific act, is mere assumption, resting on my authority alone. His affirmation that it is a verb which expresses the result of such action, is also an assumption, and my assumption is as good as his. But I do not rest with the assertion that it represents a specific act—one specific act, and no other. I consult the lexicons, and I find that they universally and invariably render it by the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, and words of kindred meaning. As secondary meanings, they give not one that is not in strict accordance with these. They are all the results of dipping, plunging, immersing, overwhelming. It is a metonymy of result or effect for the action or cause, but the action is always implied in the effect. How do I prove this? By an appeal to lexicons, learned men, and classical usage. My opponent dare not deny that this is the case.

My opponent asserts that it is a verb which expresses a result, without reference to the action by which the result is reached. Does he appeal to lexicons, and standards, and read renderings that confirm his assertion? He starts out with this assertion, and then selects a few passages in which *baptizo* occurs, and attempts to force it to take such meanings in these few cases because he has assumed a meaning, and the meaning can be sustained only by such a course.

Let us examine his example—the Lord's Supper. Did you observe that the matters which are non-essential, such as to whether we are



standing or reclining, are what he refers to, and that they have nothing to do with the act? What is the act? Eating. It is essential to the observance of the ordinance, that you eat the food, for that was the command—it is the ordinance. Do you say because you consume the food, and burning is consuming, you may burn it? No, you eat it. Do just what was commanded. Can you do anything but the one specific act of eating? So in reference to baptism. Christ commanded an act, a specific act. Without that there is no obedience to the command. You may be immersed face down or face up, but you must be immersed to be baptized, for that was what Christ commanded. He commanded that one specific act.

I would like now to have him tell me what the meaning and use of the word was before Christ used it to represent the ordinance. What was the result it expressed? It certainly could not express the result of sealing, of pardon, or being a sign of an inward grace, as we are now told, before Christ used it. What did it mean? No such idea had ever existed then. It could express no such result. What did it mean?

He tells us he will not quote lexicons. He will go to the fountain-head. How will he get there? He can not move a step without the lexicons. He owes all he knows about the word to lexicons. He can not construe a single Greek word without the aid of lexicons. Mr. Hughey can not climb to the top of the ladder of lexicons out in the open field, and then kick over the ladder on which he stands. He says he will go to the supreme court, and not to the county court. Now, as I take it, the lexicons are the supreme court, who decide what the law and the testimony of classical usage are; and my friend, Mr. Hughey, is not even the county court, but a mere lawyer who has a hard case to argue before the court. We will not accept Mr. Hughey as supreme court, yet. He takes up certain passages and attempts to show that they may have some other meaning than the plain obvious one given by the supreme court—the lexicons, and that the result can be accomplished by some other action than what the court says was the act in the case. I think the jury—public opinion, will demand of him a collation of all passages, before they will accept him in preference to the supreme court—the concurrent testimony of all lexicons and learned men. It is rather a piece of presumption for a man of his age to attempt to contradict, with only his bare *dictum*, the result of the learning and investigation of centuries.

My friend asserts that *baptizo* means "to go to the bottom and stay there." Mark! he admits it means go under the water, or be immersed. But I deny that it ever means to go to the bottom, or to stay there. This is not in the word, and no passage can be found that proves it. When immersed, objects, as the result of immersion, may go to the bottom, and they may stay there. Ships may do so, but docs immersion mean going to the bottom and staying, because this is sometimes the result? No; this is merely a most nonsensical quibble; and he caps the climax of absurdity, by wanting to know how I get them out. He must think you are wanting the slightest traces of common-sense, if he supposed you could be gulled by such clap-trap. How do I get them out? Just as he does the ones he immerses. If five hun-

dred persons were to ask to join his church, he would immerse all of them, and not ask how they were to be gotten out of the water.

I would get them out just as John got our Saviour out of the Jordan, when "he went up out of the water." When we are buried by immersion into the likeness of Christ's death, just as we are morally raised up, by the power of God, to a new life, so we are physically raised up out of the water, by the administrator. There is nothing in the word that tells how we get them out. Nothing of the kind is needed. Common-sense tells us how we get them out. The administrator takes them out. I have dwelt on this nonsensical quibble, not because of its importance, but because such quibbles are all my opponent furnishes me to reply to.

He says, Dr. Carson says all the lexicons are against him, and would have you understand that he admits that they are against him in saying *baptizo* means immerse. It is a gross perversion of his language. He asserts that baptism is a word of mode, and then says that he knows all the lexicons are against him, not in saying it means dip, but in saying it is a verb of mode. He next introduces certain books as New Testament lexicons, which give wash as the primary meaning, and dip as the secondary. We object, that this violates all logic and common-sense; for it places washing, the effect of dipping or immersion, before the cause, dipping. We immerse objects to wash them. We do not wash them to dip them. Also, the books quoted are not lexicons. The authors do not speak as scholars. They are theological dictionaries, or partisan works, and the authors speak as partisans, for their party, and not as scholars. And still more, the passages they quote to sustain their position prove no such thing. Dr. Stuart exploded that idea from the same passages.

He next quotes from Gases, a modern Greek author, who renders *baptizo*, wet, moisten, bedew. He would have you infer that he wrote and spoke the language in which the command to baptize was given; and, as a man who spoke the language, he ought to know. Gases spoke, not the Greek, but the Romaic, which bears about as much resemblance to the classic Greek, as our modern English does to the ancient German, from which it was largely derived. Instead of writing an original work in ancient Greek, as our opponent would have you infer, he merely translated Schneider's Lexicon from German into modern Greek. Schneider says its meaning is to dip, and both its primary and secondary meanings invariably involve the idea of a total immersion I prefer the master to the pupil.

He quotes, also, Suidas, who lived in the tenth century, who says it means "to draw or pump water!" We go down to the well and dip a pail into the water and raise the water out, and call it dipping water, because raising out water is the effect of the dipping. Drawing water is the effect of the dipping; therefore, to dip, in English, means to draw water. When Christ said, "Go, baptize the nations," he meant, "Go, draw water, or pump water on the nations!" Does *baptizo* mean to draw or pump water on the nations, in the ordinance? What sheer nonsense! To what straits will not men resort to evade the truth and save a sinking cause! Is a baptism by the Holy Spirit a drawing of water by the Holy Spirit? Is that what our opponent

means when he says *baptizo* means to draw water? As we have already said, Liddell and Scott, who copied these meanings as given by Suidas, have thrown them out, as common-sense demanded.

My opponent next tells us that certain New Testament lexicons, Greenfield's among others, give wash as the primary meaning. I have Greenfield open before me. He gives, as the primary meaning, dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm! But my friend says that is the classic usage. Has he shown, or will he show, that the classic and New Testament usage differ? They do not differ in action in a single sense. I shall show that in every instance the New Testament usage is the same. Remember, however, that he concedes that the primary meaning, in classic usage, is dip. Greenfield does not say its primary meaning, in the New Testament, is wash. He quotes, as the first place he refers to, a place where he gives wash as its meaning.

As I have already told you, Liddell and Scott have thrown the secondary meanings out, moisten, bedew. Scholars objected to them, and they had to erase them. Sectarianism foisted them in, and scholars compelled them to throw them out. My friend objects to the baptism of sufferings being an immersion. The Bible Union left out that passage, because it was not found in many of the best manuscripts. But all lexicographers and commentators have given *baptizo* here, the meaning overwhelm, an overwhelming of sufferings. Nothing else makes sense. How a pouring or a sprinkling of sufferings would destroy the bold and beautiful figure Christ uses when he speaks of a baptism of sufferings! John Wesley, and we quote him as good authority, says, "Our Lord was covered or immersed in sufferings" I might quote from the book before me fifteen of the most eminent commentators who agree with Wesley. George Campbell, who is quoted approvingly by my friend, says that in these places *baptizo* means overwhelm or immerse. Christ was immersed in afflictions; and similar figures occur in all languages, and in the scriptures in other places. David says, "O my God, my soul is cast down within me! Thy waves and thy billows have gone over me! I am come into the deep waters, where floods overflow me" Our Saviour was immersed or overwhelmed in afflictions; and this use of the word is common in Christian and classic authors, and in exact accordance with the primary meaning we give, "immerse."

My friend next tells us that *baptizo* and *lusai* are used interchangeably. This is certainly a new idea. His proof is that because Naaman was commanded to go and wash in the Jordan, and he went and dipped himself (baptized), the words are interchangeable. He was commanded to wash, and how did he wash? The translators say he dipped himself, and the word they so render is *baptizo*. There is no more proof, that the words *baptizo* and *lotto* are interchangeable, than that the words wash and dip, by which they are translated, are interchangeable. This was not a ceremonial cleansing of the leper, under the Jewish law, as he affirms, but a miraculous cleansing. Moreover, the final act of the cleansing of a leper, under the Jewish law, was an ablation of the whole person, or an immersion, as the law informs us, in Num. xix., and as Jewish rabbins and writers all tell us.

In reference to being baptized from a dead body, he inquires how

can we be immersed from a body? How can we be sprinkled or poured from a dead body? Paul exhorts us to draw near with a full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. How are our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience? By the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, we are cleansed from the contamination of sin and an evil conscience, as we are sprinkled from an evil conscience. So, likewise, the ceremonial law required a man to wash or immerse himself, when he had contracted ceremonial uncleanness by contact with a dead body, as the final act of his cleansing. He had, then, immersed himself from the uncleanness contracted from the dead body, or from the dead body. The uses of the words are analogous, and we can immerse ourselves from a dead body, were we under the law, just as our hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience.

My friend next asserts that sprinkle is one of the metaphorical uses of *baptizo*. I challenge him to cite an author, lexicon, or passage, to sustain him. How would he like to apply such a rendering to the baptism of the Holy Spirit? I thank him for what he has said on that point. He says that the spirit of man was baptized with the Spirit. How? By sprinkling the Spirit, or pouring the Spirit, as a substance, on the spirit of man. The language is figurative. The spirit of man was overwhelmed by the Spirit of God, and "they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance." Their powers or faculties were taken possession of, or were overwhelmed by the Holy Spirit. It was not a pouring or a sprinkling, but an overwhelming, or an immersion of the powers of the persons, in the powers of the Holy Spirit.

A person speaks of being immersed in sin, pleasure, folly, or cares, meaning that his powers are overwhelmed in sorrow, sin, pleasure, or care. So were they immersed in the Holy Spirit. Immersion will express the idea—will give force and beauty to the figure. Pour or sprinkle will not express the idea, and makes nonsense of the figure. This is a figurative use or a metaphor, and figuratively or metaphorically they were immersed in the Holy Spirit.

I come now to the passage in Mark, quoted by my opponent. Mark vii. 1—4, "Then came together unto him, the Pharisees and certain of the Scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of the disciples eat bread with defiled, that is, with unwashed hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands, eat not, holding to the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not; and many other things there be which they have received to hold, such as the washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables."

It has always seemed to me that this is one of the strongest arguments we have in the Bible for immersion. We wash our hands by pouring water on them, or dipping them into water; hence the word *nipto*, to wash, is used as expressing the result, without reference to the act by which the result, washing, was reached. But the ceremonial law required a bathing or immersion of the whole person, and all Jewish writers inform us they did immerse themselves, to cleanse themselves from any defilement they might have incurred in the market. Hence, *baptizo* is used, showing conclusively that *baptizo* means to im-

merse, or represents the only act they did to cleanse themselves. So, also, the verb is in the middle voice, which expresses reflex action. "Except they baptize themselves (or immerse themselves), they eat not."

So, also, in Luke xi. 28, the same occurrence is related, but not so fully. "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that he had not first washed, before dinner." In Hebrews ix. 10, divers baptisms or washings are spoken of. The question is, What action is implied? We can learn only by going back to the law where these cleansings are commanded. In Lev. vi. 28, we read, "The brazen pot shall be scoured and rinsed in water." "Rinsed"—how? By pouring or sprinkling? No; by immersion. Lev. xi. 32, "And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the even; so it shall be cleansed." It was sunk or immersed in the water until even, to be cleansed. In this way, were pots, vessels, beds, and tables cleansed—by immersion.

How were persons cleansed? Numbers xix. 19, "And the clean person shall sprinkle" (the water of purification) "on the unclean on the third day, and the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even."

The only way water was ever applied in the law for cleansing, was by a bathing in water, or immersion. The water of separation or purification was not the element water alone. God never commanded the element water alone to be sprinkled on any person for any purpose, ceremonial or religious. The washing spoken of in all these cases—(washing, as *baptizo* is rendered in our version)—is immersion. They were immersions, and *baptizo* is used because it means immerse, and it ought to be translated immerse in all these cases.

Rabbi Maimonides, a Jewish rabbi, learned in the ceremonial law and the traditions of the elders, says, "Wherever, in the law, washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than dipping the whole body in a laver; for if a man dips himself all over, except the tips of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness. In a laver which held forty sacks (one hundred gallons) of water, every defiled man dips himself, except a proflunious man, and in it they dip all unclean vessels. A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in a pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay of the bottom, it is clean."—Hilcath Mikna, chap. i. 2; Hilcath Cailim, chap. xxvi. This man, a Jew, who knew what the Jews did, says they dipped in all cases.

Vatabulus, professor of Hebrew in Paris, says of Mark vii. 4, "They washed themselves all over." Grotius, the great German writer, says, "They cleansed themselves more carefully from defilement contracted at the market, to-wit: not only by washing hands, but by immersing their bodies." So says the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, and, also, Olshausen and Buxtorf.

My friend wants to know if they actually immersed the beds, pots, vessels, and tables. The law requires immersion in so many words.

Jews tell us they did immerse them; so do all learned men. An explanation as to the meaning of bed: Calmet says, "The word bed is in many cases calculated to mislead the reader and perplex him. The beds in the East are very different from those used in this part of the world. They were often nothing more than a cloth or quilt folded double."—Hague edition, p. 132. It was evidently so light it could easily be folded up and carried. Matt. ix. 6, Jesus saith unto the sick of the palsy, "Arise, take up thy bed and walk." John v. 8, Jesus saith unto him (the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda), "Arise, take up thy bed and walk."

My opponent says beds and tables could not be immersed, and would have you believe they were like the beds and tables we use now. The beds resembled a sailor's hammock, or a soldier's blanket, and the tables were merely a piece of cloth, or leather, or mat, spread on the floor. On these the food was placed, and the persons eating seated themselves around them, seated as tailors sit, and ate with their fingers. Could not such tables be immersed? Even if the rich had larger and more costly couches and tables, Maimonides says they could be immersed part by part; and although their legs stuck fast in the mud in the bottom of the pool, they were clean—showing that such was sometimes the case. Beds and tables so large as to need to be dipped part by part, and to reach to the bottom, were immersed. The law required immersion. Jewish elders say that they did immerse them, and my friend's inability to see how it could be done, cuts a very poor figure in the case.

Next comes the passage from the Apocrypha, where the bathing of Judith, or her baptism in the fountain, is spoken of. It is said she went forth out of the camp into the valley of Bethuliah, and baptized herself at (or in, it should be) a fountain of water. The question now is, What was the act in this case? We affirm it was an immersion. It was for the purpose of cleansing herself after she had come in contact with that which caused ceremonial uncleanness. The law did not require sprinkling or pouring to cleanse her, but it did, as we have shown, require bathing or immersion. If only a washing of hands and face was what she did, why did she go out of the camp, in the night, down into the ravine of Bethuliah, for *pharanx* means a defile or ravine, and bathe herself in the fountain? This fountain was, as nearly all fountains in the East are, a pool. She went forth from the camp, as one of the oldest Greek manuscripts (No. 58) says, and baptized herself in the fountain. Two of the oldest translations (the Latin and Syriac) say in the fountain. Every circumstance favors an immersion—the law requires an immersion, and she did immerse herself.

In regard to the passage, "My iniquity overwhelms me," my opponent says it should be "terrifies me." The translators say "overwhelm," and I will let it remain. Next comes Naaman. The translators translate *baptizo*, dip, and that is all the weight the passage has, and that is in my favor. The last act of cleansing a leper was immersion, and as dipping completed Naaman's cleansing, it agrees with the law in that. He reiterates again his assertions concerning immersing from a dead body or being baptized from a dead body. We have shown that the law required an immersion as the crowning act, or by it he

was cleansed from contamination, or cleansed or immersed from the uncleanness, or the dead body.

We have proved by a number of Jewish authors, by the ceremonial law, that Judith would have to immerse herself. Old manuscripts, in Greek, Latin, and Syriac, say she did immerse herself in the fountain. The word means, immerse, and she did immerse herself, whether my friend, with his prejudice and partisan zeal, can see how she did, or not.

In regard to the divers immersions mentioned in Mark, Luke, and Hebrews, I have shown that the Jewish law required an immersion. I have shown by Jewish authorities and learned men that they did immerse. I have shown that the articles could be immersed; hence, *baptizo*, the word used, meant immerse. I prefer to take the law which commanded the act, and the word of those who obeyed it, to the queries of my partisan opponent, as to how they could immerse.

In regard to the baptism of the Spirit, we have shown that it could not be a pouring or sprinkling. It was an overwhelming, or immersion of the powers of the person in the power of the Spirit. Immersion is figuratively used here, but it satisfies the figure; pouring or sprinkling makes nonsense of it. Hence, it was an immersion.

We have now taken every passage my friend has brought forward, and examined them. He has not brought them up to show that *baptizo* means pour or sprinkle, as he in all reason should, but to show that it might mean something else, such as to wash or purify, ideas not incompatible with immersion, but in exact accordance with it; for we immerse things to wash or purify them by water.

Let me ask you, has my friend produced a single passage that you can now refer to, that you can mention, that has proved baptism to be a pouring or sprinkling? No; he has, with the pretense of removing the rubbish from the question, raised a cloud of dust to conceal himself and the question, to bewilder your minds, and lead you away from the issue. He has hunted far and wide for a few far-fetched meanings of secondary meanings of *baptizo*, to show, not that it means pour or sprinkle, but that it expresses a result that may, not must, be accomplished by pouring or sprinkling. If I ask him to baptize me, he will perform one specific act, and say he baptizes me. Then baptism is that specific act. He concedes the specific act of immersion to be baptism; then it can not be sprinkling or pouring, for no word can express three entirely different specific physical actions. Will our friend now prove that *baptizo* means pour or sprinkle.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My friend still insists that I am properly in the affirmative. I care very little about this except from the fact that it places me in an awkward position, placing me really in the negative, when I am nominally in the affirmative. The gentleman told us, in the first place, that *baptizo* is a specific word—a word of action and not of result or effect. I produced here numerous examples showing that it is a word of effect and not of action. My friend asserts that he proves it is a word of action by the

lexicons. He also tells us that it simply puts a man into the water but does not take him out. I showed you that Mr. Campbell teaches 'that it signifies the specific action of putting into the water for a moment and then withdrawing again. But he tells us that this specific action is not in the word at all. Now, I would ask you, how is he to get a man out of the water except by the force of the word *baptizo*? He says that he gets him out just as I do—that common-sense gets him out; but in saying this he gives up the specific meaning of the word *baptizo*; for he admits that it does not express the specific action which he calls baptism. I told you that in classic usage, where *baptizo* meant immerse, in nine cases out of ten it meant to go to the bottom and stay there, but my opponent tells us, "that whether the object immersed comes out of the water, or not, does not depend upon the force or meaning of the word itself, but something outside of it." But this admission proves that it is not a word of specific action at all.

Mr. Braden now takes the position that the word *baptizo*, in the New Testament, must be understood in the same sense in which it was used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour; but he tells us there is no difference between this later Hellenistic usage, and ancient classical usage. You remember, that in my opening speech I took the position that our Saviour and his apostles used the word *baptizo* in the sense in which it was used by the Jews who spoke the Greek language; and that in ascertaining the meaning of the word in the New Testament we must confine ourselves to the three centuries immediately before, and those three immediately following, the Saviour's time; and in this you remember I was sustained by the highest authority.

My opponent tells us that Carson differed from the lexicons only on one single point; and that he does not admit that they are all against him. I will read what Dr. Carson says upon this point:

" My position is, that it always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons. Many may be startled at the idea of refusing to submit to the unanimous authority of lexicons as an instance of the boldest skepticism. Are lexicons, it may be said' of no authority? Now, I admit that lexicons are an authority, but they are not an ultimate authority. Lexicographers have been guided by their own judgment in examining the various passages in which a word occurs: and it is still competent for every man to have recourse to the same sources. The meaning of a word must ultimately be determined, by an actual inspection of the passages in which it occurs, as often as any one chooses to dispute the judgment of the lexicographer. The use of a word, as it occurs in writers of authority in the English language, is an appeal that any man is entitled to make against the decision of Dr. Johnson himself. The practice of a language in the House of Lords, is competent to reverse the decisions of all the dictionaries."—Carson on Baptism, pp. 55, 56. This is what Dr. Carson says, and it fully sustains all that we have stated concerning his admission, that all the lexicons are against him.

But my opponent tells us that the last edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon has omitted the definition "to pour upon." I would like to



know who the editor of this last edition is? The edition which I have here is dedicated to Dr. Charles Anthon, who is much esteemed by his friend and pupil, the editor, as a classical scholar. I would like to know who the editor of this last edition is?

*Mr. Braden*—Drisler.

*Mr. Hughey*—I have Drisler's edition of the lexicon now before me. The gentleman says it is the last edition, and it contains the definition "to pour upon." He can read it himself if he wishes.

My friend quoted John Wesley as to Christ's "baptism of sufferings." The argument which I brought forward to prove this figurative use of *baptizo* was that, in this example, effect, and not mode, is signified by the term. The sufferings of Christ are represented as being "laid on him," not as his being "plunged into them." In the figurative use of *baptizo*, then, we have either the mode of pouring, or the effect of the baptism simply, without the mode at all. The idea of overwhelm is not to be found in the baptism of Christ's sufferings. Let the gentleman take either horn of the dilemma here, and he is ruined. If *baptizo* indicates mode, then pouring is the mode. It does not matter if the whole Pacific Ocean is poured upon a man, he is not immersed; and if mode is not the idea, then *baptizo* simply expresses effect, and consequently can not specifically signify "to immerse."

I told you that the translators of the "Seventy" used the terms *baptizo* and *louo* interchangeably. The command of Elisha was, "Go, wash thyself (*lousai*), and Naaman went and baptized himself." I did not say that these terms are always interchangeable, or always convertible, but that these translators did so use them in this instance. This Mr. Braden knows, and he dare not deny it; and this totally destroys the specific meaning of *baptizo*.

My opponent tells us that the various purifications under the law of Moses, called by Paul baptisms, were performed by immersion. But there was not a single personal immersion required by the law of Moses. Sometimes these baptisms required both a sprinkling and a washing; but the Hebrew word, here translated wash, is not the word which signifies to dip or immerse, but which signifies to wash in a general sense. The Hebrew word signifying to dip, is never used in regard to any of the personal purifications required by the law of Moses. The persons to be cleansed were sometimes required to wash themselves, after the water of purification was sprinkled upon them; but this might be done by pouring water on them, or by superfusion in any way. The special act of immersion was not required in the cleansing of any person under the law of Moses. There was the sprinkling with the water of separation—there was sometimes the general washing; but dipping or immersion was never required. This the gentleman certainly knows. The principal part of all these baptisms was by sprinkling. Now, if you have sprinkle and wash both, they do not constitute the specific action of dip. I hope my friend can see the point here; if he does not, I am sure every one in the house does see that if *baptizo* includes both sprinkle and wash, it can not specifically mean to dip or immerse. It can not express mode at all.

Just so, in "baptizing from a dead body." I showed you that this was a literal baptism—a literal sprinkling—and, perhaps, a general washing; but not a dipping, because the word translated wash does not signify to dip—provided the man upon whom the water of separation was sprinkled, was required to wash himself. This, however, is doubtful, as I showed you before.

Can my friend see the point? Here we have two actions; they can not, therefore, constitute one specific action. I think every body can see the point I have established. In the baptism from a dead body, if a general washing was required, this might be performed in any way—but dipping was not enjoined.

Suppose *baptizo* does here mean both sprinkle and wash, it can not be a word of mode at all. If the word includes both sprinkle and wash, it does not mean dip specifically, for the general action expressed by the word wash, and the specific action expressed by the word sprinkle, can not possibly constitute the specific action of dip or immerse.

The gentleman talks about a spiritual baptism, and tells us that the persons baptized were spiritually overwhelmed, and borne off, as it were, by the influence of the Holy Spirit. But what was the specific action by which this baptism was performed? The effect produced was, they were filled with the Holy Ghost; but the" specific action performed was pouring. The effect produced was that they were borne off by the Holy Ghost—or carried away by the Holy Ghost. The baptism was performed by the one specific act of pouring; and the effect of this baptism was that they were filled with the Holy Ghost. So, here, again, the gentleman can take whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses. If *baptizo* means specific action, then that specific action is pouring; if it means the effect produced, then it is not a word of mode at all! With all his ingenuity he can not get over this argument. He can not prove the specific action of dip, for the idea of dip is not there.

In Mark vii. 3, the word *niptontia* is used, which signifies 'to wash the hands.' In Luke xi. 30, *ebaptisthe* is used, which signifies to baptize the person; and the same identical washing is referred to in both instances. In the one instance it is called a washing of the hands, in the other it is called a baptism of the person; showing that *nipto* and *baptizo* are used interchangeably in the New Testament, for they are both used to express the washing before eating, which was simply a washing of the hands, here called a baptism of the person.

I next quoted a passage from Clement of Alexandria, in explanation of this baptism before eating. You will find it in Seiss on Baptism, page 120. He tells us that "'Penelope, having [*hudraino*] moistened or washed herself, and having on clean apparel, prays.—Odys. iv. 755. 'Telemachus, having [*nipto*] washed his hands, in the hoary sea, prayed to Minerva.'—Odys. ii. 261. This was the Jewish custom, [*loos baptizesthai*,] to be baptized in this way, even often upon the bed or couch."

Here baptism is traced through all the lustrations of the heathen, and it is represented as handed down from Moses to the poets; and we are further told that the Jews often baptized themselves in this way,

that is, by washing the hands upon the bed or couch. Clement of Alexandria lived about one hundred years after the Apostle John, and was well acquainted with Jewish customs in his day. My opponent has quoted Maimonides to prove that the Jews immersed themselves before eating. I have shown you that they washed their hands upon their couches, and that this washing of the hands was called a baptism of the person by Luke.

Maimonides was a Jewish rabbi who lived in the twelfth century, and is too young a man by eleven hundred years to tell us what the customs of the Jews were in the time of our Saviour. If I were to quote Maimonides to prove that proselyte baptism was practiced in all ages among the Jews, he would tell me Maimonides lived too late to testify in regard to the practice of the Jews in the time of the apostles. But here I prove, by Clement of Alexandria, a Greek himself, who lived one hundred years after the Apostle John, and who surely understood how to use the language correctly, and also the customs of the Jews in his time, and he tells us they often baptized themselves upon their couches, by simply washing their hands.

This example of *baptizo* certainly does not express the specific action of immersion, and if I could not produce another example of its use, where it signifies to pour or sprinkle, this one example from Clement is sufficient to prove that it can not specifically mean to dip.

I based no argument on the use of the word *baptizo*, in Mark vii. 4, where it says, "And when they come from the market, except they baptize (wash) themselves, they eat not." This was not the example of its use my argument was founded upon, but the example where the baptism of couches, and the baptism before eating, are spoken of.

My friend says it is here shown that they immersed themselves. I call in question the assertion that the Jews immersed themselves "when they came from the markets," and I would like to see the authority for it. I find no authority for immersing any one in the law of Moses, and Maimonides lived a little too late to be good authority in regard to Jewish customs in the time of our Saviour. When they came from the markets we are told that they "baptized themselves," but how was this done? Clement of Alexandria says it was done by "washing their hands upon their couches." By this means they purified themselves, when they came from the markets, and not by immersing themselves in water contrary to the law.

In Hebrews ix. 10, the whole Jewish ritual is called "divers baptisms." Some of them, I admit, were performed by both sprinkling and a general washing, but some of them were mere sprinklings; some of them required bathing, and some of them did not. My opponent attempts to get around the difficulty by saying that the law required that they should be dipped in water. The law required in some of these baptisms, in addition to the sprinkling, there should be a general washing; but it did not require dipping in a single case! These baptisms were either simple sprinklings, or they consisted of both sprinkling and a more general washing; in either case the word can not possibly signify to dip.

We next had a long dissertation upon Jewish beds and tables. Now, it is true that their beds were sometimes made as the gentleman

told you, but they were often entirely different. It is true, that they sometimes consisted of a sort of mattress, upon which they slept, but it is also true that they were often a kind of platform, or elevation of the floor around the sides of the room, and therefore could not be taken down for the purposes of immersion—and yet we are told that they were baptized. Look in Dr. Nevin's "Biblical Antiquities," and you will find a full description of these beds; and my friend knows that one of the greatest modern critics has declared that there was no such thing as immersing them. He says that these beds were sprinkled, because he knew that immersion was out of the question; and unless they were baptized by sprinkling, it could not be done at all.

The gentleman tells us that Judith went out of the camp of Holofernes for the purpose of immersing herself in the fountain; that if she had merely wished to wash herself, she might have done so in the camp. Judith went out into the valley of Bethulia, nightly, to pray; and preparatory to her prayers she "baptized herself in the camp, at the fountain of water." She did not go out of the camp; she simply went out of the tent of Holofernes. The baptism took place "in the camp, at the fountain of water." She purified herself before prayer by washing her hands at the fountain of water, and then performed her devotions. There is always somebody awake in a camp when an army is in the presence of an enemy; and the idea that Judith would undertake to immerse herself in the midst of the camp, in the fountain that supplied the army with water, is preposterous and absurd; yet it was here that she baptized herself.

I must now proceed with my affirmative argument. The use the early Christian fathers made of *baptizo*, proves that it is not a word of mode, but a word of denomination. I will begin with Justin the Martyr, who flourished as a writer from A. D. 130, to A. D. 166. My first extract will be found upon the 104th page, Ante-Nicene Library—Justin and Atenagoras.

"Baptize the soul from wrath, and from covetousness, from envy, and from hatred; and lo! the body is pure."

Here, modality is not in the word at all. Effect is all that is expressed by *baptizo* in this example.

I will read next from the 122d page:

"What need have I of that other baptism, who have been baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Here we find that this baptism of the Holy Ghost was the common privilege of the early Christians,—the common heritage of the Church of God; and this baptismal influence, or influence of the Holy Spirit, is called by Justin, the "baptism of the Holy Ghost." Throughout his Apology, he calls baptism "a washing with water." He uses the word *louo*, which signifies to wash in a general sense, but he does not use any term which expresses the specific action of dip, when describing the manner in which baptism was performed.

I will read one other extract from Justin, which is found on the 357th page of the same book, where he calls baptism a "sprinkling."

"By that which took place in the running water, in which the wood and the hyssop and the scarlet were dipped, is set forth the bloody pas-

sion of Christ on the cross for the salvation of those who are sprinkled with the Spirit, and the water, and the blood."

Those who were baptized in Justin's time were "sprinkled with water."

I will next read from Irenaeus. He says:

"As the dry wheat can not become a mass of dough and one loaf of bread without moisture, so neither can we all become one in Christ without the water which is from heaven. And as the parched earth can not yield fruit unless it receive moisture, so neither can we, who at first are but sapless wood, ever produce living fruit, without the rain which is freely poured out from above; for our bodies through baptism, but our souls through the Spirit, have obtained that communion with the imperishable essence."—Neander's Church History, Vol. I. p. 646.

Here the water in baptism is represented as being poured out as the rain from heaven. This is a very strong passage, showing that the fathers used the term as expressing acts of sprinkling, and that in their time baptism was performed in this way.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I apprehend the trouble is not that I don't notice the arguments (so called) presented by the gentleman, but that I pay a little too close attention to them. I have noticed every argument he has thus far presented. He contends that I abandon the idea of specific action, when I say that there is nothing in the force of the word *baptizo* that tells how the immersed person comes out of the water. He asserts that if the word means anything, it means "to go to the bottom and stay there." Observe, he admits it means "go under the water." Then it can not mean pour or sprinkle, but immerse, and immerse only. I deny that it means, go to the bottom and stay there. It has no such idea. We have only the gentleman's assertion, without a word of authority, or a single passage where it has such a meaning. In the case of immersed ships, after their immersion they go to the bottom and stay there; but does immersion, therefore, mean going to the bottom and staying there? That follows often as a result of their immersion, but is no part of the immersion. *Baptizo*, like immerse, means to put under anything, so as to cover or overwhelm, as in a liquid, sand, earth; or, figuratively, in sufferings, debts, cares, sorrow, sin, etc.; but, when a person is immersed, must he go to the bottom and stay there? Is that a part of the specific act? No; it is no part of the specific action expressed by *baptizo*. My friend admits that the primary meaning of *baptizo* is to put under the water. This he does to be able to attach the nonsensical idea of going to the bottom and staying there. But he loses the whole question and gains nothing. Do you suppose Christ would have used the word, if it had such a meaning? It is charging our Lord with folly, and makes nonsense of this ordinance of his kingdom. There is no force in the word *baptizo* to take a man out when he is under the water, and none is needed. The force is in the arms of the administrator. When you immerse a man, do you suppose that

action then ceases? All that is expressed by immerse ceases when he is under the water. There is nothing in immerse to take him out; but common-sense would expect the force in the arms of the administrator to take him out. The specific act, "put under water," is in the word, as our friend admits. All the abandoning of position is done by him.

Now, permit me to say, ladies and gentlemen, that a more nonsensical quibble I never met. It shows at what paltry straws a drowning man will clutch. He reasserts that Dr. Carson says the lexicons are against him in saying *baptizo* means dip. This has been asserted by Methodist preachers for years, from thousands of pulpits. Carson says no such thing. He says *baptizo* is a verb of mode, and that the lexicons are against him in saying that it is a word of mode, and not in saying it means dip, as my friend so grossly misrepresents him, and will foully, too, if he ever repeats the statement.

I said Liddell and Scott's late editions have erased moisten, bedew, draw water, pump water. I have a copy of the last edition of their dictionary, and I know what I say. I will give one hundred dollars to any one who will find these renderings in their last edition. Sectarianism quoted these renderings from Gases and Heysechius, my friend's standard authorities. Scholars compelled them to throw them out, because they could not sustain them by a single quotation. Even if they were true, the gentleman has only made nonsense of the ordinance, and a fool of our Lord. "Draw water on the nations!" The entire attempt of the gentleman is to destroy immersion, not to prove sprinkling; and yet he will to-day stultify himself by immersing every one who demands it of him before entering his church!

He goes back to the baptism of sufferings. The new version leaves out the passage, because not found in several of the best manuscripts, and not because it was a difficulty in the way of proving immersion—for immersion is the only rendering that will make sense of the passage. Christ was overwhelmed, or immersed, or plunged, or dipped, or submerged, in sufferings. He was not poured or sprinkled in sufferings! What a murdering that would make of our Lord's bold and beautiful figure of speech! My opponent thinks if we place overwhelm there as a rendering of *baptizo*, of course the idea of immersion is not there, and we abandon the question! O twaddle! If you overwhelm a man in water, do not you immerse him?

The use of the word is figurative, and the effect is placed for the cause, or act. The act was an immersion; the effect, an overwhelming. We often place the effect, by a metonymy, for the cause; but the original specific act is always implied. It is nonsense to affirm, as my opponent does, that I abandon the idea of specific action, when I place effect for cause. *Baptizo* can be used in its specific sense to express an overwhelming, the effect, as well as an immersion, the cause. The washing, cleansing, purifying, the effect, is the effect of an immersion; and immersion, the original act, is always implied, and nothing else. Can you wash a thing by pouring or sprinkling water on it? Do we do so? Hence I don't abandon the idea of the specific action, immersion; and the gentleman only asserts it so confidently and repeatedly, because he hopes, by his confident vociferations, to lead you to suspect such is the case. Such absurd assertions are an insult to your good

sense, and I hope respect for you, and self-respect will restrain him from repeating them.

I will now make this fair offer to the gentleman: He can not find a passage in Greek where *baptizo* can be translated pour or sprinkle I can and will translate every passage where *baptizo* occurs, by dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, and make sense, and show that the force of the word, the context, and the effect produced, required immersion, and could be reached in no other way. This is a fair, plain way to settle the question. Will he undertake it?

My friend again asserts that in Naaman's case *louo* and *baptizo* are used interchangeably. Naaman was commanded to wash himself in the Jordan, and the Bible says he baptized himself to obey the command. The translators render *baptizo*, dip. He washed himself by dipping himself. If *louo* and *baptizo* are interchangeable, then—so are wash and dip. Will he claim that he can use dip where he can use wash? He tells me to draw some water. I say, I dipped the water from the well. Does draw water and dip mean the same thing? Can we use one always where we can the other? What nonsense! I hope to hear no more of it.

My friend next assumes that the divers baptisms mentioned in Hebrews, or divers washings, include the sprinkling of the water of purification, as well as the bathing. The sprinkling was not, and could not be, included in the washing, for it was not water that was used in sprinkling, and we do not wash by sprinkling. Bathing or immersion was the crowning act of cleansing the person—was the only act in cleansing pots and vessels, and Maimonides says an immersion of the whole person was necessary to a cleansing, where purification was mentioned in the law—that purification means nothing else than an entire immersion in water. He was a learned Jewish rabbi, and knew what the law meant, and what he did, much better than my opponent.

The articles which were cleansed were put into the water, or immersed, and in this way rinsed. This was the baptism of tables, couches, pots, and vessels. When the Bible says the articles were to be put into the water, or immersed and rinsed, I will believe it. When all the learned world informs us that baptism is an immersion, I will have the temerity to accept immersion as the act in the "divers baptisms," on their authority; my opponent to the contrary notwithstanding. When Jews say they did immerse in these "divers baptisms," I will take their word before my opponent's "can't see how it could be done."

I will ask the gentleman, if the pouring of the Holy Spirit was the baptism of the Holy Spirit? If the Spirit were baptized and not the apostles? No; he says the baptism was the action of Spirit on spirit. What was that action? An overwhelming, or an immersion in the Spirit. The language is figurative, but still it necessitates the idea of an immersion. The powers of the spirit of the individual were immersed or overwhelmed in the Spirit of God. Here comes again his absurd assertion, that if I call it an overwhelming, I abandon the idea of specific action. It was an overwhelming of the Spirit. Where do you overwhelm a person in water, but in immersion? Then whether the

word denotes the original act, or an effect of the act, it is immerse, and immerse only, as the specific act.

My friend says I have mistaken his intended use of the passages he collated. He compares passages where *baptizo* is used with others where *louo* and *nipto* are used, to show that they are interchangeable, or that *baptizo* is a word expressing result without reference to the action by which the result is reached; and to show that they are interchangeable. In the case of Naaman, wash was the result commanded to be reached, and *baptizo*, or dip, was the specific act by which it was reached. They are not interchangeable. In Mark, the hands were *niptoed*, and the bodies baptized, because the result of washing can be reached by dipping or pouring, but the bodies were to be immersed, and that was the only act the law allowed; hence *baptizo*, the word that peculiarly meant dip or immerse, was used. This is one of the strongest arguments in favor of immersion yet produced.

In regard to the passages from Clemens Alexandrinus: "They baptized their hands on their couches," I would say there is nothing against dipping or immersion there; for as the servant held the vessel they dipped or immersed their hands in it, into the water. It still means immersion, and not sprinkling.

The gentleman speaks of the meaning of *klinoon*. He says it sometimes means couches nailed up against the walls, and he can not see how such articles could be immersed. To amount to anything in the way of objection, he should have shown that the couches and tables immersed, in the passage quoted, were of such an unwieldy character. We know they were rarely ever such. Those in common use were never such. But look at the nature of the objection. We read of the baptism of couches and tables. I say that since the word means dip or immerse, it is an immersion of couches. Instead of showing that the word does not mean that, he attempts to raise difficulties, or, in other words, he attempts to impeach the testimony of God's word. If baptism means immersion, and he does not on this occasion attempt to show the contrary, except by an objection, and God's word says they were immersed, they were; and he merely says, "I can't see how it can be so," or how God's word can be true! We turn to Jewish writers; they say that every such thing was immersed, and say where the articles are large—such as he described—they can be dipped part by part, thus removing his objection. Above all, the word of God in Leviticus, quoted several times already, says every bed, or vessel, or thing defiled, was to be put into water, immersed, and rinsed. I will take God's word, though partisan bigotry may not let my opponent see how it can be.

He next brings up again the case of Judith in the camp of Holofernes, and says the soldiers were asleep. The soldiers were asleep, but the guards were awake, and Holofernes ordered the guards to permit her to go out of the camp to bathe herself. I read you the two oldest translations of the book of Judith, which say she immersed herself in the fountain of water out of the camp (the Syriac and Latin versions); and the oldest Greek version of the Septuagint, No. 58, which says she baptized herself in the fountain of water, which was of course, an immersion. The Mosaic law required an immersion, or



a bathing of the whole person. Jews tell us they immersed themselves, and we leave it there.

The quotation which my opponent read from Justin Martyr reads as follows:

"For what is the benefit of that immersion (baptism) which makes bright the flesh and body only? Be immersed (baptized), therefore, as to the soul, from anger, and from covetousness, from envy, from hatred; and behold the body is clean."

Now, it seems to me, there is a baptism spoken of which makes bright the body, an immersion. But, says Justin, there must be more than this; we must have our souls immersed from anger. How? Unless we renounce anger, covetousness, hatred and envy, our immersion will do us no good. But, if we do this, then, by our immersion as an act of obedience to God, we are cleansed from the corruption of these things, as we are immersed from them. We are immersed from anger, as we are sprinkled from an evil conscience.

In regard to the passages from Irenaeus, I would say that I have them here; but I wish to examine them more fully in the original authorities, and compare the context, and see if they are fairly rendered. I wish, also, to have the gentleman to furnish me the original Greek of the passage from Clemens Alexandrinus. I wish to examine it, and see if he has translated it correctly. This should be the first thing that the immersionist should do in all cases, for many of the difficulties raised by their opponents to always rendering *baptizo* by immerse, are based, either on garbled quotations, or wrong translations of the passages in which the difficulty is claimed to be found.

Let me ask you now, my friends, to remember the fact that we are talking about an act to be performed in obeying a plain and simple command of our Saviour. What is that act? It is required of every penitent believer. Can it be possible that he used a word of such ambiguous import, as my friend would have you infer this word *baptizo* is, to represent an act to be performed in obeying a command that he has made one of the two ordinances of his kingdom—an act that is at the entrance to his kingdom—a command that can be obeyed but once? What is the nature of a positive command? It takes an act that never was, not before the command was given, meritorious, and makes it an ordinance; and the merit lies in the obedience. The act had not, until the command was given, any such significance. It requires but one act, and that act is essential to obedience of the command; for the act is the ordinance, and the ordinance can not exist without the act. Has God ever given a positive ordinance that could be obeyed by more than one act? This is a question my opponent has not answered. He has not said a word in reply to my argument based on the nature of positive commands, though it overturns his whole position. It is not the result that was made the ordinance, but the act; and the result was the end for which the act was performed. A verb of result can not be made to represent a positive ordinance.

Take the command, "Take, eat; this is my body." He used the word eat, a word expressing one specific act. He did not use consume, destroy, or any word of result, but a word representing one specific, clearly-defined act; and he used it evidently in its primary

and most obvious meaning. It was a plain, simple word, one that had a plain, clearly-defined meaning, and he used it in that sense, and not in a secondary and loosely-defined meaning. In the other positive command, "baptizing them into the name," etc., he also used a word equally plain, equally simple—one that expressed one clearly-defined, specific act. Do you suppose a word, used as this is, in a positive command, can mean anything you choose to make it? Do you suppose such vague and generic words, as wash, cleanse, and purify, would be used to express so important a positive ordinance? These men of plain common-sense suppose no such absurdity.

I assert that the word means but one plain, positive action; and when we come before you to-morrow, we will prove to you what that act is. We will show that the act is expressed by dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm. We shall show that every lexicon and learned man so testifies; that we can translate every passage where *baptizo* occurs by one of these words, and that sense and the context demand such translation; that *baptizo* can not be used interchangeably with sprinkle or pour. My opponent asserts it can; but why does he not prove his assertion? His argument is just this: It may sometimes mean something else than immerse; therefore, it means sprinkle and pour! Can you be deceived by such shallow sophistry? Would anything so plain as a positive ordinance is required to be—plain by every consideration of reason and justice—require such an effort as he has made for four mortal hours to define it? He has not found a single author who says it means sprinkle or pour, nor a single passage where he dare translate it sprinkle or pour. It may, in a few instances, mean something else than immersion (which is always, however, accomplished by immersion); therefore, it means pour and sprinkle! We will tell you a plain and straightforward story, and prove it by plain and positive evidence, such as so important a command requires.

If you were now to be called on to mention what proof he has brought forward to prove baptism is pouring and sprinkling, what single argument, what single proof, what passage of scripture, could you mention? Can you, my pouring and sprinkling friends, tell me? On what, then, do you base your practice? Ponder well on these things, and to-morrow we will show you a more excellent way.—[*Time expired.*]

WEDNESDAY MORNING, August 19, 1868.

MR. HUGHEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I shall, in the first place this morning, make a few remarks in reply to the gentleman's speech last evening; and then I shall proceed with my affirmative argument. You will bear in mind that he repudiates the position of Mr. Campbell, that both immersion and emersion are found in the word *baptizo*; and agrees with Dr. Conant, that it merely requires putting under the water, without the idea of emersion again at all; thus wholly giving up the specific action of *baptizo* contended for by Carson and Campbell.

He tells us that I admitted, in my remarks yesterday, that the

classical sense of *baptizo* was originally to dip. In this he is wholly mistaken. I started out with the position that my friend has not noticed, that the original and primary meaning of the word was to dye, tinge, or color; and that this original or primary meaning inhered through all the family of words that came from the root *bap*. A number of words I gave, showing that the idea of dye always inhered, while the idea of dip is sometimes wholly dropped out. But he has not had time to notice this argument. I stated, also, that in nine cases out of ten, where the word is used in classic Greek, in the sense of dip or immerse, it means to go to the bottom and stay there. He has not denied it, and he dare not deny it, for the very examples given by Dr. Conant prove that, in nearly all cases where *baptizo* signifies dip, it means that the subject sinks to the bottom, and remains in that dipped condition. Such a dipping, preached by my opponent, would not make many converts, I trow. [Laughter.]

I said that Campbell's position was that the termination *zoo* made *baptizo*, not a frequentative, but that it denoted the rapidity of the action; consequently, it was by the force of the termination *zoo* that Mr. Campbell gets the baptized subject out of the water. This my opponent denied. I will read what Mr. Campbell says:

"We have, however, an exemplification at hand, which ought forever to settle this matter. It is a case in which the word baptize is used in a contrast that forbids sinking to the bottom. It is a remarkable passage found in one of the Sybilline oracles, a poetic prediction concerning the fortunes of the ancient city of Athens. The poet says: *Askos bupitizee dunai de toi ou themis esti*—"Thou mayest be dipped, O bladder! but thou art not fated to sink;" showing that in ancient times, it was a part of the signification of *baptizo* to emerge again, as well as to immerse, making it equivalent to *katadusis* and *anadusis* combined. Certainly and clearly it is that the word *baptizo* never meant to sink to the bottom, except by chance. *Bapto* may leave the substance some considerable time under water or any liquid: indicating that a change might come upon the substance, and that it might acquire some new matter which it had not before being put into the liquid. But *baptizo* permits the subject to stay under the water but a very little time, and then emerge again. In the etymology and philology of the Greek language, the word *baptizo* never can be shown to mean going to the bottom and staying there. *Duoo dunai*, and their compounds indicate that."—Campbell and Rice's Debate, pp. 77, 78.

He (Campbell) further says:

"I have a new theory of my own upon this subject, or rather it is a theory adopted from an old one, as it ought to be called. It goes to explain a material fact in the history of *bapto*.

"My idea is that the word originally meant, not that the dipping should be performed frequently, but that it indicated the rapidity with which the action was to be performed; that the thing should be done quickly; and for this reason the termination *zo* is never used when the word is employed in connection with the business of dyers and tanners. But the word *baptizo* is always used to express the ordi-

nance of baptism. This is the best reason I can give for the change of the termination into *zoo*.

"With regard to the frequent occurrence of this word in the New Testament usage, I said that there might be some good reason given. And that reason is found in the fact that *bapto* means to dip, without regard to continuance, long or short, but *baptizo* intimates that the subject of the action is not necessarily long kept under that in which it is immersed."—*Ibid.* p. 78.

If this does not prove that Mr. Campbell puts the subject into the water by the force of the root *bap*, and lifts him out by the force of the termination *zoo*, then, I confess, I do not understand the import of language.

Mr. Braden tells us that Prof. Drisler has been compelled in his last edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, to take out the definition "to pour upon." If scholars have compelled Prof. Drisler to take this definition out of his work, what a pity they had not compelled Parkhurst to have taken it out of his lexicon also! Why have they not compelled Gases to change his lexicon and take pour and sprinkle out of his definitions, and put in one word at least that signifies to dip! Why have they not compelled Robinson to change his lexicon? Why did they not compel Schrivellius, Heysechius, and Suidas to change theirs? But I have produced a number of examples of the use of *baptizo* justifying and demanding this definition; and if Mr. Drisler has taken it out of his lexicon, it shows that he is a very great simpleton, and not a scholar of profound research.

But my friend will have it that if *baptizo* signifies to draw water, it must signify to dip. I read from Heysechius, the oldest Greek lexicographer, and he gives but one definition, *antleo*, which has the general sense of to draw, pump, or pour out water; and if it means to draw, pump, or pour out water, it does not mean specifically to dip. To draw, pump, and pour out water does not constitute the specific act to dip, and Mr. Braden must certainly know it. But, then, I asserted that in those Jewish ablutions there was no immersion required. My opponent says there was a general washing, and he said, that "if *baptizo* signifies a general washing, and a general washing ever signifies an immersion, that is all I ask." But I will tell my friend the law required no personal immersion. Many of these baptisms were simple sprinklings. Some of them consisted of both sprinkling and washing; but sprinkle and wash do not constitute the specific act, dip! If *baptizo* includes both sprinkling and washing, then it can not be a word of specific action. Can my opponent understand this?

But my opponent asks, "Were not the apostles overwhelmed by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost; and was not this overwhelming the baptism?" I answer, No. They were not overwhelmed, but were filled with the Holy Ghost. The filling was not the baptism, but the effect of it. The only action here was pouring, and this pouring out of the Holy Spirit was the baptism. Peter called this pouring out of the Spirit a baptism; for he says, in relating the account of Cornelius' conversion: "As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John verily baptized with water, but ye shall be bap-

tized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." The resemblance between the transactions brought up the idea of baptism to Peter's mind. But if John immersed the people, where was the resemblance between this, and the falling on of the Holy Spirit? Now, he tells us that we can overwhelm by pouring. The apostles were not overwhelmed, but they were filled with, the Holy Spirit.

Again, I say, pouring is the mode of baptism specifically pointed out by the Holy Spirit. And the meaning that my opponent attaches to *baptizo* here, of overwhelm, is far-fetched and gratuitous; and is not sustained by the facts of the case.

But, in reference to Luke xi. 34—38, if he will read the passage he will discover the purification spoken of is the washing before eating, for Jews that had not been to the market.

In Mark vii. 3, we read, "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say with unwashed hands, they found fault." Now, in the former passage *ebaptizthe* is used; and in this *nipzoontai* is used. In Luke xi. 38, it is not the washing when coming from the markets but the washing before eating that is called the baptism. "They marveled that he had not first (*ebaptizthe*) washed before dinner." The collation is not between Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, but between the latter passage and Mark vii. 3.

In the passage which I quoted from Clement of Alexandria, he tells us that it was the custom of the Jews to wash their hands upon their couches, and to baptize themselves in this way. "Well," my opponent says, "if they baptized their hands, they dipped them; and that was immersion." But Clement says, "They baptized themselves by washing their hands, upon their couches." He does not say they baptized their hands, but, they baptized themselves by washing their hands. The washing of the hands was the baptism of the person.

But, in regard to the baptism of couches, he tells us that some of these couches, or *klinoon*, were mats upon which the Jews slept. The *klinoon*, however, was the frame upon which the mat was spread. Often they could not be dipped, yet they were all baptized. There was some way of baptizing them, then, besides dipping. He admitted some of these *klinoon* could not be dipped, and yet they were all baptized. They were, therefore, baptized by sprinkling, as all authors tell us.

In regard to the baptism of Judith, he wanted to know why she went out into the valley. I will read the passage as found in Judith xii. 5-9: "Then the servants of Holofernes brought her into the tent, and she slept till midnight; and she arose when it was toward the morning watch, and went to Holofernes, saying, Let my lord now command that thy handmaid may go forth for prayer. Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her. Thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia and washed (*ebaptizeto*) herself at a fountain of water by the camp. And when she came out, she besought the Lord God of Israel to direct her way to the raising up of the children of her people. So she came in clean, and remained in the tent until she did eat her meat in the evening."

Here she went out and purified herself by washing her hands at

the fountain, for it is not said she baptized herself in the fountain; but she baptized herself at the fountain, according to the Jewish method of purifying, which was done ordinarily by washing of hands; and after she had purified herself and prayed, she returned to the tent of Holofernes.

But my friend says there are certain translations which give immerse for baptize here. I will read what Dr. Conant says:

"One of the oldest Greek manuscripts, and the two oldest versions (the Syriac and Latin), read immersed (baptized) herself in the fountain of water (omitting in the camp). According to the common Greek text, this was done at the fountain to which she went, because she had there the means of immersing herself. Any other use of water for purification could have been made in her tent."

How does my friend get immerse in this old manuscript? Why, he says, *baptizo* means immerse! One of the oldest Greek manuscripts reads, immersed (baptized) herself; therefore, she plunged herself in the fountain of water. When I ask what word this old manuscript uses, I am answered, *baptizo!* the identical word found in the text. *Baptizo*, he tells us, means immerse; and this old manuscript says she baptized herself in the fountain; and, therefore, she immersed herself in the fountain I I was not prepared, I confess, to see, on the part of my learned friend, such a complete begging of the question. I should not like to be caught in such a predicament as this before an intelligent audience.

But the example from Justin Martyr—which is as literal a translation as can be made—he says: "Baptize the soul from wrath, and from covetousness, from envy, and from hatred; and lo the body is pure." I brought forward this example to show you that *baptizo* was not used in the sense of modal action, but in the sense of effect—purify the soul, and lo the body is pure. It is the effect produced, not the modal action which is here expressed by *baptizo*.

I will make one remark, also, in regard to what my opponent calls a positive institution requiring specific acts. I told you the Lord's Supper was a positive institution. He tells us that *phagoo* signifies to eat; but the gentleman well knows that the word used to give name to the Lord's Supper is *deipnon*, which means the principal meal of the day. "When you come together therefore, in one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper"—(*kuriakon deipnon phagein*)—not merely *phagein*, to eat; but to *phagein* the *deipnon*, that is, to eat the Lord's Supper. *Deipnon* is used to give name to the ordinance, and it means the principal meal of the day. It does not mean to eat a morsel of bread and drink a sip of wine. Nothing is eating the Lord's Supper, according to the gentleman's arguments, but eating the principal meal of the day! The whole principle that he lays down, that positive institutions require specific acts, is thus proven to be vicious at its very foundation. It will not do to base an argument upon such a vicious principle in the interpretation of the scriptures. *Deipnon* simply signifies the principal meal; it does not tell how much we are to eat. You can learn nothing from the word as to how it is to be done—whether the position of the body is to be standing, kneeling, or reclining. Nobody will contend that any position of the body is re-

quired in the word; and yet it is an institution that depends upon the divine command for its perpetuity and obligation.

I will now proceed with my affirmative argument, and present to you some other examples from the fathers of the use and import of the term *baptizo*, showing that it is used as a general term, expressing, not the specific action of dip, but all kinds of action. The first I take from Justin Martyr, First Apology, p. 59. He says, in describing baptism:

"For in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water."

Again, on page 60, he says:

"And the devils, indeed, having heard this washing published by the prophet, instigated those who enter their temples, and are about to approach them with libations and burnt-offerings, to sprinkle themselves."

Here Justin tells us that this sprinkling of the heathen was in imitation of baptism; for he, throughout this Apology, shows how the devil imitates everything connected with the Christian worship. There would be no imitation here unless Christian baptism was by sprinkling.

The next example I will give you is from Cyril of Alexandria. This father speaks of the Jewish rite of sprinkling as a baptism; his words are:

"We have been baptized, not with mere water, nor yet with the ashes of a heifer, but with the Holy Ghost and fire."—Seiss on Baptism, p. 124.

Here Cyril tells us that the sprinkling with the water of separation was a baptism—and, if this sprinkling was a baptism, where was the immersion?

Ambrose speaks in the same way:

"He who desired to be purified with a typical baptism, was sprinkled with the blood of a lamb, by means of a bunch of hyssop."—Ibid. pp. 123, 126.

Now where is the dip of my friend in this passage? I am giving him a few examples to practice on. You know he said he could put dip or immerse in every place where *baptizo* was found. I want him to translate the word dip or immerse in these examples.

Ambrose said that he was sprinkled with the blood of a lamb by means of a bunch of hyssop. Was that a dipping? Yet it was a baptism.

Again, he says: "For he who is baptized, both according to the law and according to the Gospel, is made clean, according to the law in that Moses with a bunch of hyssop sprinkled the blood of a lamb."—Ibid. p. 125.

There was then a baptism according to the Jewish law. Was it an immersion?

Again, the same father, taking a general survey of the Jewish and heathen absolutions, thus sums up the matter, saying; "There are many kinds of purifications (*baptizmatum*), but the apostle proclaims one baptism. Why, there are heathen purifyings (*baptismata*), but

they are not purifications (*baptismata*). Washings they are; purifications (*baptismata*) they can not be. The body is washed, but sin is not washed away. Nay, in that washing, sin is contracted. There were, also, Jewish purifyings (*baptismata*); some superfluous, others typical."—Ibid. p. 126.

Here he tells us there were baptisms, and yet they were not baptisms. They were purifications, and yet they did not purify. Undertake to put immersion for baptism here, and you have a positive contradiction. Immersions (*baptismata*) they are; immersions (*baptismata*) they can not be! You see here is a direct contradiction. *Baptismata* can not be translated immersions here.

Next, we turn to Tertullian, to inquire what meaning he attached to *baptizo*:

"At the sacred rites of Isis, or Mithra, they are initiated by a washing; they carry out their gods with washings; they expiate villas, houses, temples, and whole cities by sprinkling with water carried around. Certainly, they are purified in the Apollinarian and Eleusinian rites; and they say that they do this to obtain regeneration and to escape the punishment of their perjuries. Also, among the ancients, whoever had stained himself with murder, expiated himself with purifying water. In view of these things, we see the zeal of the devil in rivaling the things of God, inasmuch as he thus also practices baptism among his own people."

Here we have a description of the various lustrations and expiations performed by the devil's people, not only upon their own bodies, but also upon villas, houses, temples, and whole cities—and that by sprinkling with water carried around.' And yet Tertullian sums it all up as the devil's baptism (*baptismatum*)!—Ibid. pp. 128, 129.

How were these purifications performed? By sprinkling; and yet Tertullian calls them baptism.

Again, Tertullian says, speaking of the water and blood which issued from the wounded side of the Saviour:

"These two baptisms he poured forth from the wound of his pierced side."—Ibid. p. 130.

Did he mean to say, that he poured forth these two immersions from his pierced side? Do you not see it would make nonsense to translate *baptismos* immersion here? He did not pour forth two immersions, but two baptisms or purifications—one, by water; and the other, by blood. It is effect, not modality, that Tertullian here expresses by *baptismos*.

Origen calls "the outpouring of the blood of Christ a baptism." Who would call this an immersion?—Ibid. pp. 130, 131.

Again, Origen, in commenting on John i. 25, says:

"What makes you think that Elias when he comes will baptize, who in Ahab's time did not (himself) baptize the wood upon the altar, which required washing in order to be burnt up when the Lord should reveal himself by fire? For he ordered the priests to do that (*i. e.*, baptize the wood), not only once, for he says, Do it the second time," etc.—Ibid. p. 131.

The account is given in 1 Kings xviii: "And Elijah took twelve stones, and with the stones he built an altar, and he made a trench



about the altar, as great as would contain two measures of seed. And he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels with wafer, and pour it on the burnt-sacrifice, and on the wood. And he said, Bo it the second time; and they did it the second time. And he said, Bo it the third time; and they did it the third time. And the water ran round about the altar, and filled the trench also with water."

Here we have an example of baptism by pouring. The water was poured upon the wood and upon the sacrifice. Yet Origen, a native Greek, and one of the most learned of all the fathers, called it a baptism. Here we find the fathers using *baptizo* to express pouring and sprinkling.

Niciphorus, also one of the Greek fathers, describes a baptism in this way:

"He (the man) expecting to die, asked to receive the water, *i. e.*, to be baptized; and he baptized him even upon his couch on which he lay."—*Ibid.* p. 133.

Now, the question is, Bid he dip him? Yes, says my opponent, for *baptizo* always means to immerse! The idea of immersing a man upon his couch upon which he lay, every man knows is an absurdity. He was baptized by sprinkling.

Again, in a paper ascribed to Athanasius, found in the works of John of Damascus, it is said that "John was baptized (*ebaptisthai*) by placing his hand on the divine head of his Master." Was this an immersion?—*Ibid.* p. 134.

Again, Anastasius speaks of "baptism as poured into water-pots; and of water-pots as baptized by pouring baptism into them." Where is the immersion in these acts? Can immersion be poured into a water-pot? [Laughter.]

But I might produce many other examples from the fathers, where *baptizo* is used as expressive of acts of pouring and sprinkling; but surely these are sufficient to satisfy every reasonable man.

There is another fact that must forever settle the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and that is, when immersion, that is, trine immersion (which was the ancient manner of baptizing in this way), became common, the completion of the ordinance was called baptism; but the immersions were expressed by another word, which in Greek properly signifies to dip or immerse.

Gregory Nepsen says, concerning the baptism of Christ: "Coming into water, the kindred element of earth, we hide ourselves in it, as the Saviour did in the earth," and doing this "three times," etc.

And Basil says: "By the three immersions (*en trisi tais katadusesi*), and, by the like number of invocations, the great mystery of baptism is completed."

And again, Damascenus says: "Baptism is a type of the death of Christ, for by three immersions (*kataduseon*) baptism signifies," etc.

Again, in Apostolical Constitutions: "Immersion (*katadusis*) denotes dying with him (Christ): emersion (*anadusis*), a resurrection with Christ.

Photius says: "The three immersions and emersions (*kataduseis kai anaduseis*) of baptism signify death and resurrection."

Athanasius says: "To immerse (*katadusai*) a child three times in the bath (or pool), and emerse (*anadusai*) him, this shows the death," etc.

Chrysostom says: "We, as in a sepulcher, immersing (*kataduon-ton*) our heads in water, the old man is buried; and sinking down (*katadus katoo*), the whole is concealed at once; then, as we emerge, the new man rises."—Stewart on Baptism, pp. 147, 148.

Here, when these Greek fathers speak of the immersions of baptism, they use *kataduo*, but when they speak of baptism as completed by the three immersions, they call it baptism.—[*Time expired*.

MR. BRADEN'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—We shall first review what the gentleman has just said worthy of notice, and then proceed as we promised yesterday evening, to sustain an affirmative, that baptism is always an immersion. We wish first to call attention to this strange fact, that though he is discussing a scriptural ordinance, he has not yet quoted a single passage in the scriptures, nor cited a single commentary, in which the ordinance is spoken of. Why does he not take up the command which instituted the ordinance, and passages in which the ordinance is spoken of, and from them prove his position? He takes passages where *baptizo* is used in a secondary or figurative sense, and attempts to prove, not that it means sprinkling or pouring, but that it may mean something else than immersion. He has not even touched the subject of scriptural baptism.

He goes away to the fathers, who lived from one hundred and fifty to three hundred years after Christ, and reads from them passages in which he thinks that *baptizo* may mean something else than immerse; or where they speak of the effect of baptism—purification. He then goes to the Jewish law to show that a part of purification there mentioned was sometimes accomplished by sprinkling blood, or the compound called the water of purification; and then reasons that, as a part of the purification in the Jewish law was by sprinkling blood or some other substance than water, of course, the purification spoken of by the fathers was a sprinkling of water—entirely ignoring the law we laid down, and which he can not deny, that God never commanded water alone to be sprinkled on any person, for either moral, ceremonial, or religious purposes.

But I will take every passage he quotes and show that *baptizo* can, and should, and must be translated immerse; and he dare not attempt to translate it pour or sprinkle. Did you observe that in some of the very quotations, and in all where a translation is made, the Latin and other fathers translate *baptizo* by immerse? In the passage he read from Conant, the translators all render *baptizo* by immerse, but he can't see how it can be an immersion; therefore, it is a pouring or sprinkling. If this is logic, then, I confess, I am unable to see it. Will you take his quibbles, and "can't see how," before the positive declaration of learned men, who lived almost contemporary with the event, who spoke and read the Greek as a living language; and the law of God which says that Judith must bathe her whole person, or immerse her-

self; and Jewish writers, who say that they always bathed, or immersed the whole person, and even if the tip of a finger was not dipped, they were not cleansed?

My opponent quotes from early writers secondary and figurative uses of *baptizo*, to show that it may mean, not pour or sprinkle, but something else than immerse, though that something else, when he has found it, is always accomplished by immersion. He does not touch passages in which they speak of the ordinance or describe it. I will, when I reach the proper point, show that when they baptized, they always immersed, and that they invariably speak of the ordinance as an immersion. I shall not talk about what it may be, but what it is, and prove what it is.

It is charged that I differ from Alexander Campbell in reference to the word *baptizo*—that is, as to the extent of its meaning—and, therefore, I abandon the idea of specific action. This is too trivial, too contemptible to deserve notice; but as it is all my opponent can adduce, I will again tax your patience, and perhaps insult your good sense, to notice it, in consideration for him. It shows to what straits my opponent is reduced—what paltry straws a drowning man will clutch at. I say that *baptizo* always means to immerse one in water or any substance that will cover him; that it always expresses a specific act, and this one specific act. Mr. Campbell says that this is the specific act, also, but he makes the act of longer duration than I do; and because I do not give the same latitude of duration to the same specific act, I abandon the idea of specific action! This is sheer nonsense. I again repeat that *baptizo* means invariably one specific action, namely to immerse—that is the primary meaning, and the secondary always includes the idea of having been accomplished by that specific act. It that is not making it specific, I can not see how it can be done.

He speaks again of the nonsensical idea of going to the bottom and staying there; and if I abandon the idea of going to the bottom and staying there, I abandon the idea of specific action! As if you could not immerse a person without putting him to the bottom and making him stay there! He immerses. Is that the way he does it? If so, I can easily understand why he is so much opposed to immersion. I never gave nor accepted such a meaning, but repudiate it with contempt. He can not find an author who gives such a meaning, nor a passage where it will admit of such a meaning. It is a silly figment of his own fertile brain. I repeat, *baptizo* simply places one under the water, or any substance that will cover him and accomplish this specific action. Common-sense will tell how you take him out. I trust, after this explanation, he will not insult your common-sense by any more such twaddle as 'I how do you get him out?'

I will relieve Mr. Campbell of the charge of talking such nonsense as my opponent and his brethren place in his mouth. He did give his speculation as to the meaning of the intensive termination 20, but he never uttered such nonsense as Methodist debaters put in his mouth. They pervert his language—make nonsense of it, and then attempt to use it for their purpose, because, no doubt, his nonsense is better than their sense. He says, My idea is that the word originally meant, not that the dipping should be

done frequently [as the grammars assert.—*Braden*], but it should be done quickly. That is the best reason I can give for the change of termination into *zoo*." Mr. Campbell does not utter such nonsense as that *bap* places a man under the water, and *zoo* takes him out! And if such were the case, what of it? Verily, this is a powerful argument!

My friend parades again the pouring of the Holy Spirit. Was the Spirit literally poured as a substance on to the spirit of the individual? Was the pouring of the Spirit the baptism? I affirm again, that the baptism was an immersion, and I have eighteen learned pedobaptist authorities to sustain me in the position, such as Robinson, Dr. Geo. Campbell, Gurtlerus, Bloomfield, Archbishop Tillotson, Cyril, Prof. Stuart, Theophylact, Neander, Bishop Reynolds, Ikenius, Le Clerc, Casaubon, Bishop Hopkins. Cyril and Theophylact were early fathers, not pedobaptists, but their testimony is only the stronger, for it shows how the early church understood the baptism. They all make it an immersion, or an overwhelming of the powers of the mind by the power of the Spirit. Immersion will make the figure bold and beautiful. Pouring or sprinkling makes it literal and nonsense.

My opponent is not yet satisfied with regard to my statement, that Liddell and Scott, and Drisler their American editor, had to throw out wet, moisten, bedew, draw water, pump water, as meanings of *baptizo*. Mr. Drisler, quoting from Heysechius and Gases, Mr. Hughey's great authorities, inserted these renderings. Liddell and Scott had them in their first London edition, quoting from the same authors, for they are the only ones who have had the temerity to give such perversions. Scholars demanded that they should verify them by appeal to classic authors, and they threw them out—one of the strongest proofs that the word has no such meaning.

Graves, in his first edition, away down at the bottom of a long list of renderings, such as dip, etc., surreptitiously foisted in sprinkle as a rendering of *baptizo*, in a few passages, one or two where it had a figurative meaning. Scholars assailed the rendering, and he has thrown it out. Sectarianism would fain have surreptitiously foisted it in as a possible meaning; but scholars drove it out. The same thing was attempted by the American editor of an edition of Donnegan's Greek Lexicon, but scholars assailed it. Donnegan was appealed to, and, pedobaptist as he was, he indignantly repudiated the trick; and compelled the sectarian editor to throw it out. These attempts to foist in these meanings, and the ignominious backing down of those who attempt it, are one of the strongest proofs ever given that it can mean no such thing, as pour or sprinkle. The throwing out of all secondary meanings incompatible with immersion, shows that it has no meanings that are incompatible with immersion; and that is all my opponent has yet attempted to show.

In speaking of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, I spoke of an overwhelming of the person by pouring. My opponent, ever ready to pervert my words, says I admit pouring to be a baptism. I do no such thing. I say the result—the covering of the person in water—would be an overwhelming. The covering or overwhelming would be an im-

mersion, not the pouring. So the overwhelming of the powers of soul would be an immersion, or a baptism; and baptism is immersion.

My opponent goes back a second time to Judith, twice in the same speech. He can't see how *baptizo* can here mean immerse. Look at the circumstances: Is it likely she would go out, in the dead of night, attended only by her maid, away out of camp, down into the valley of Bethulia, to wash her hands, when there was water in the tent for that purpose? What nonsense! The Jewish law required a bathing of the whole person, an immersion. All Jewish authorities say they invariably did immerse the whole person, not permitting even the tip of the little finger to escape the immersion. Two of the oldest translators say she immersed herself "in the fountain"—the Latin and Syriac.

*Mr. Hughey.*—What is the Syriac word?

*Mr. Braden.*—I can not see what effect that would have on the argument.

*Mr. Hughey.*—Perhaps the gentleman does not know it!

*Mr. Braden.*—I am certain Mr. Hughey would not know whether I gave him the right word or not, were I to do so. I have the authority of Dr. Conaut, and what Dr. Conaut says on such matters Mr. Hughey dare not question. He says they render it "immersed herself in the fountain of water." The old Greek manuscript, No. 58, says, "she immersed (*ebaptiseto*) herself in the fountain of water."

*Mr. Hughey.*—Is not the word *baptizo* the one you read immersed?

*Mr. Braden.*—Yes, sir; but I also gave the word without the translation; and I quoted it to show that it was done in the fountain, and to herself, on her whole person, and she was immersed.

Is the washing of hands called a baptism in Luke? I repeat, it is not. The Pharisee wondered that he (our Saviour) had not bathed himself, or immersed himself, before he ate, as the Jews, according to all their rabbins, always did. The washing is not the same as expressed by *nipsontai*, in Mark vii. 3, but the same as expressed by *baptizo*, in Mark vii. 4, the bathing of the whole person, or immersion; and the immersion or putting of tables, etc., under water. When a Jew came in from a crowd, lest he might have become defiled by some person or thing forbidden to be touched, he always dipped himself, as Maimonides assures us, and the law required when a man was defiled. It may seem strange and burdensome to us, who are unaccustomed to so much bathing as they practice in the East. But there bathing is almost as common as washing the face here, and regarded as no more of a task. Indeed, did they live as we do, they would be carried off by leprosy in every family. The burdensome Jewish law was a rational sanitary regulation, demanded by the physical welfare of the Jews, and modern hygiene is not yet as wise as God's ancient law.

The gentleman next attempts a very small pettifogger's trick. I said I could and would translate every passage where *baptizo* occurs, by immerse, or some word of kindred meaning. He then hands me "Seiss on Baptism," a partisan book, where the passage is translated, and asks me to translate the passage which Seiss translates "baptizing themselves on their couches," by immerse. You, no doubt, thought he handed me the original Greek. There is not a word of

Greek in the passage. There are two words of Greek in parenthesis, spelled in English letters, and from those two words, I am to translate several lines of Greek; and then he triumphantly claims I have failed! What a contemptible trick. I will now say that I will find the original, and place it and a correct translation in a note in the book containing the debate. So that matter is disposed of.

Your attention was next directed to *phagoo* and *deipnon*, and he wants to know if I make *deipnon* a specific action. Here the word that expresses the specific action is *phagoo*, a word which expresses but one specific act, eat. This our Saviour used when he gave the command, giving it, as all positive ordinances must be, by a word expressing but one specific act. This act, when performed in a certain way, constitutes the Lord's *deipnon*, or supper. My opponent would attempt to dispose of my argument, that all positive commands are expressed by words expressing but one specific act, by substituting *deipnon*, the ordinance, for *phagoo*, the act by which the ordinance is fulfilled; and claim that I make *deipnon*, supper, a specific word. I said no such thing. I said our Saviour used *phagoo*, a specific word, a word to express but one specific act; and in like manner he used *baptizo*, a word expressing but one specific act, in the other command; and as we can not have the Lord's *deipnon*, without the specific action, eating, we can not have his baptism without the specific action of immersing.

I can dispose of all the passages he quotes from the fathers in a lump. He quotes certain passages in which the fathers speak of baptism as a purifying rite. He then goes back to the Jewish law, and shows that sprinkling blood or the compound known as the water of purification, was a purifying rite in the Jewish law; and as both are purifying rites, the act is the same in both cases. Strange logic, certainly. Let me reason. The British Sovereign and our President are both inducted into office by what is called an inauguration. The British Sovereign is crowned; as both are called inaugurations, both are crowned, or we crown our President. The early fathers never used the ordinance of baptism as substituted for Jewish cleansings. Never say it was performed the same way. They merely speak of it as a purifying rite, having somewhat the same significance in the Christian dispensation, Jewish cleansings had in the old. One cleansed the soul from guilt, or rather was the crowning act of such cleansing, and the crowning act of Jewish cleansings was an immersion; and if there is any force in the quotations, they prove immersion.

But when the fathers speak of Christian baptism, they call it an immersion. They tell us they immersed, and call our Saviour's baptism an immersion. We shall introduce them in due time, and hear them on the subject at issue. We have now disposed of all our opponent's arguments, so called. He has not produced an author who dare translate the word our Saviour used to express the ordinance, by pour or sprinkle. He dare not translate a single passage in that way. He has not examined a passage in the Bible where the ordinance is meant, and yet he is trying to prove what a scriptural ordinance is. He gives to *baptizo* the absurd meaning "go to the bottom and stay there," though I never said so, nor does any authority or man of sense; nor can he find a single passage where he dare to give it such a nonsensi-

cal meaning. I repudiate such stuff, and then he vociferates triumphantly, "Ah, you have abandoned your claim that it expresses specific action," because I reject his specific nonsense. He is like the butcher's dog, Noble, who stuck his nose into a hollow log, and, though there never had been a trace and scent even of game in it, he barked and howled over it as if he had a lion treed; and tried, by his roaring, to make every one believe he had something wonderful there. For weeks did he persist in this folly, though no one regarded him. So my opponent has seized hold of this absurdity, that never was an argument, but always an insult to the common-sense of his hearers, and he vociferates and shouts, hoping, like Noble, to make you believe he has his opponent cornered there. I hope self-respect, and respect for your good sense, will prevent his ever hinting such a thing again.

Though *baptizo* occurs nearly four hundred times, he has in his supreme appeal, touched on but about a dozen instances, and but few of these refer to the ordinance. They are secondary and figurative uses. He has not attempted to translate by sprinkle or pour, but he takes "purify," and then, since this is sometimes done by some other act—in one instance partially by sprinkling, and that not water, he claims it can mean sprinkling! Driven from this, he goes back and begins the story over again. Like the old woman, who was starting on a journey, and was afraid she would lose her baggage, and kept repeating "big box, little box, band-box, and bundle;" "bundle, band-box, little box, big box." back and forth, he repeats, parrot like, "you have abandoned specific action" "Judith," "Naaman," "Clemens Alexandrinus," and the "fathers"—"the fathers," "Clemens Alexandrinus," etc. I hope he will add a few items to his list for variety, if nothing else.

We shall now commence what we shall call an universal affirmative—affirming that the word *baptizo* means dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm—that it invariably represents the specific act expressed in English by three nearly synonymous terms, in its primary sense; that it expresses, in its secondary meanings, results always accomplished by this specific action; because they are thus accomplished, and even in its secondary meanings it can invariably be expressed by these words.

We have already offered two arguments in favor of this position that have not been noticed, though they as clearly establish it, unless answered, as two and two make four.

1. If the words in the Greek language were all translated into English, we would have the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, several hundred times; and in nine cases out of ten as translations of *bapto* and *baptizo*, proving clearly that these words are the words which pre-eminently, in Greek, represent the specific act expressed by these English verbs.

2. We would have the words pour and sprinkle several hundred times, and never once as renderings of *bapto* or *baptizo*; showing that these words can never represent the acts expressed by those verbs, as my friend claims.

3. Mr. Hughey, and no one else, dare translate "I pour thee," or "I sprinkle thee," by "*Baptizo se*;" thus showing that "*Baptizo se*" can never mean "I pour or sprinkle thee."

4. He can, and must, from the analogy of the Greek language, translate "I immerse thee," by "*Baptizo* se," showing that "*Baptizo* se" means "I immerse thee."

But we will now go further, for we are only troubled with abundance of proof. Remember, we said, and it has been virtually admitted, that all positive commands must be expressed by a word representing one clearly-defined specific act, and can be obeyed by no other, for the act performed in a certain way is the ordinance, and without the act there is no ordinance; that baptism is a command or ordinance of this character; hence, when our Saviour used *baptizo* to express one of the two ordinances of his church, he used a word which had a clearly-defined specific meaning, and he used it in that meaning, and no other; hence this ordinance is one clearly-defined specific act, and no other. As the gentleman admits immersion to be baptism, unless he can disprove what we have just said, and he has not attempted it, he must concede immersion alone is baptism. Remember, we called on him to name one positive command of God that could be obeyed by more than one act. He has not done it; and, as he admits immersion to be baptism, he admits it to be that one act. We challenged him also to mention one word which could represent more than one specific physical act. He has not done it; hence, as he admits it does represent immersion, it must represent that alone.

Remember, we said *baptizo* was a Greek word, and we must learn how the Greeks used it; that we would confine the examination to *baptizo* alone, for that alone was used to express the ordinance, and it was a word of much narrower significance than *bapto*, its primitive; that we had nothing to do with secondary or tropical meanings, unless it was attempted to show that *baptizo* had lost its primary meaning, and taken a secondary one, different from the primary; that we have nothing to do with sacred senses, unless it was shown that *baptizo* had a sacred sense, and that the sacred sense was different from the classical. Indeed, it could have no sacred sense, until it was made a rite or ceremony by John and Christ, and when they took it they must take it in its common-sense, before there was any sacred use of it.

We will now go to those learned men, those judges and lawyers, who have honestly and with great research compiled the decisions of classical usage, my opponent's supreme court. We shall read from lexicons compiled, in nine cases out of ten, by persons who, as sectarians, practiced sprinkling and pouring, but who, as scholars, tell the truth. I shall first quote from the twelve lexicons which are relied on by our opponents to sustain pouring and sprinkling. We read from Bailey's Manual of Baptism, a work published by G. S. Bailey, one of the leading Baptist preachers of our State, and a book indorsed by the Baptist Publication Society. His quotations can be sustained by an appeal to original authority. Unlike pedobaptist authors, who appeal only to secondary and far-fetched renderings, and skip over the most obvious and the real meaning, he gives both primary and secondary.

Scapula.—*Baptizo*, to dip, to immerse; also, to dye, as we immerse things for the purpose of dyeing them or washing them; also, to plunge, submerge, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash. *Baptismos*,



immersion, Trashing, cleansing; the act itself of washing, cleansing; also of immersion.

Hedericus.—To dip, to immerse, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash, to baptize in a sacred sense.

Stephanus.—To dip, to immerse; as, immerse things for the purpose of washing or coloring; to merge, submerge, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash.

Schleusner.—To plunge, to immerse, cleanse, wash, purify with water.

Parkhurst.—To immerse in or to wash with water in token of purification. Figuratively, to be immersed or plunged in a flood or sea, as it were, of grievous affliction and suffering.

Schrivellius.—*Buptizo*, to baptize, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash.

Bretschneider.—Properly, often to dip, often to wash; to wash, to cleanse; in the middle voice, I wash or cleanse myself. An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism. This is the meaning of the word, for in baptism is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water; at least so is *baptisma* in the New Testament. In the New Testament *buptizo* is only used concerning the sacred and solemn submersion which the Jews used. *Baptisma*, immersion, submersion. In the New Testament concerning the sacred submersion which the fathers call Christian baptism.

Suidas.—To sink, to plunge, to immerse, to wet, wash, cleanse, purify.

Wahl.—To perform ablution, to cleanse, wash, to immerse.

Greenfield.—To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink. In the New Testament, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, immerse.

Now, concerning these twelve lexicons I observe, 1. Every one gives immerse, dip, or plunge, as a primary meaning of the word. 2. Not one gives sprinkle or pour as a meaning, primary or secondary. 3. Not one gives a meaning that contradicts the primary idea of immerse. 4. Not one gives a meaning that could be accomplished in the Bible by pouring or sprinkling water. To cleanse or purify as a religious rite, was never performed by pouring or sprinkling water. 5. Every meaning they give in a sacred or religious sense was accomplished by immersion, as we have repeatedly shown. Yet these are the lexicons specially relied on to prove pouring and sprinkling!

We continue:

Parson.—*Bapto* and *buptizo*, to dip, to dye, because it is done by immersion. It differs from *dunai*, which means to sink to the bottom and to be thoroughly submerged. [Here is Mr. Hughey's "sink to the bottom and stay there" and yet this is one of the words by which he would translate immerse into Greek!] Afflictions are compared to a flood of waters in which they seem to be immersed, who are overwhelmed with the sorrows of life, yet only so as to emerge again. [Here is the baptism of sufferings made an immersion, and no abandoning the idea of specific action.]

Donnegan.—To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to soak thoroughly, to saturate, hence to drench with wine. Metaphorically, to confound totally (overwhelm), to dip in a vessel and draw.

[Here is Mr. Hughey's "draw water," because the act is dip.] Passive, to be immersed.

Dr. John Jones, of England.—*Baptizo*, I plunge, I plunge in water, dip, baptize, bury, overwhelm.

Prof. Rast.—To plunge, to immerse, submerge.

Bass, of England.—*Baptizo*, to dip, immerse, plunge in water, to bathe oneself, to be immersed in sufferings and afflictions.

Pickering.—*Baptismos*, immersion, dipping, plunging; metaphorically, misery or calamity with which one is overwhelmed.

Stokius.—*Baptizo*, generally and by the force of the word, indicates simply, the act of dipping and diving; but properly, it means to dip or immerse in water. In the New Testament it denotes the first sacrament, in which sacrament those to be baptized were anciently immersed in water.

Robertson's Thesaurus.—*Baptizo*, to immerse, to wash.

Suicer's Thesaurus.—*Baptizo*, properly, denotes an immersion or dipping into.

Liddell and Scott.—"Baptize, to dip repeatedly; of ships, to sink them. Passive, to bathe; soaked wine, over head and ears in debt; a boy drowned with questions. To draw water. [No doubt just as Donnegan gives it, to dip water.] In New Testament, baptize." We have already called attention to the important fact that they had to pour upon, to wet, to drench, in the first edition, and have thrown them out, because inadmissible; a triumphant argument against pouring and sprinkling.

Dr. Anthon.—The primary meaning of the word is dip, or immerse, and its secondary meanings, if it ever had any, all refer to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, pouring, etc., are entirely out of the question. [Dr. Anthon was one of the best classical scholars America ever produced.]

Leigh, of England.—"The votive and proper signification of *baptizo* is, to dip into water, or to plunge under water." Mr. Home, in his Introduction to Sacred Scriptures, says of Mr. Leigh, "He was one of the most learned men of his time, and most succeeding lexicographers of the Old and New Testaments have been greatly indebted to his '*Critica Sacra*.'"

Charles Richardson.—*Baptizo*, to dip or merge in water, to sink, to plunge or immerse.

Parson.—Same as Liddell and Scott, for it is the basis of that work.

Castel.—Bathe, baptize, immerse.

Constantine.—*Baptismos*, baptism, the act of dyeing, that is, of plunging.

Schoettgenius.—*Baptizo*, from *bapto*, properly, to plunge, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash.

Trammises.—*Baptizo*, to immerse, to dip.

Minhart.—*Baptizo*, to baptize; properly, indeed, it signifies to immerse, to plunge, to dip into water. But, because it is common to plunge or dip a thing to wash it, hence, it signifies also to wash, to wash away. *Baptisma*, immersion, dipping into, washing, washing away; properly, and according to its etymology, it denotes that washing that is done by immersion.

Boyster.—*Baptizo*, to dip, to immerse, to cleanse or purify by washing, to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize. *Baptisma*, immersion, ordinance of baptism.

Here are thirty-two Greek lexicons, standard authorities, men who have compiled the decisions of Mr. Hughey's supreme court, and how do they decide? They all give dip, immerse, plunge, submerge, immerge, overwhelm, as the primary meanings. When they give wash, cleanse, and purify, they do so because they are the results of that one specific act. Not one gives pour or sprinkle. One gave pour and had to erase it. Look at the way pouring and sprinkling have to be proved: 1. All primary meanings have to be ignored. 2. Nearly half the lexicons say that it takes secondary meanings, because they are results of immersion; this has to be ignored. 3. Even then there is no pouring or sprinkling; but it is assumed that these effects can be accomplished by pouring and sprinkling also, hence they are baptism. This assumption, that cleansing or purifying can be accomplished in a religious sense, in the Bible, by pouring or sprinkling water, is in direct violation of the fact that God never commanded water to be poured or sprinkled on any one for a religious purpose. 4. Some passages are quoted where they "can't see how it can mean immerse" so plainly as to leave no difficulty—hence it must mean pour or sprinkle, though there is no passage where they dare to translate it pour or sprinkle! Verily, this is logic.

Look now at the argument for immersion: 1. All lexicons give dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, immerge, overwhelm, as the primary meanings. Nearly all give these as the only primary meanings, and wash, cleanse, etc., as secondary. 2. A majority say that they give these secondary meanings because they are the effect of an immersion, and that a total immersion is necessary to the full idea of the word. 3. Not one gives a meaning that is not in full accordance with the primary idea, dip or immerse. 4. All these meanings, when taken in a ceremonial sense in the Bible, require an immersion, for that was how persons were cleansed when water alone was used. 5. Some say that pouring and sprinkling are out of the question. If that is not making out that *baptizo* means the specific act expressed by immerse, etc., I know not how to do it. It means that and nothing else.

My opponent seems to have abandoned all hope of proving pouring and sprinkling to be baptism. He merely hopes to befog the argument for immersion. By the same course of argument he urges against immersion, or rather that *baptizo* always means immerse, I can destroy every word in the English language. Take immerse. "Immersed in debt." How do you immerse a man in debt, sorrow, care, affliction? Do you, as he asks, take him up and dip or plunge him in debt or sorrow literally? No. Well, then, there is no such thing as immersion. We have no word to express any such idea. Just in the same way as he argues, I can destroy every word that expresses this act which we have in the English language.

Now, we ask you to contrast the two courses of argument, and, as plain men of common-sense, in the name of reason, will you prefer such far-fetched meanings of secondary meanings of *baptizo*, to the

plain, obvious, and only meaning? Will you let such quibbles conceal the truth from you?

But we are not done with testimony yet. We will next appeal to learned men and lexicographers who were writing on other subjects, and gave incidentally definitions of *baptizo*.

Michaelis, author of Syriac Lexicon.—To baptize, to immerse, to bathe.

Schaaf, author of Syriac Lexicon.—To bathe oneself, to bathe, dip, immerse in water, baptize.

Guido Fabricius, another.—To baptize, dip, bathe.

Buxtorf, another.—To baptize, dip, bathe oneself.

Schindler.—To baptize, dip, bathe, immerse in water.

Paschal Anscher.—To baptize, to wash by plunging in water.

Mekitar Vartobed.—Same as Anscher.

Encyclopedia Americana.—Baptism, that is, dipping, immersion, from the Greek word *baptizo*.

Edinburgh Encyclopedia.—In the times of the apostles the act was very simple. The person was dipped in water.

Kitto's Encyclopedia.—The whole person was immersed in water.

Alstedius.—*Baptizien* signifies only to immerse, and not to wash, except by consequence.

Wilson.—Baptize, to dip into water, or plunge one into water.

Dr. William Young.—To dip all over, to wash, to baptize.

Bailey's Dictionary.—Baptism, in strictness of speech, is that kind of ablution or washing which consists in dipping, and, when applied to the Christian institution, it was used by the early Christians in no other way than that of dipping, as the learned Grotius and Casaubon observe.

Butterworth renders *baptizo*, to dip, immerse, or plunge.

John Ash.—Dip, plunge, overwhelm, to administer baptism.

Riordes' Encyclopedia.—*Bapto*, I d:p. Baptism was originally administered by immersion. At present sprinkling is generally substituted in northern climates.

We have now quoted fifty lexicons and dictionaries. Will you take their plain and positive testimony, or will you take the far-fetched, occasional, and improbable meanings of my friend here? I give you all the decisions of the learned world, and of pedobaptists in nine cases out of ten. Next we will bring up historians, then learned men, then the fathers, and, lastly, verify their assertions by appeal to classic usage, examining all the passages where *baptizo* occurs, and show that the decisions of the supreme court have been correctly compiled by our authors. I will now close by reminding you that we have from the affirmative no argument from the New Testament yet, based on a passage where the ordinance is mentioned. , We are talking about scriptural baptism, and where is the scripture for pouring or sprinkling?—[*Time expired*.

MR. HUGHEY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I see that my friend has abandoned his line of argument, and has taken to reading. I knew he would do this. He told us last evening that he could

tell me exactly the course I would take this morning. I expect he thought he could, for Mr. Sweeney has the manuscript of my debate with him, and will not give it up; and he has been at Carbondale recently, and I rather suspect that he gave my friend the privilege of examining my argument, for he tracks my line of argument in that debate exactly. But I have changed my base a little, and that has confused the gentleman. [Laughter.] The opinions of men in regard to the meaning of *baptizo*, will only have weight so long as they have proper ground on which to predicate those opinions. It is the *usus loquendi* of the term that I was trying to bring to the notice of the gentleman. This he ignores, and quotes what Bretschneider, or some other German, has said concerning its import, without attempting to set aside the examples I have produced of its use.

I will read from McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, one of the first works of the kind ever published, and admitted by all to be a standard work of the highest authority. They say on this word:

"As to the meaning of *baptizo*, it is allowed on all hands that it is (at least sometimes) applied to acts involving the process of immersion, both by profane and sacred writers. But the best lexicographers agree that this is not its exclusive meaning, and none but a daring controversialist would assert that it is. The word *baptizo* is derived from *baptos*, the verbal adjective of *bapto*, to wet thoroughly; and its etymological meaning is to put into a drenched or imbued condition. In the New Testament it generally means to purify by the application of water. As the word *baptizo* is used to express the various ablutions among the Jews, such as sprinkling, pouring, etc. (Heb. ix. 10); for the custom of washing before meals, and the washing of household furniture, pots, etc., it is evident from hence that it does not express the manner of doing a thing, whether by immersion or affusion, but only the thing done—that is, washing, or the application of water in some form or other. It nowhere signifies to dip, but it denotes a mode of, and in order to, washing or cleansing, and the mode or use is only the ceremonial part of a positive institute; just as in the Lord's Supper, the time of day, the number and posture of the communicants, the quantity and quality of bread and wine, are circumstances not accounted essential by any part of Christians. If in baptism there is an expressive emblem of the descending influence of the Spirit, pouring must be the mode of administration, for that is the scriptural term most commonly and properly used for the communication of divine influence. The term sprinkling, also, is made use of in reference to the act of purification. So far, then, as the word *baptizo* is concerned, there is no foundation for the exclusive theory of the Baptists."

Thus these scholars testify, and they are admitted to be among the most learned men of Christendom, especially Dr. McClintock.

Now, I might go on and read you any amount of testimony of the same kind as that given by McClintock and Strong, but what would this amount to? These are the opinions merely of learned men; but I wish to go to the facts of use itself. But to this supreme court he will not go. He will not examine the passages I have presented to him, because he can not translate the word *baptizo*, in those passages, to dip or immerse, and make sense.

I will take up his speech and review it for a little while. He says I have not found a single passage of the use of *baptizo* where the ordinance of Christian baptism is spoken of. I am surprised to hear such an assertion, when nearly all the examples from the fathers, either directly or indirectly, speak of Christian baptism. But if this were true, it would not affect my argument in the least, for I am now simply showing the meaning of *baptizo*, from the use of that word in the writings of the fathers. But this is precisely what my opponent will not meet, because in these examples he knows *baptizo* does not mean to dip or immerse, and that he can not so translate it.

My opponent tells us the fathers all speak of baptism as an immersion. But do they use the word *baptizo* to express the specific act of immersion? This is the question we are now discussing. When I get to the history of baptism, I will prove that the earliest mode was by pouring. Immersion was by no means the earliest, nor the uniform mode in the ancient church. I will give you example after example where the fathers speak of baptism by pouring. But I am now inquiring what was the meaning the fathers put upon the word *baptizo*? Did my friend attempt to answer this argument, or translate the word immerse in every case? No; he was too smart for that. He said the fathers all speak of baptism as an immersion! But what did I prove? I proved that Justin Martyr called sprinkling baptism; and that all the fathers called sprinkling or pouring baptism. And I produced examples where the word *baptizo* was used by the fathers where immerse was out of the question. How did he meet these examples? By simply ignoring them.

Now, sir, I want him to come up, like a man, and answer my argument here, or admit he can not do it. When an argument is made to the point, and an opponent refuses to meet it, or attempts to dodge it, it is a confession on his part that he can not answer it. Time and again he has made this very confession by persistently refusing to notice the examples I have produced. Instead of this, he tells us very learnedly that he can translate *baptizo* immerse in every example of its use! Does he suppose the audience are to be imposed upon by such learned twaddle as this? He gives you the examples of *baptizo* from Dr. Conant, where the word signifies to sink to the bottom; but, when I give him examples where immerse is entirely out of the question, what does he do? He goes to reading from some German, and tells you what they say about it! Instead of coming up like a man, and showing that these examples do not prove what I bring them forward to prove, he keeps on traveling around "Robin Hood's barn." [Laughter.]

He tells us the difference between him and Alexander Campbell does not amount to anything—that I am insulting your common-sense, when I am showing the radical difference between them. I have heard men talk that way before. When a difficulty was presented which they could not get out of, they put on an air of surprise, and declare there was no difficulty there at all! [Laughter.] But any individual that understands the import of language knows that when Alexander Campbell says, "the etymology and philology of *baptizo* requires the bringing of the subject out of the water," he stands precisely against

the gentleman's position; and if the specific action of putting into and taking out of the water is not in *baptizo*, it is not a word of specific action at all—it does not express the specific action which he calls baptism.

I want to know whether the word includes going to the bottom and staying there. Conaut says it does, and by this admission he abandons the specific action which he calls baptism. This is not talking nonsense, but my friend wants to get away from this contradiction between Campbell and Conaut very badly. Let him reconcile them if he can; but he can not do it.

I have produced before him example after example where *baptizo* can not mean to dip—where it means to pour, to sprinkle, or to purify—where it can have no other meaning. Now, I want him to set aside these examples, or confess he can not do it. He asks me whether the Holy Spirit was literally poured out on the apostles? Did I not bring up this passage as an example of the metaphorical use of the word? But while this is metaphorical, the scriptures use the mode of pouring, not of dipping.

This spiritual baptism was performed by pouring, as the scriptures inform us, and the effect of the baptism was, they were filled with the Spirit. There was no overwhelming "in the Spirit," neither literally nor metaphorically. The mode of the Spirit's baptism is everywhere represented as by pouring, never by dipping or overwhelming.

The gentleman still affirms that the definition "to pour upon" has been taken out of the last edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon. Whether this be true or not, I have proved by numerous examples from the use of the word that such is its meaning; and it matters not what lexicographers may say when we have the usage of the word before us. There is ample authority for this definition; and I intend to use it, and quote Liddell and Scott as good authority.

But my friend will have it that Judith immersed herself. Did I not read you the whole transaction, and show to you that the baptism was performed preparatory to her devotions, and that the circumstances show that she baptized herself at the fountain by washing her hands? But he tells us that in the Syriac version, the word *baptizo* is here translated immerse; but when I ask him to tell me what Syriac word is used, he puts on a learned air, and says, "It is of no use for me to tell you, for, if I did, you would not know!" Dr. Conant does not give the word, and Mr. Braden does not know what the Syriac word is, for his master does not tell him.

But he says that I impeach Dr. Conant. I *do* impeach him. Dr. Conant says the German word *taufen* signifies to dip or immerse; but there is not a German in the world, who understands his own language, but knows that *taufen* does not signify to dip or immerse. A man that will make such a statement in regard to the meaning of a German word, is not to be trusted in regard to the meaning of a Syriac word. Dr. Conant is a special pleader for exclusive immersion, and I will take his testimony just as far as I will that of my opponent, and not a particle further. I will believe the statements of Dr. Conant just as far as he furnishes the evidence upon which those state-

ments are made; but, beyond this, I will receive the testimony of no special pleader.

Now, in regard to Mark vii. 3, and Luke xi. 38, he tells us that Christ had been in the market where people gathered for the purpose of buying and selling. But it is specifically stated that the baptism here was simply the washing before eating. Christ had not been to the market at all. In Mark, *nipsoontai* is used, in Luke, *ebaptisthe*; and, in both instances, the same thing is referred to, the washing before eating.

I read a passage from Clement of Alexandria, showing how this was performed, that "the Jews baptized themselves upon their couches by washing their hands;" but my opponent has not noticed this passage at all.

I do not think it is necessary to spend more time on *phagoo* and *deipnon*. The one signifies to eat; the other, to eat the principal meal—and neither of these, by themselves or both together, express the thing which my friend claims in the practice of baptism. They do not specify how much to eat, or what posture of body the eating is to be done, or anything about the mode of the supper at all.

My friend states that all my quotations from the fathers have gone to prove that baptism was performed by immersion. I just want to call his attention to the fathers once more, and ask him if the fathers do not call sprinkling and pouring baptism? but when they come to speak of immersion, *kataduoo* is the term used; and *baptizo* is used to express the thing as having been done, whether by sprinkling, pouring, or by trine immersion. Now, if *baptizo* expresses the specific action of dipping, why did not these Greek fathers use it, and not *kataduoo*? But it was the three *katadunoon*, immersions, which constituted the baptism. Now, Mr. Braden can certainly see that when the mode of baptism by immersion was spoken of, they used one word, and when baptism was accomplished they used another word. That is the point. The word *baptizo*, with them, did not express the action of dipping, for they expressed that action by another word.

The various ablutions among the Jews and heathens performed by sprinkling or pouring, were also called baptism by the fathers. Now, from this point I know he can not get. I knew he could not answer my argument here, for I knew that it was founded upon the immutable basis of eternal truth.

I have not based my argument upon the sacred or metaphorical use of *baptizo*, as Mr. Braden has persistently stated. I told you in the very outset that my position was that the Saviour and his apostles used the word in the sense in which it was used among the Hebrews at the time they lived, and from this position I have not moved. This position I have sustained conclusively by examples from the New Testament, and the fathers, which my friend does not touch. He has never noticed the example of the baptism of the Israelites by the cloud, nor the numerous examples from the fathers, wherein the idea of immersion is wholly precluded. But my opponent is a great lover of the sacred meaning of words. I am content to take the word *baptizo* in its ordinary meaning, as used by the Jews who spoke the Greek language in the time of Christ. But my opponent will go to the classical usage



of the word. Well, I will show by examples from the classics that the classical usage agrees with the Hellenistic and Patristic usage of the word. The first example I shall present is furnished by Dr. Carson, and is found in the writings of Plutarch. (See Carson on Baptism, p. 38.

"Plutarch speaking of a Roman general dying of his wounds, says that having baptized his hand in blood, he wrote the inscription for a trophy."

Here the moistening of the end of the finger is called a baptism of the hand.

Again, Dr. Carson quotes Dr. Gale, as applying the word in exhibiting the beauty of Homer's representation of the death of one of his heroes.

"He struck him across the neck with his heavy sword, and the whole sword became warm (baptized) with blood."—Carson, p. 59.

The sword was baptized with the blood which flowed from the wound, and this flowing of the blood constituted the baptism.

These examples Carson gives us himself. Here the baptism was by sprinkling.

Carson also furnishes us an example from Hippocrates. "Dip it," says Carson; "baptize it," says Hippocrates, "again in breast-milk and Egyptian ointment." "He is speaking," says Carson, "of a blister, which was first to be dipped (*baptus*, baptized) in (or rather with) the oil of roses, and if thus applied it should be too painful, it was to be dipped (baptized) again in the manner above stated."—Carson on Baptism, p. 64.

"Baptize the blister with, or by means of, woman's milk and Egyptian ointment." This is the exact language of Hippocrates. No one since the world began ever heard of a blister-plaster being dipped or immersed in woman's milk, and yet Hippocrates directs that if too painful the blister must be baptized with woman's milk!

Here moistening the surface of a blister-plaster with breast-milk and Egyptian ointment is called a baptism. No physician ever directed that a blister should be plunged or immersed into anything, much less into breast-milk. Every one knows that blister-plasters are not dressed by plunging or immersion, but simply by moistening the surface.

In Dale's *Classic Baptism*, pages 283, 288, we have the case of baptism of tow by means of oil.

"And baptizing (*baptizos*) the tow with oil, binding it to her tail, he set it on fire." This is told of a fox that had been caught and was thus punished for her mischief.

Now, we are told that this baptism was accomplished by plunging the tow into the oil, instead of moistening it with the oil. The dative of instrument, however, in this case, precludes the idea of immersion, and demands that the baptism be with, not into, the oil. The most natural way to saturate tow with oil, would be to rub on the oil with the hands. Here *baptizo* most evidently means to besmear. The idea of dip is not here.

There is another example given by Dale, p. 317, the baptism of a mass of red-hot iron:

"Since, now, a mass of iron pervaded with fire drawn out of the furnace is baptized by water, and the heat by its own nature quenched by water ceases."

Dale in this place proves that the "mass of red-hot iron drawn out by the smith," is so spoken of as to show that the idea of plunging is wholly out of the question; that the dative of instrument here used proves that the mass of iron was drawn out of the furnace and water was thrown upon it; and that it was thus baptized, and not by plunging it into the water at all. Such a mass of iron red-hot is not a thing to be dipped or plunged into water, while the dative of instrument proves that it was done by pouring.

Dale gives another example on the same page:

"Why do they pour beside the wine sea water, and say that fishermen received an oracle commanding them to baptize Bacchus by the sea?"

Now, how was this baptism to be performed? Why, Bacchus was baptized "by the sea," simply by pouring sea water into wine, in other words, by tempering wine. Pouring sea water into wine was a baptism of Bacchus.

He gives another example, in regard to Alexander's army, on the same page:

"You would not have seen a shield, or a helmet, or a long pike, but soldiers baptizing with bowl, and cup, and flagons, along the whole way, pledged one another out of large wine jars and mixing vessels."

The soldiers were drinking as they passed along. They were dipping from the wine jars, or drawing from the wine casks, and drinking one another's health. These examples show by the usage of the word that classical usage agrees exactly with scriptural usage, and also the usage of the fathers.

These examples might be increased indefinitely, but these are sufficient.

My friend tells us that the lexicographers all give to *baptizo*, immerse as its first meaning. In classical usage lexicographers usually give dip or immerse as the first or most common meaning, and other meanings are reckoned as secondary. But these same authorities, when they come to define the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as used in the New Testament, drop immerse and give wash as the first meaning. But I want to call your attention to one thing that my friend is ignorant of, if we take his argument as illustrative of his intelligence; and that is, that language changes by the change of time: that in one period of a language a word may have a different signification from what it has at another period. Hence we have lexicons giving different significations of the same word, in different periods, of the same language. When we take up a classical lexicon it gives the meaning of words from the time of Homer. If we take up a New Testament lexicon, it gives the Hellenistic or Jewish meaning of Greek words; and it so happens that all of these New Testament lexicons give wash as the primary, and dip as the secondary meaning of *baptizo*. While some of the classical lexicons give dip as the first meaning of *baptizo*, they all give wash, etc., not as figurative, but as literal meanings of that term. My friend's

position is that it has one meaning and one only. But there is not a lexicon in existence that so defines *baptizo*. Schrievellius defines *baptizo* by four Latin words, "*baptizo, mergo, abluo, lavo.*" We know that *baptizo*, in Latin, does not signify specifically to dip, yet he gives it as the first meaning, and *mergo, abluo, lavo*, as secondary meanings. *Lavo* signifies to wash, even by sprinkling.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I am better pleased with the way the discussion is going on now, than I have been since we commenced. My friend has at last got to work. He has got upon ground where you can understand something of what is going on. He objects to my reading, but I leave it to you if he has not read as much as I have. The trouble is, my reading bears directly on the point at issue. His does not. And, by the way, the last author he quoted from was a Dutchman! What a petty sneer that was! Does he not, himself, owe nearly all his knowledge of Latin and Greek and ecclesiastical history to German scholarship and erudition? He reads nearly all his extracts and draws his arguments from a Dutchman—Dr. Seiss. I have presented to you Scotchmen, Germans, Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards, Englishmen, Irishmen and Americans; and full as many Englishmen as Germans. There would never have been any knowledge of Greek, without the aid of these men. He derived all his boasted learning from them. He can not climb to the top of the ladder of lexicons and learned men, and then kick over the means of his elevation without the fall that always overtakes pride and arrogance.

My friend insinuates that I have seen his manuscript, which he says is in Mr. Sweeney's hands. I have never seen it; nor do I know of an argument or word in it. I have not an idea, directly or indirectly, concerning it. I have never talked five minutes with Mr. Sweeney concerning my opponent or his arguments. I meet my friend as unacquainted and as free from previous calculations, as one man can meet another. We will be better acquainted before we are through.

Let me illustrate the nature of the discussion we are engaged in, and the use that should be made of authority and classic usage. There is a case in court, in which is involved an issue of law and of fact. The judge does not understand the facts, and is not able, of course, then to determine what law would apply, and is not ready to decide the case. The witnesses present the facts. The lawyers present the law, and argue the issues of law and fact, citing the law, the precedents, and decisions of former cases. All witnesses interested in the case are rejected. The parties are not allowed to swear. The judge is not bound by the arguments and assertions of the lawyers, except so far as they agree with law and testimony. Relying on law and testimony, the judge decides the case. We have here an issue of law, the law of the Greek language concerning the meaning of this word *baptizo*, and an issue of fact concerning the practice of Christ and his apostles and the early church. You, my respected hearers, are the judges; I and my friend are the lawyers. We call up our

witnesses—classic usage. We appeal to the law as laid down by lexicons. Any lexicon or book in which the author acts as theologian of a certain school, or a sectarian, we reject, as we would a lawyers plea; but all lexicons written by learned and impartial men, as Greek scholars, based on their investigation of the Greek language, we accept. All the authorities- I have quoted were men who, as Greek scholars, were writing lexicons to be used as standards in the study of the Greek language. Their interest and their reputation would demand that they make a fair and impartial lexicon—one that would be received as a standard. They would have to do so; or, like Liddell and Scott, Graves, and the American editor of Donnegan, they would meet with the adverse criticisms and exposures made by scholars. Mr. Hughey can not impeach one of them. McClintock and Strong write and speak, *ex cathedra*, as theologians. They write an encyclopedia for theological students in a peculiar set of theological schools. Their *dictum* is unsupported by appeals to classic usage. It positively contradicts Dr. Stuart, who supports his assertion by over forty classic quotations. They have none. We object to them as lawyers attempting to carry the case by their own assertions. Give us the law and testimony.

I here renew my offer to translate every passage where *baptizo* occurs by dip, plunge, immerse, or words of kindred meaning, and show it is demanded by the sense. If this is not a fair meeting the issue, I know not how to meet it.

But it is urged by my opponent that Justin Martyr speaks of sprinklings as baptism. He was not speaking of baptism at all, but of results that were accomplished in the Jewish and heathen religions by sprinkling. He does not call them baptisms. My opponent knows this well; yet he would deceive you, and have you think because somewhere else Justin says Christian baptism does the same thing for the Christian, therefore these things are the same, the act is the same by which these results are reached. In the same way, as I have shown, we can prove that we crown our President, because the British inaugurate their Sovereign, also, and crown him in doing it.

The assertion is again made that Judith purified herself by washing her hands; in the face of the circumstances; in the face of the law, which never required washing the hands for self-purification; in the face of old versions and translations, which say she bathed herself in the fountain; in the face of all Jewish authors, who say they always dipped the person all over. There is not a scrap of law or testimony in the scriptures on which to base this plea. It is in violation of all law and scripture, and I can not understand how a man can muster the hardihood to stand and reiterate so baseless an assumption.

The position of Conant in regard to *taufen* is sustained by Martin Luther. He says:

"Then, also, without doubt, in German, the word *tauf* comes from the word *tief* (deep), because what one baptizes, he sinks deep in the water." Meidenger gives under *tief*, "*dippen*, to immerse; *taufen*, to baptize. Anglo-Saxon, *dippon*, to plunge; English, dip, dive"—showing that they have the same root, and have the same ground idea. I will take Martin Luther's word in reference to the word, before any

Dutchman who has been educated to a peculiar idea of the sacred sense of *taufen*. *Taufen* has, when applied to the ordinance, an ecclesiastic meaning not given by the original meaning. Get a German to drop all idea of the ordinance, and ask him what it means when not applied to the ordinance, and he will tell you it means "sink deep." That is what it meant when Luther translated the Bible.

I once was met in discussion by a German theological student, that my opponent introduced, who said it meant baptize without reference to mode. He would not say it had any meaning aside from what it had in the ordinance. A brother German Methodist took him in hands, and told him that he did not answer me fairly. He compelled him to admit that it had a meaning outside of the ordinance, and that it was "sink deep," and that it was its original meaning. The word has in its ecclesiastical use been modified to German practice. Luther translated it by a word that meant dip, and that alone in his day.

I will now give him what Syriac lexicons say on *amad*. He says it has the absurd meaning, "standing up." "I stand thee up in the name of the Father," etc.! We assert it means originally and primarily, immerse.

Schaaf, Syr. Lex.—To bathe oneself, to bathe, dip, immerse into water, baptize.

Michaelis.—To bathe, baptize, immerse.

Guido Fabricius.—To baptize, dip, bathe.

Buxtorf.—Baptize, dip, bathe oneself.

So depose these learned lexicographers. All give bathe or immerse oneself. Not one even hints of "stand up." That nonsensical quibble originated in the fertile brain of Dr. Rice. Let us have no more such attempts to impose on the ignorance of an audience.

I repeat what I before said about the passage from Clemens Alexandrinus. The Greek is not here, and hence I can not translate it. The gentleman knows this, yet he persists in insulting my common-sense and yours, by thrusting a translated sentence into my face, and asking me to translate it; just as though the original was before me. I hope you will be insulted by no more such trickery. I can not determine whether it means themselves, or their hands, for the Greek is not there. I will get it and insert it in a note in the book when published.

He again asserts that the fathers called sprinkling baptism. They did no such thing. He can not produce a passage where they did so. He has produced passages where they compared the Christian rite or ceremony of baptism to heathen rites, in their offices in the respective religious; but there is nothing suggested as to similarity of actions, any more than when our President was inaugurated, and an Englishman says the same thing of his Queen, one must necessarily mean the same act; and as the Queen was crowned, our President was also. The gentleman's whole argument is based on assumption and far-fetched and assumed analogies.

"The fathers transferred *baptizo* into Latin because they could not translate it. If it had meant immerse, they could have translated by *immergo*." Such is not the case. The fathers thought that such words as *pascha*, *eucharistia*, *baptisma*, etc., were sacred, and should not be

translated, any more than *Jehovah*, *Messiah*, or *Christos*. But they did call baptism an immersion, and when they tell us how they baptized, they say they immersed. When not applied to the ordinance they translate *baptizo*, by immerse.

I will now take up the case of the general baptizing his hand with blood. I will read from Conant, having the original before me.

"But in the depths of the night, surviving a little longer, he took away the shields of the slain enemies, and dipping (baptizing) his hand in blood, he set up a trophy, inscribing, 'The Romans against the Samnites, to the trophy-bearing gods.'"

It does not say he dipped the shields, as my opponent has it, but he took away the shields. The shield was a means of defense carried on the left arm. It was very much in form like one of our old-fashioned long bread trays. It was large enough to cover nearly the whole body. Men often fell with them under them and bled large quantities of blood into them. He took one of these shields, into which a man had bled, and dipping his hand into the blood, he wrote on the trophy. What did he do with the blood? Did he pour it on his hand? No. Did he sprinkle it on his hand? No. He dipped (baptized) his hand into the blood in the shield.

The next passage is from the Iliad of Homer, where he speaks of Achilles driving his sword through the neck of Echiclus. A writer says of this, "Homer so speaks, as if the whole sword were so imbathed (baptized or plunged into his neck) as to be heated." It certainly means here plunged into, and the great poet and scholar, Pope, translates the passage to which the writer refers,

"Plunged into his throat, the smoking weapon lies."

The action was not pouring or sprinkling, but plunging into his neck.

We are ready now for the famous blister-plaster. My opponent does not read to you from the Greek, but from a Latin account of the direction of Hippocrates, an account made from memory. The passage is from a Greek work falsely attributed to Hippocrates. The writer speaks of a certain medical contrivance, and says it is to be baptized in the oil of roses. The question is, What was it? It was a blister-plaster, says a Latin writer, quoting from memory; and so says Dr. Rice—and, my brother, you can not immerse a blister-plaster in breast-milk and oil of roses; hence *baptizo* can not mean immerse! We will go to the original Greek, which I have before me. It says, "Dip the pessary" (not blister-plaster). Now, a pessary was a small cylindrical instrument used in certain diseases, and had, of necessity, to be dipped in oil, to be inserted. If there is a physician present, he will say a pessary must be dipped before using, and *baptizo* was used as the Greek word expressing that action. Alexander Johnson, of Kentucky, wrote to Rice, stating that he had not quoted the passage right, as in the original Greek, and he could not deny it. In every case, where the original can be consulted, we find that *baptizo* means dip. I feel as if we were making progress, when my opponent furnishes me arguments, as he has in every classic quotation made in his last speech.

We will next take the case of the tow to be fastened to the foxes' tails. Suppose you wished to wet or saturate tow with oil, how would you do it? Dip it in oil, and then fasten it, thoroughly saturated as it would then be. You would not sprinkle it, nor pour it, but dip it in oil.

I am glad my opponent brought up the passage that speaks of cooling the iron. If there is a blacksmith present, let me ask him, "How do you cool your iron when you take it out of the fire?" You plunge or immerse it in the shop tub, do you not? Then, *baptizo* was used because it peculiarly expressed that act. My friends, we are making progress.

The next passage is concerning baptizing Bacchus in or with the sea. When sailors mix sea water with wine, they say they have baptized Bacchus in the sea. When they pour the water on the wine, they cover the wine with the water, or baptize or cover Bacchus. If that is not its meaning, what is it they do to Bacchus? But Labeck conjectures that we should have another word for *baptizien*, and it is not certain that it is a correct giving of the passage. Also, all Latin authors who have translated the passage have translated it by *immergeu.* to immerse Bacchus.

Next comes the passage he renders "and the soldiers baptized themselves from wine casks." Now, candor compels me to say the gentleman is very ignorant and should not attempt a translation, or he has been dishonest, and his translations can not be trusted. The writer, describing the march of Alexander's army, says: "You would not have seen a buckler, or helmet, or pike, but the soldiers along the whole way (baptizing), dipping from great wine jars and mixing bowls with their cups, and horns, and goblets." The soldiers did not baptize themselves from wine casks, but they did dip wine from wine casks—and *baptizo* again means dip. Let me here suggest, that the gentleman's pet passage from Clemens Alexandrinus, "baptizing themselves on, their couches," has been tortured in the same way.

My friend next says, without a show or a shadow of reason or authority, that the word *baptizo* lost its primary and took a secondary or metaphorical meaning at the time our Saviour used it to express the ordinance. I deny it *in toto*. He can not produce a passage to give a shade of probability to such an opinion. If our Saviour used it in a different sense from what it was ordinarily understood, and did not explain himself, he was a hypocrite. But he says, when words which express merely physical action are used to express an ordinance, they take a new meaning. He does not produce either authority or instance to support this. The act is the same, and performed in the same way prescribed by the command, because the ordinance, eat in the supper, means eat still.

Here is a Greek word which expressed one specific act Our Saviour used it to represent the act in an ordinance. Did he not use it in its ordinary sense and unchanged? My opponent would have you believe he used it in a sacred and different sense, and still he brings forward no reason but his own assertion. Christ never said he had given it a new and sacred sense. If he did, and did not tell us, he was a deceiver. Some words expressing a moral quality admit of a sa-

cred sense, for revelation used such words in a higher sense than *the* heathen Greeks could; but *baptizo* was not one of them. Words expressing physical action can not so expand or change. I challenge the gentleman to produce one instance of a word of physical action that was thus changed.

There is not a translation that has ever been made of the New Testament into other languages, in which *baptizo* has not been rendered dip. Some have transferred, as we have in our King James'. Some have applied *baptizo* to another act in the ordinance, as the Russian has "to cross," or make the; sign of the cross; though they invariably dip; falsely regarding this human addition of the sign of the cross, as the important part of baptism. These are not translations. When translated it has always been translated by immerse or a word of that meaning.

We will now resume our array of authority, and it is almost all men who practiced pouring and sprinkling. Many of them have written in favor of the practice of sprinkling. When we ask them to tell us what *baptizo* means, "immerse," say they, one and all. I am told Dr. Clarke and Wesley were in favor of sprinkling. Yes, they were, but not because *baptizo* meant sprinkling, but, Dr. Clarke says, he does not regard immersion decent, though he admits our Saviour was immersed! Wesley thinks John must have taken a bush and sprinkled the people as they stood on the bank! Strong arguments. We will hear the same yet from my opponent. We begin our authority by quoting from Neander the great historian.

Neander.—"In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as an entire baptism into the Holy Spirit. It was only where exigency required it, that exception was made with the sick. In this case baptism was administered by sprinkling. Many superstitious persons, clinging to the outward form, imagined that such baptism by sprinkling was not fully valid; and hence they distinguished those who had been so baptized by calling them '*clinici*.' Bishop Cyprian expressed himself strongly against this delusion. 'It is otherwise,' he says. 'The breast of the believer is washed. The soul of the man is cleansed by the merits of faith. In the sacraments of salvation where necessity compels, and God gives permission, the divine thing, though outwardly abridged, bestows all that it implies on the faithful.' "

This is most important testimony. This historian and scholar testifies, 1. That *baptizo* means immerse. 2. That ancient baptism was immersion. 3. That sprinkling was introduced by sickness. 4. That such persons were called clinics. 5. That Cyprian could offer no better reason for sprinkling than the modern reason, "a drop is good as an ocean, if the heart is right." He admitted, however, that it was an abridgment of the ordinance.

John Wesley.—"Buried with him in baptism, alluding to the ancient manner of baptism by immersion."

Calvin.—"The word baptize signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was practiced by the ancient church."

Martin Luther.—"The term baptism is a Greek word. It may be



rendered in Latin by *merso*—when we immerse anything that it may be entirely covered with water."

Beza, the great French scholar.—To be baptized in water signifies no other thing than to be immersed, which is the external ceremony of baptism.

So depose also Altingius, Bossuet, Hospinianus, Gurtlerus, Boddens, Venema, Fritsche, Person, the greatest Greek scholar England has produced, and a sprinkler, Cattenburgh, Keckermannus, Stourdza, a native Greek. We give his testimony in full.

Stourdza.—"The word *baptizo* has only one signification. It literally and perpetually signifies to plunge. Baptism and immersion are therefore identical. To say baptism by sprinkling, is as though one should say immersion by sprinkling, or any other contradiction."

Jeremiah, the Greek patriarch, Rogers, Bishop Taylor, Geo. Campbell, Storrs, Flatt, London Quarterly Review, Curcellius, Knapp, Dr. Bloomfield, Vitranga, Prof. Stuart, Witzius, Zanchius, Chalmers, Pictet, Salmasius, Augusti, Brenner, Paullus, Scholz, Ikenius, Casaubon, Christophalus, a Greek, Ridgely, Limborch, Floyer, Poole's Continuat-ors, Valesius, Coleman. Edinburgh Review, Wetstenius, Melancthon, Barrow, Burmanus, Bently, Beckmanus, Bucanus, Gerlach—in all fifty-four; and we might have hundreds more.

We have here historians, theologians, professors of Greek, eminent scholars, all testifying, as scholars, that *baptizo* means immerse, and baptism is immersion—that the ancient church baptized in no other way.

They stretch out through hundreds of years, at the head of churches that practice and advocate pouring and sprinkling. They stood at the head of the learning of their age. As scholars they give competent and impartial testimony. There is not a scholar living to-day, who would stake his reputation on any translation of the word, except such as we have read from these men.

My opponent dare not let his name go out as having translated "I immerse thee," by any other Greek words than "*Baptizo se.*" Let me recall this argument. I ask him to translate "I sprinkle thee" into Greek. He dare not say "*Baptizo se.*" It can not mean sprinkle, and sprinkling can not be baptism. I ask him to translate "I pour thee." He dare not say "*Baptizo se.*" Pouring can not be baptism. I ask him to translate "I immerse thee." He can and must use "*Baptizo se.*" Hence immersion is baptism, and nothing else. Now this argument you can all grasp. Now let my opponent meet this fairly, or abandon the issue, for it settles the dispute.

I have one more most conclusive argument to produce. We said we should appeal to classic usage to verify the decisions of lexicons and learned men. In the Greek literature so far examined, we have the word three hundred and sixty-three times. Eighty times (in the New Testament) it is applied to the ordinance, and transferred by the word baptism, and not translated. Two hundred and eighty-three times it has been translated. About two hundred and eighty times it has been translated by dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, immerge, overwhelm, and never sprinkle or pour.

*Mr. Hughey.—Baptizo?*

*Mr. Braden*—Yes, sir; I have the original and the translation before me. In the New Testament it is translated wash three times, but it can and should be translated immerse, for, as we have repeatedly shown, the washing was an immersion.

Let me recapitulate. In the three hundred and eighty-three times it occurs in common use and in reference to the ordinance, it can be translated every time by immerse and make sense. In nearly every case where it is not applied to the ordinance, it must be so rendered, and in every case it should be so rendered. The supreme court sustains the compilations of learned men.

I will now offer again to translate every instance where it occurs, by immerse, and show that such should be the meaning. My opponent dare not once translate it pour and sprinkle. Yet it means pour and sprinkle!—[*Time expired.*]

"WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, August 19, 1868.

MR. HUGHEY'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I wish to say one word in regard to the remark about reading from Germans—those great German scholars to whom my friend has paid so much attention. I made the remark to which he has alluded in pleasantry, and it was not intended to throw discredit upon any of those distinguished men. Instead of examining the passages I produced from classical and from patristic usage, and showing that the passages themselves did not sustain my position, he gives us the opinion of learned German scholars; and those who are acquainted with theology know that most of them leaned strongly toward immersion. They are not unprejudiced witnesses, that is, the great mass of them. Schaff and Neander were strong immersionists; that is, they held that immersion was the original mode of baptism. It was because he brought forward the opinions of these men, instead of grappling with the examples I presented, that I used the term I did, and not to cast any reflection upon German scholars.

In regard to McClintock and Strong's "Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature," it may be proper to say a few words. Dr. McClintock is as competent a witness as any American or German in the world. His text-books, in Greek and Latin, are extensively used in our schools and colleges. His Greek and Latin grammars are standard works. He himself stands at the very head of the list of scholars, both in the Old and New Worlds; and it will not do to say that such men as these are prejudiced witnesses, when my opponent depends on Dr. Conant and others of his class to defend his position and sustain his argument.

The gentleman tells us that lexicographers are impartial witnesses. Do you suppose there is a lexicographer on the face of the earth who does not have a leaning one way or the other on this question? Are not McClintock and Strong as impartial witnesses as Dr. Conant?

My opponent tells us that he can translate *baptizo* immerse, wherever he finds it, and it should have been so translated wherever it occurs. Why then did not the American Bible Union translate it so

every time? In Matt. xx. 22, 23, they suppress the word six times; and, in Mark x. 38, 39, they translate the passage, "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" . . . "and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized."—"Can ye endure the immersion I endure?" . . . "Ye shall endure the immersion which I endure." Here *baptizo* is translated endure four times. Why did they not translate this passage, "Ye shall drink of my cup, and be immersed with the immersion I am immersed with?"

Here immersionists have a translation of the New Testament; but it would not do to translate the passage, "immersed with the immersion I am immersed with," or, "immersed in the immersion I am immersed in;" so they give the word a meaning it never possessed. It is not a translation, but a substitution of one word for another. They render the passage in Luke xii. 50. "I have an immersion to undergo," giving to *baptizo* the meaning of "undergo." This is the way the gentleman's friends translate *baptizo* by immerse, in every place where it occurs!

But, again, the gentleman tells us, that Justin Martyr and the fathers, when they made use of the word *baptizo* to express pour and sprinkle, were not speaking of the Christian ordinance. But what has this to do with the meaning of the word? But many of the examples I produced from the fathers do refer to the Christian ordinance. I gave some twenty examples where the words *baptizo* and *baptismos* are used to express acts of sprinkling, or pouring, where there is not a man, woman, or child, who does not know that they can not mean immerse at all—"He poured forth two baptisms from his side." In the examples where *baptizo* and *kataduoo* are used, the one expressive of mode, the other of the thing done, all know *baptizo* can not mean immerse.

The gentleman has stated that he will translate the word *baptizo* immerse, in every example I will produce of its use in the Greek language. Must I go on producing examples till doomsday, and he pay no attention to them, but keep on asserting, "I can translate the word immerse in every example?" I want him now to take the examples I have given him, and translate the word immerse in them all; and then he shall have plenty more. I have brought forward a number of examples which he dare not touch. There is the "baptism of the Israelites by the cloud and by the sea," which he has not touched yet, and he dares not touch it. I read you the passage from Justin Martyr where "these things were done for the salvation of those who were sprinkled with the Spirit, and the water, and the blood;" but he does not notice it. There is no difficulty in bringing forward such passages as these from patristic usage, and the gentleman knows it very well.

The gentleman tells us that Dr. Conant understands the term *taufen* just as Luther understood it. Do you suppose that when Luther took a little babe and held it in his arms and dipped his fingers into a bowl of water and dropped it upon the child's forehead, and said "*Ich taufen dich*" he meant, "I dip you!" He was not so great a simpleton as to talk such nonsense. The truth is, *taufen* does not mean to dip at all. I have examined German-English lexicons on this subject, and conversed with learned Germans, also, and the unanimous testimony of

German lexicons and scholars is that it has not the specific meaning of dip; but signifies simply to baptize. In my discussion with Dr. Lucas, in Golconda, this question concerning the meaning of *taufen* came up; but there being many educated Germans in the place, the question was quickly settled, everyone of them siding with me in the most emphatic manner.

The gentleman asserts again that the word *amad*, in the Syriac, has the specific meaning of to dip. But did you observe that his own authorities, every one of them, give *abluit se*, as the first definition of that term? And what does *abluit se* mean? It does not mean dip, but wash, wash thyself, he washed himself.

Schaaf, in his Syriac lexicon, gives these definitions of *amad*: "*Abluit se, ablutus, intinctus, immersus in aquam; baptizatus est*"—he washed himself, was washed, stained, immersed in water, was baptized. Here immersion is the next to the last definition that is given. First, *abluit se*, he washed himself; second, *ablutus*, was washed, third, *intinctus*, stained; and, fourth, comes the meaning, "immersed in water."

Castel, Michaelis, Buxtorf, and Gotch all agree with Schaaf, that *amad* has the general meaning of "*abluit se*, he washed himself."—Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 125.

But the gentleman tells us I can not produce the original of the passage in Clement of Alexandria, where the Jews are said to have been baptized upon the bed or couch; and, because I have not quoted the whole passage in the original, he says he does not know whether it means the hands or the whole person that was baptized! I will read the whole passage, and you will see that it was the person, and not the hands. He says:

"There is [*eikoon baptismatos*] a picture, image, representation of baptism which has been handed down from Moses to the poets; as, for example, Penelope, having [*hudraino*] moistened or washed herself, and having on clean apparel, prays."—Odyss. iv. 759. "Telemachus, having [*nipto*] washed his hands in the hoary sea, prayed to Minerva."—Odyss. ii. 261. "This was the Jewish custom [*loos baptizesthai*] to be baptized in this way, even often upon the bed or couch."

It is here stated that this hand-washing was an image of baptism, and that the Jews often baptized themselves in this manner [*loos baptizesthai*] upon their couches.

When I bring forward examples from the fathers where the word can not mean to immerse, the gentleman tells us the word is here used in a metaphorical sense, and that the fathers looked upon *baptizo* as a sacred word! But how did it happen that the fathers always use *baptizo* when speaking of baptism, however performed, whether by pouring, sprinkling, or immersion; but when they speak of the mode by immersion, they always use *kataduoo*, or some word of that family, to express the action of dipping? Will the gentleman explain this? The truth is, the fathers knew that *baptizo* did not specifically signify to dip; and, therefore, they never so used it, but used another word which did signify specifically to dip or immerse. And this very

fact shows that *baptizo* does not express the specific action of dip, and every man, woman, and child knows it.

But we come again to the case of the man who baptized his hands in blood. Can you suppose that the man would have plunged his hand all over in the blood; or do you think he would not have dipped the tip of\* his finger in it? The first supposition is not possible. He would have dipped his finger in the blood, just as a man dips his pen in the ink for the purpose of writing, and not have overwhelmed his hands in it. And yet this moistening of the end of the finger is called a baptism of the hand! Look at the case, and you will see that no such thing as an immersion of the hand was meant by the word *baptizo* in this passage.

The gentleman tells us, in regard to the passage in Homer, where the sword is said to have been baptized with blood, that the sword was plunged into the man's neck; but the plunging into the neck was not the baptism. It does not say the sword was baptized into his neck; it does not say the sword was baptized into his flesh—but the sword was struck across his neck, and the blood gushed forth and baptized the sword; and in this way the baptism was performed. It does not matter how the sword was used. The blood gushed out upon the sword and baptized it. The baptism was performed by the flowing forth of the blood upon it, and not by plunging the sword into it.

In the case of the baptism of the tow, there is a fact that even my opponent will not call in question. In this case the simple dative, or dative of instrument, is used. The passage does not say the tow was plunged into the baptizing element, but the baptizing element was put upon the tow. It is not that the tow was dipped *ejj* the oil; but here is the simple dative, "*elaioo baptism*, baptized with oil." The oil was poured upon the tow, and *baptizo* here simply signifies to moisten by this means.

The gentleman also tells us that the mass of iron was plunged into the water. But, mark you, it is not a little piece of iron that is said to be baptized. It is a "mass of iron drawn red-hot from the furnace" that is baptized, "until by its own nature the fiery glow, quenched with water, ceases." The simple dative again—*hudati baptizetai*. The idea is not that it was plunged into the water, but that the water was thrown upon it. The question is not simply, can a blacksmith plunge a piece of iron in water, but was this mass of iron plunged into the water, or was the water thrown upon it? The passage proves clearly that the element was applied to the iron, and not the iron to the element.

I have a few words more to say about the blister-plaster. He says that my quotation was taken from a Latin translation of Hippocrates. Well, Dr. Carson had only a Latin translation of Hippocrates! Great Dr. Carson, the greatest classical scholar the Baptist Church has ever produced, when he was writing the most critical and learned work on the mode of baptism that has ever been produced on the side of immersion, had only a Latin translation of Hippocrates! How, I ask, could he get the forms of the word in the Greek, if he only had a Latin translation? And yet, on page 42, where the very same thing is referred to by Carson, occur the words "the moistening of the blis-

ter-plaster." This, says Carson, was expressed by *bapsus*, one of the forms of *bapto*; but the next moistening in the same passage is expressed by *baptizo*.—Carson, p. 64.

How, I ask, in a translation could he get the forms of the words in the Greek? But we are told it was not a blister-plaster, but a pessary, that Hippocrates was speaking of, and that Dr. Conant had the original of Hippocrates from which he took the example. But the word pessary is not in the quotation that Dr. Conant gives; and I would ask my opponent, as he did in regard to the passage from Clemens of Alexandria, to produce the original with the word pessary in it.

A physician living in this town told me that when he was studying medicine, his preceptor had a copy of Hippocrates both in the original Greek, and an English translation, and that it was from this very passage that he first learned to dress blister-plasters with breast-milk.

Dr. Carson has preserved all the different forms of the word here used, which shows that he had the original, and that it was a blister-plaster, and not a pessary, that Hippocrates ordered to be baptized with breast-milk.

In the example of the baptism of Bacchus by the sea, he tells us that Bacchus was actually plunged into the sea. Well, now, I will read to you the passage, and you can see whether Bacchus was plunged in the sea or not.

"Why do they pour in beside the wine, sea water, and say that fishermen received an oracle commanding them to baptize Bacchus by the sea?"

How was Bacchus baptized by the sea? Why, it was simply pouring sea water into wine that constituted the baptism of Bacchus; simply tempering wine by pouring sea water into it, that was the baptism of Bacchus. I think, if my friend will examine, he will find the very same thing in Conant. These, then, are my classical examples, and there is no getting around a single one of them. The passages that have been quoted from the New Testament, the Apocrypha, and from patristic usage, all sustain me; and these classical examples also bear me out in the position I have taken.

But, then, my opponent wants to know how I would translate immerse into Greek; and says I can not do it by any word but *baptizo*. Very well, we will try it, and see. I will show you first how a Greek did it.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, speaking of Christ's baptism, represents him as saying to John: "*Kataduson me tois Jordanou reithrois*.—Plunge me in the river Jordan."—Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 167.

Did he use *baptizo* here to express dip? No, sir; he used *kataduson*. Now, how am I to render, "I immerse thee into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," from the English into the Greek? I would render it thus: "*Kataduoo se eis to konoma tou Patros kai, tou uedion kai, tou agion Pneumatos*"—I immerse thee into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. I use the word here in translating immerse into Greek, which the Greeks used themselves when they were speaking of immersion. Now, I trust my friend is satisfied.

The gentleman told us that the word *baptizo* occurs in the Bible three hundred and sixty-two times.

*Mr. Braden*—Allow me to correct the gentleman. I said in the classic Greek and in the Bible altogether.

*Mr. Hughey*—I knew that if the gentleman had said that there were so many occurrences of the word in the Bible, he had made a great mistake. But I so understood him, and I am glad to be corrected, so that we can perfectly understand each other.

Dr. Conant, perhaps, gives us all the examples of the use of *baptizo* in the classics which he has found, where it signifies to dip, immerse or sink; but there are many examples of its use which Dr. Conant has not furnished, which have been furnished by others, when the word does not signify to dip. When a man tells you that he has examined "the whole range of Greek literature," and professes to give you every instance in which a word occurs in the Greek language, he states what no man of information can credit, for he knows it is not true. Manuscripts of works in the Greek language are constantly being brought to light, and no man, living or dead, ever examined the "whole range of Greek literature."

When I sat down I had just commenced the examination of the testimony of the lexicons, and I will spend the few remaining minutes I have in the same way. I have a few lexicons here, and shall now quote from them. I have quoted from old Schrivellius, and now I will quote from Robinson's great Lexicon of the New Testament. He tells us, in the examples that he has quoted, in the classic usage it means to dip, to sink, to immerse. "In the New Testament it signifies to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing, to wash oneself—the hands or person—or to perform ablution."

In the second place, "to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism; to be baptized, or cause one to be baptized; generally to receive baptism." He illustrates these meanings by numerous examples from the New Testament and from cotemporary writers.

We will next hear the testimony of Parkhurst. He defines it thus:

1. "To dip, immerse, or plunge in water." But in the New Testament it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included in sense two and three below:

2. "To wash oneself, be washed," etc.

3. "To baptize, to immerse in, or wash with water in token of purification from sin, and from spiritual pollution."

4. "In a figurative sense, to baptize with the Holy Ghost. It denotes the miraculous effusion upon the apostles and other believers, as well on account of the abundance of his gifts (for anciently the water was copiously poured on those who were baptized, or they themselves were plunged therein), as of the virtue and efficacy of the Holy Spirit, who like living water refresheth, washeth away pollutions, cleanseth," etc. This testimony is the more important as Parkhurst was personally favorable to immersion.

Greenfield gives as the first sense in the New Testament, "to wash, perform ablution, cleanse," and, secondly, "to immerse."

Here is the testimony of Parkhurst and Greenfield. They agree substantially with each other; and, with Robinson, Greenfield gives as

the first definition in the New Testament, "to wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse."

The following I take from Campbell and Rice's Debate, page 69:

"Hedericus thus defines *baptizo*: '*Mergo, immergo, aqua abluo*; (2) *Abluo, lavo*; (3) *Baptizo, significatu sacro.*, To dip, immerse, to cover with water; (2) to cleanse, to wash; (3) to baptize in a sacred sense."

"Stephanus defines it thus: '*Mergo, sen immergo ut quae tingendi aut abluendi gratia aqua immergimus—Mergo submerge*) *obruo aqua; abluo, lavo.*' To dip, immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing, to. merge, submerge, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash."

"Schleusner defines *baptizo*, not only to plunge, immerse, but to cleanse, wash, to purify with water; (*abluo, lavo, aqua purgo.*)"

"Bretschneider: '*Propriae; sepius intingo, septus lavo; delude* (1) *lavo, abluo simpliciter—medium, etc.; lavo me, abluo me.*' Properly, often to dip, often to wash; then (1) simply to wash, to cleanse; in the middle voice, I wash or cleanse myself."

"Wahl defines it, first, to wash, perform ablution; secondly, to immerse," etc.

And thus we might go on through the entire range of lexicography, and we would find the same thing everywhere. Not one of them gives to *baptizo* the specific sense of dip or immerse; and when we come to the New Testament lexicons they unanimously give, as the first meaning of *baptizo*, to wash, to cleanse, to purify, etc., and if they give immerse at all, is in a secondary sense. Now, if I have time, I will introduce two more lexicons:

Suidas, who was a native Greek lexicographer who lived in the tenth century, thus defines *baptizo*: *Pluno*; in Latin, *madefacio, lavo, abluo, mundo*—to wet, to lave, to wash, to cleanse, to purify. Neither dip, plunge or immerse is found in this definition!

Gases, a learned Greek, who compiled a lexicon of the ancient Greek language at the beginning of the present century, which is now the standard lexicon in the colleges in Greece, thus defines *baptizo*: *Brecho, lavo, antleo*—to wet, moisten, or bedew, to wash, lave or bathe; to draw, pump or pour out water. (Seiss on Baptism, p. 66.) Not a word here signifying to dip or immerse, while the first definition given signifies, properly, "to rain, to cause to send rain, etc."—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will first review the arguments offered by my friend in his last speech. We are told that learned German scholars were generally partial to immersion. That is true. So are all learned men and scholars. These men were Germans, and all were raised in churches that practiced pouring and sprinkling. They were poured or sprinkled themselves. They, as preachers, for nearly half of them were ministers, practiced pouring and sprinkling. Some of them, as Wesley for instance, wrote treatises in favor of sprinkling and pouring. But when, as scholars, they testified as to the meaning of *baptizo*, they all say it



means immerse. Not one says sprinkle or pour. Several of the most eminent say that pouring and sprinkling are utterly out of the question. As historians, learned in early church history, they say that the apostles and early Christians invariably immersed. They defend sprinkling on Cyprian's ground: That we can abridge the ordinance so the heart be right; but not one claims a particle of scriptural or classic authority for it.

Dr. McClintock gives a very decided opinion, unsustained by a single classic authority or quotation. Professor Stuart, far higher authority, gives an exactly opposite decision, and sustains it by pages of classic authorities, and a long list of quotations, and makes his case clear and undeniable. We will take Stuart's clearly proved point, before McClintock's *dictum* in the face of all authority and classic usage unsustained by a single quotation.

My friend does not consider lexicographers to be important witnesses. I do, when they are giving the meaning of a word as scholars, and not trying to sustain the practice of their respective churches, especially when their decisions are in direct opposition to their own practice and that of their churches. I believe candor compelled them, as scholars, to testify as they do. It is the highest and clearest kind of evidence.

My friend has told you that the Bible Union has cut out the passage concerning the baptism of sufferings, because it was a difficulty they could not surmount in proving that baptism was always immersion. He knows better. He knows that all the oldest and best manuscripts of the Bible do not contain the passage. It is not in the way of immersion. On the contrary, it was an immersion of sufferings. A pouring of sufferings! A sprinkle of sufferings! What paltry nonsense it makes of the words of the Son of God. I can read you the decisions of eighty-nine commentators and eminent scholars who call it an immersion—Wesley among the rest. It is used just as we use immerse in the expression "immersed in debt, cares, sorrows, sufferings, sleep, crime," and almost an innumerable list of such expressions.

I will translate it immerse, and the gentleman dare not translate it otherwise; and I again offer to translate every passage where *baptizo* occurs by immerse. I do not offer to take every perversion of the original that he can offer as a translation, and from such a perversion tell what the correct translation should be. We have had in the quotation which he translated representing the general as baptizing the shields, when it says he dipped his hand; and in the other where he said the soldiers baptized themselves from wine casks, when it says they dipped with cups from wine casks—a specimen of the perversions and tricks of debaters of his school.

We come now to the sprinkling with water and blood spoken of by Justin Martyr. He does not call the sprinkling a baptism, however. Even should he say three baptisms were drawn from his side, there was no sprinkling in the case, and the pouring and sprinkling are not the baptism.

My friend can not let Luther tell us what his native tongue means. He understands German better than Luther. I believe Luther knew what *taufen* meant before the church perverted it, and will let him decide the matter:

Luther.—"The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from depth, which they call *teiff* in their language, as if it were proper those should be deeply immersed who are baptized.

Let us take German dictionaries:

Heinsius' Large German Dictionary.—*Taufen* signifies to plunge into water or any other fluid. In a more limited sense to immerse in water in a religious way.

Kaltschmidt's Quarto.—*Taufen*, to immerse, to consecrate to Christianity, to name. The last meaning evidently comes from the fact that persons are named in infant baptism.

Smilthenner—*Taufen*, in old German *taufian* from *tauf*, which signifies *teife*, deep; consequently it means immerse.

Schwencke.—*Taufen*, to immerse in water; specially to purify with water for admission into the Christian Church. *Taufen* is the same etymologically with *tauchen*, to dip.

Genthe.—*Tauchen* and *taufen* were originally the same. The act expressed by *taufen* was performed by immersion in water. At present the word *taufen* retains its proper signification, to overwhelm with water.

Wiegand.—*Taufen*, originally equivalent to *unter tauchen* (to dip under), signifieth, in its religious sense; to immerse in water.

Knapp.—*Baptisma* from *baptizien*, which properly signifies to immerse, like the German *taufen*, to dip in, to immerse in water.

So say these great German standards, and they settle the matter against my opponent, who is ignorant of the German. What would you think of a German who was utterly ignorant of our language and would undertake to teach Johnson, Walker, Worcester and Webster what our word dip meant?

He repeats Dr. Rice's nonsense about *amad*, the word by which the Peshito-Syriac version translates *baptizo*. Schaaf, Michaelis, Fabricius and Buxtorf, our great Syriac scholars, in their Syriac lexicons, give as meanings of *amad*, to bathe oneself, to bathe, to dip, to immerse in water, to baptize. Not one gives to stand, nor does it ever have such meaning. We will let them settle the question instead of Rice and Hughey, who know not a word of Syriac, and can only read what these great scholars say, and then presume to contradict them. Think of a German who could only read a German translation of Webster, challenging that great author about a well-known English word!

I give my opponent fair warning that I shall not notice any more pettifogging nonsense on *amad* or *taufen*. My opponent, also, dares to challenge the translation of the passage attributed to Plutarch, and says he (the general) baptized the shield. He can not know a word of Greek, or he would not make such an assertion. Moses Stuart, the translators of Plutarch, and the learned world, have always translated it, "He took away the shield and dipped his hand into the blood." Any person with a smattering of Greek can see such is the case.

The baptism of tow comes next. Common-sense says one would dip the tow in oil, and *baptizo*, a word which peculiarly means dip, is used to express the action. It is a strong argument on my side. The dative, without the preposition, he says, means instrument. He

knows, or should know, before he attempts to construe Greek, that it also *means place*. Dipped in oil is the meaning.

I will settle the case of the blister-plaster. If the gentleman's doctor friend will produce the original Greek, I will show that it was a pessary, and pay him, or any one else who has the original, for his trouble. Dr. Rice dare not deny Bro. Johnson's statements. I here pledge myself to find the original Greek, and insert it in a note in the book, and show that it was a pessary, and that dipping in oil was the proper way of preparing the instrument for use, and *baptizo* was chosen as the word which peculiarly expressed the action—dip.

At last we have a translation of the sentence, "I immerse thee." It is "*Kataduo se!*" Well, wonders will never cease. Our Saviour commanded his disciples to "sink down the nations into the name of the Father," etc., for so *kataduo* means! The gentleman stands committed before the world, who read this discussion, to that absurdity. He felt the force of the argument that he could not translate "I immerse thee" except by "*Baptizo se,*" and, after being pressed for several speeches, he, to save himself before this audience, made such a perversion as he has. He will wish many times before he has done with the debate he had never permitted such a perversion to go into the record.

The lexicons have at last been introduced by my opponent, after decrying them for several speeches. I had read all he read before. He did just as I told you he would. He skipped over all the primary meanings and takes secondary meanings. Still he has not one who gives sprinkle or pour as meanings. He takes wash, purify, cleanse, and claims, because we sometimes cleanse things by sprinkling, that sprinkling is baptism. Baptism is a cleansing, as cleansing is sometimes the result of baptism. We cleanse the system by taking pills; therefore, taking pills is baptism! Baptism results in purifying; we purify a room by fumigation; therefore, fumigation is a baptism! What sheer nonsense. Such is the way he uses lexicons. Takes secondary meanings; has not pour or sprinkle yet; assumes that the same results can be reached by sprinkling; assumes sprinkling is baptism.

He finds two or three who say wash is one of its primary meanings. How do we wash things—by sprinkling? Let my brother's wife sprinkle a few drops of water on his coat, and say she has washed it. Would he accept it as washed? No, he would say "dip it in the water." Away, then, with such nonsense—such perversions of Christ's word. Wash the nations.

But he finds no one that says that washing is the action. We have found that nearly half say that immersion is the only action, and wash is given by metonymy, because we immerse things to wash them. Greenfield gives as the meaning, in the first place it occurs in the New Testament, "wash." We have already shown that in that passage (Mark vi. 4) it means immerse, because the bathing was an immersion. So says the law commanding it, and the Jews who obeyed it. This passage is a clear case of immersion, and should be so rendered.

Let us take his authors: Schrivellius.—1. Baptize; 2. To im-

merse. 3d. To cleanse. That proves that *baptizo* means pour or sprinkle!

Bretschneider.—"Properly, to dip often, to wash often, to wash, to cleanse; in the middle voice, I wash or cleanse myself."

An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism. This is the meaning of the word, for in *baptizo* is contained the idea of a complete submersion; at least so is *baptisma* used in the New Testament. In the New Testament *baptizo* is not used unless concerning the sacred submersion. The Jews used *baptisma*—immersion, submersion. In the New Testament it is used only concerning the sacred submersion, which the fathers called baptism.

Such is the evidence the gentleman relies on to prove that sprinkling and pouring are baptism! If I were to take the passage, "God is love," and assert it means "God is hatred," the perversion would not be more gross.

We have repeatedly asked the gentleman if the Greek has not words which mean dip, plunge, submerge, immerge, immerse, overwhelm? Are not *bapto* and *baptizo* the chief and almost only ones used? He dare not deny it. He dare not translate "I sprinkle or pour thee," by "*Baptizo se.*" He can and must, if he wishes to avoid the contempt of all scholars, translate "I immerse thee," by "*Baptizo se.*" Is not immersion, then, the only action of baptism? Can pouring and sprinkling be baptism?

We will again call the attention of the gentleman to an argument that forever and conclusively settles the question against him:

1. Were the entire extent of Greek literature to be translated into English, the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, immerge, merge, overwhelm, would occur several hundred times.

2. In over nine cases out of ten they would be translations of the words *bapto* and *baptizo*. Is not the conclusion inevitable that these words peculiarly and pre-eminently, in Greek, expressed the specific action represented in English by the words dip, plunge, immerge, submerge, immerse, overwhelm?

Also, to this:

1. The words pour and sprinkle would occur several hundred times.

2. But not in a single instance as a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*. Is not the conclusion inevitable, then, that neither the action expressed by *baptizo*, nor the results reached by that action, can in any case be pouring or sprinkling—that *baptizo* can have no connection with pouring or sprinkling?

From this we draw these conclusions:

1. When our Saviour gave the command to baptize, he used *baptizo*, a word which peculiarly and pre-eminently meant the specific action of immersion, because he meant that that specific action should be the only way of obeying the command.

2. That pouring and sprinkling can never be acts of obedience to the command, for they are in no sense what our Saviour meant by the specific act he enjoined in the command. Here is an argument you can all grasp and understand. Does it not forever and most conclusively settle the question at issue? My opponent has staked his reputation to deny and refute this position; yet he has not produced a

single argument against it—has not noticed it. Let him refute it, or yield his untenable position.

My opponent has read from the fathers, and had much to say about them. He has not read a word in which they told us how they baptized. Why? Because it would be fatal to his position. Now, if the fathers tell us how they baptized, and if they did it by pouring or sprinkling, would he not have paraded it here continually? He reads passages from the fathers, where they compared baptism with heathen lustrations or cleansings, and because the two are compared, and the heathen lustration was a sprinkling of blood, the Christian rite must be a sprinkling of water. I say two men died violent deaths. One was killed by an assassin, as Lincoln was. Of course the other—Wallace—was shot by an assassin also; thus falsifying history, which says he was beheaded. Such is the shallow trickery of my opponent.

Now, I will appeal to the fathers, and read what they did when they baptized. I will, however, first appeal to Josephus, a Jewish writer, who wrote in Greek, and who certainly understood Jewish Greek. Josephus uses the word eighteen times, that I have noticed, and every time it means immerse, and is so translated by his learned translator, Whiston. Certainly, then, immerse was its Jewish-Greek or Hellenistic, or sacred use.

Barnabas, companion of Paul.—"Blessed are they who put their trust in the cross, and descend into the water; for they shall have their reward in due time." We go down into the water, and come up again bringing forth fruit.

Hennas, cotemporary of Paul.—"The apostles went, therefore, with them into the water and again came up."

Justin Martyr, born near the close of the first century, and one so much quoted by my opponent, how did he baptize? "The candidates are led by us to where there is water" (was not this what was done with Paul, and the Philippian jailer, and the household of Cornelius?—*Braden*), "and are born again in that kind of new birth in which we ourselves were born again. For upon the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of Jesus Christ our Saviour, and of the Holy Spirit, the immersion in water is performed."

That is how Justin baptized, and all in his time, immediately after the time of the apostles.

Tertullian, born about A. D. 150, wrote about A. D. 200.—"The person, in great simplicity, is led down into the water, and, with a few words said, is dipped. Nor is there any difference between those who John dipped in the Jordan, and those Peter dipped in the Tiber.

"And, last of all, commanding that they should immerse them into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. [Describing the commission.] Then we are three times immersed, answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed." [Answering more in being immersed three times.]

Clemens Alexandrinus, another of my opponent's authorities, who lived about A. D. 200.—"You were led to a bath, as Christ was conveyed to the sepulcher, and were thrice immersed to signify Christ's three days' burial."

Hypolytus, a Christian writer about A. D. 200.—"For he who goes

down with faith into the bath of regeneration is arrayed against the evil one, and on the side of Christ. He comes up from the immersion (baptism) bright as the sun."

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage.—Now we will give you the origin of pouring or sprinkling: "You ask, dear son, what I think of those who in sickness receive the sacred ordinance, whether since they were not washed in the saving water, but have it poured upon them, they are to be esteemed right Christians? Now, here is a chance for Cyprian to say to Magnus, "You know sprinkling and pouring were practiced as well as immersion by the apostles, and those who followed them," had such been the case. Now for his defense of pouring: "In the sacraments, when necessity obliges, and God grants his indulgence, abridgments of divine things will confer the whole on believers."

Observe, pouring was denied to be baptism. Cyprian acknowledges it is not the whole, but an abridgment of the divine command, and must be used only in case of necessity.

Cornelius, Bishop of Borne, A. D. 250.—"Novatian fell into a grievous distemper, and being about to die, he received baptism, being sprinkled on his body, if that can be termed baptism." [Here is the first recorded case of sprinkling, and the Bishop of Rome denies that it is baptism.]

Athanasius.—"Thou didst imitate in the sinking down the burial of the Master, but thou didst rise from thence again, before works, witnessing the work of the resurrection."

"The child sinks down thrice in the font and comes up."

Jerome.—"First they teach all nations, and when they are taught, they immerse (or dip) them in water."

Ambrose.—"The body was plunged into this water, to wash away sin. Thou must be dipped, that is buried [in baptism.] Yesterday we were speaking of the font, whose appearance is as it were a sepulcher, into which we are received and submerged and rise, that is restored to life."

Gregory Nazianzus.—"Let us, therefore, be buried with Christ in baptism, that we may also rise with him. Let us go down with him, that we may also be exalted with him."

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, about A. D. 350.—"As he who is plunged in water and baptized is encompassed by water on every side, so they that are baptized by the Spirit, are wholly covered all over." "Thou going down into the water, and in a manner buried in the waters, as he in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life." "Ye professed the saving profession, and sank down thrice into the water, and again came up, and thus by a symbol shadowed forth the burial of Christ."

Simon, the Magian, once came to the bath. "The body, indeed, he dipped in the water, but the heart he did not enlighten by the Spirit."

Basil the Great, about A. D. 350, Bishop of Cesarea.—"Imitating the burial of Christ by the baptism of the bodies of those immersed or buried in the water." "The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb."

We might read Heliodorus, Bishop of Tricca, Chrysostom, Augus-

tine, Apostolic Canons, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, John Damascenus, Alcuin, Theophylact, and many others to the same purport, but this is enough.

Now, let me ask you did not these fathers of the church, extending from the days of Paul to A. D. 700, most of whom spoke the Greek as their native tongue, and all of whom read it, know what was baptism? Some of them had seen the apostles baptize, and two or three were doubtless baptized by the apostles, and they knew what apostolic baptism was. They all say it is immersion. They never call pouring and sprinkling apostolic baptism. On the contrary, pouring is challenged, and defended as an abridgment of the divine ordinance, compelled by necessity, in case of mortal sickness. The first case of recorded sprinkling is given, and it is denied that it was baptism.

My opponent may bring a few cases of allusion to the effects of baptism, and claim, because it was contrasted with heathen sprinklings, it was a sprinkling; but such far-fetched assumptions have not a straw's weight against the positive and unanimous declarations of nearly thirty of these fathers we have read, and many more we might read, to show that they say immersion is baptism, and immersion alone. My opponent again brings up baptizing Bacchus, or wine in the sea. So unusual is the use of *baptizo* here, that the scholiasts on Homer reject the word and supply *alibduien* or *aliduien* in its place. So we refuse to accept the passage as a correct use of *baptizo*. But suppose it did mean mix here. Is that pour or sprinkle? We have one case out of 383 instances where it means mix. In 382 it means dip or immerse, and hence it must mean pour and sprinkle in the ordinance.

We come next to the case he renders baptizing from wine casks. Though we have already disposed of it, we will do so again. He has not read the passage. We will do so:

Plutarch's Life of Alexander.—"Thou couldst not have seen a buckler, or helmet, or pike, but the soldiers along the whole way, dipping (baptizing) with cups, horns and goblets from great wine-jars and mixing-bowls, and drinking to each other."

Now, what was the baptism here? They dipped up wine by dipping the cups, and horns, and goblets into the wine, and drank it, just as we dip water with a cup, when we dip the cup in the water and drink. The action was dipping, and nothing else. Hence we have an argument that *baptizo* means dip. I hope my opponent will not attempt to pervert this passage any more.

My opponent seems to be troubled to know how the mass of iron could be dipped. He assumes it was too large to be dipped. The context says the mass was drawn red-hot from the furnace. If a man takes the mass out, can not he dip it? It is just what a blacksmith would do. Another argument for immersion.

We will recur again to the passage from the Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer. The author says: "The sword was so plunged (into his neck) as to be warmed with blood." The English poet Pope, who translated Homer, renders the passage to which the critic on Homer refers:

"Plunged in his throat the smoking weapon lies."

The great translator of Homer probably knew as much about Greek as my opponent. Another argument for immersion.

We have not before spoken of the baptism of the Israelites unto Moses in the cloud and the sea, because we intend to use it as an argument in favor of immersion, when we speak of the figurative references to baptism. We will, however, disprove our opponent's argument for sprinkling at this point. He reads from the LXVIII. Psalm to show that at the passage of the Red Sea it rained on them, and the sprinkling with the rain was a baptism; but the very passage refutes this. We will read it in full, not a part, as he did:

"O God! when thou wentest forth before thy people; when thou didst march through the wilderness; the earth, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God; even Sinai was moved at the presence of God. Thou didst send forth a plentiful rain, whereby thou then didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary."

Now, the rain was when it thundered at Sinai. Not a word is said about rain at the passage of the Red Sea. The waters were congealed around them; a cloud of fire was over them. Not a word is said in the account about thunder or rain. After the thunders of Sinai we read of the rain, not before. There is not the ghost of an argument for sprinkling. In due time we will show you what the baptism was.

We have now appealed to lexicons, to learned men, and, lastly, to classical usage. They all say baptism is immersion. We have appealed to the apostolic fathers, men who were the companions of Paul, who saw the apostles baptize, who were, doubtless some of them, baptized by the apostles; men who spoke, the Greek as their native tongue, or could read and translate it into Latin, and they say they always immersed; call baptism an immersion. They speak of pouring and sprinkling as not baptism, and excuse it as admissible only in extreme cases. And not until two hundred years after Christ do we meet with these excused innovations. In our next we will present the scriptural argument for immersion.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I am sorry the time for discussing this proposition is drawing so near to a close, and so much matter remains yet to be disposed of. I wish to say, however, in regard to the last remarks of *the* gentleman, that it is of no consequence whether the ordinance of Christian baptism is referred to or not in the examples I have produced from the fathers; sprinkling is here called baptism, and this is sufficient to show that *baptizo* does not specifically signify to dip.

The gentleman tells us the Israelites were baptized by the cloud and by the sea; and that the baptism by the cloud and by the sea were two things. I thank the gentleman for this admission. I stated this distinctly at the outset. The baptism "by the sea" was while they were passing through the sea; the baptism "by the cloud" was while they were under the cloud—but they were not under the cloud while they were passing through the sea. The cloud poured out



water upon them and thus baptized them when they were at Sinai; at the giving of the law, and by which they were baptized or confirmed unto Moses. The preposition *en* here, is used in the instrumental sense, and shows that the clouds and the sea were the instruments of the baptism spoken of.

The passage from Homer, the "plunging of the sword into the neck," was not the baptism; the baptism was by the blood that gushed forth upon the sword. I wish to have you bear this in mind.

I wish, also, to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the example of "the mass of iron drawn out of the fire by the smiths," the simple dative or dative of instrument is used, which does not allow of the idea of dipping. Besides, such a mass of iron as this, "drawn out of the fire by smiths," is not a thing to be dipped or plunged into "water. Both the construction and the object baptized forbid the idea of dipping, and demand that we shall understand the baptism as the tempering of iron, by throwing water on it.

The gentleman asked, in regard to the baptism of the tow, "if the dative without the preposition does not indicate place, as well as instrument." Suppose it does; yet there is not a man of intelligence who does not know that place is not the thing intended here. It is not where the tow was baptized, but how it was baptized that is expressed by the dative in this example, and it shows that the tow was baptized with the oil, and not in it.

But the case of "Bacchus baptized by the sea" troubles my friend. He wants to know if sea water could not be poured into Bacchus till he was covered, or if water could not be poured into wine until the wine is overwhelmed! Most assuredly not. How would you mix sea water with wine to temper the wine. Is it not by pouring sea water into it? The wine was tempered by having the sea water poured into it, and the tempering wine by means of sea water, was called a baptism of Bacchus.

The gentleman told us that learned German scholars are generally in favor of baptism by immersion, and this is one of the strongest arguments in favor of his position. But why do many learned German scholars favor immersion? It is not because the philology of the word *baptizo* requires it. Professor Stuart tells us why, page 186. It is because they find it in the third, fourth and following centuries the ordinary practice, and they have based their views on this, instead of the philology of the word. It is not because the philology of the word demands it—not because usage demands it, but because they find it in the third and fourth centuries the usual practice of the church to baptize by immersion; therefore they conclude it was the original mode. But if they favor immersion on this ground, they should also favor trine immersion, for this was the only immersion practiced in ancient times, and the candidates, divested of all their clothing, and as naked as Adam and Eve were on the morning of their creation.

My opponent tells us that in the translation of the "Bible Union," the passage in Matthew xx. 22, 23 was dropped out because there was not sufficient authority in the ancient manuscripts for retaining it. It is true Grotius and Mill rejected these words in Matthew, and Griesbach and Fritz canceled them, but the more modern critics,

Bloomfield and Alford, consider the authority to reject insufficient, and consequently they retain them. But there is no shadow of excuse for dropping these words in Mark and Luke, and, consequently, they are retained, and, without the shadow of authority, the translators of the "Bible Union" render *baptizo* "endure" and "undergo" in these passages! But the gentleman tells me to bring on my examples, and he will translate *baptizo* in every one of them immerse. But has he done it? I would rather a man would do a thing, than say "I can," or "I will do it." Let him translate *baptizo* in this passage immerse, and let it go upon the record. "Can you be immersed with the immersion I am immersed with;" let him translate in this way, and see what sense it will make. Or let him translate it, "Can you be immersed in the immersion I am immersed in?" and see what sense it will make. The translators of the "Bible Union" had too much sense to put before the public such a translation. It would look too badly, but I had rather ten thousand times that they had done it than to see them adopt such a gross perversion as they have done to sustain a sinking cause.

But I am continually appealed to to bring forward the original for my friend to translate. He is an exceedingly singular kind of man. I have brought forward whole sentences in which the word *baptizo* occurs, showing the construction and the syntax of the passages, but he has not dared to notice them or touch them. The truth is, to translate *baptizo* immerse in these passages would make nonsense of them, and the gentleman knows it.

But my opponent goes on at some length to give us Luther's opinion of the meaning of *baptizo*. But when Luther took an infant in his arms to baptize, and sprinkled the water on it, he did not say "I dip you." This settles the matter, as to Luther's understanding of the force and meaning of *baptizo*. As to the meaning of *taufen*, it is perfectly certain that it does not signify, specifically, to dip; for when Luther sprinkled the water on the infant's forehead, he said, "*Ich taufe dich*," and all men know that he did not mean to say, "I dip thee." When you come to examine German lexicons, and the testimony of German scholars, you will find that *taufen* is not the German word which signifies to dip at all; but *undertauchen* is the German word for dip.

We shall not trouble you any further in regard to the Syriac word *amad*, for all the lexicons quoted by my opponent tell us that the primary meaning of the word is "*abluit se*;" "he washed himself," and, consequently, it does not signify to immerse.

In regard to the baptism of the hand in blood, it does not matter how much blood there may have been in the shield; the Roman general simply moistened the end of his finger with it. There was no dipping of the hand about it. It was simply a moistening of the end of the finger for the purpose of writing, and this moistening of the end of the finger was called a baptism of the hand!

We now come to the gentleman's tremendous proposition. But I shall object to the testimony of Dr. Conant. We can not accept any such testimony. Dr. Conant is a controversial writer on the side of immersion. He has written a work in which he has given us a number of passages from the classics in which the word *baptizo* occurs,

where it signifies to dip, immerse, or sink to the bottom and remain there. But there are many other examples of the use of the word where it does not signify to dip, immerse, or sink, which Dr. Conant has not given; but other writers have given them, and I have produced scores of them here. It matters not how many such examples Dr. Conant may produce, one clear example of a different use would be sufficient to prove my position; but I have given many clear examples where the word signifies to pour, to sprinkle, etc., which really sets aside Dr. Conant's conclusions.

But it was the desire of my opponent that I should commit myself, just as I have done, in regard to *kataduoo*! He tells us that *kataduoo* means to sink. Well, does not *baptizo* mean to sink, according to Dr. Conant and Mr. Braden, also? "But," says Mr. Braden, "whether the thing or person baptized is to remain in a sunken condition, depends upon the good sense of the baptizer, and not upon the force or meaning of *baptizo*." So I say in regard to that which is *kataduseon*, whether it remains in the immersed or sunken condition, depends upon the good sense of the immerser, and not upon the force of the word *kataduoo*. This is like my friend exactly. We stand in the same relation to these two terms. I am sorry my opponent had to fall upon such a thing as this to find something with which to fill out his time. He wishes to learn if the Greeks had not words expressive of the actions dip, plunge, immerse and overwhelm? In my opening speech I called his attention to the fact that the Greeks had words expressing precisely these actions; but I have proved to you a hundred times over that *baptizo* is not the Greek word specifically signifying to dip or immerse. I have given the gentleman the word the Greeks themselves used to express the action of dip or immerse, and yet he comes forward, and asks if the Greeks had no word to express the action of dip or immerse! He totally ignores what I have proved, and then learnedly asks if the Greeks had not words to express the action which he calls baptism, when I have been putting these words at him, from the beginning of the discussion.

The gentleman tells us, "that if all the Greek language were translated into English the word *baptizo* would be translated overwhelm, dip, etc., often, but it would be translated sprinkle never. I have also stated to him that in nine cases out of ten, where the word could be so translated, he would find that it means to go to the bottom and remain there. This he has not called in question. I have shown you examples in which the word can not be translated dip or immerse, as in the example from Origen, where the pouring of the water on the wood on the altar, is called the baptism of the wood; and numerous other examples where the word means to pour or sprinkle, and where it can not be translated immerse. *Baptizo* is thus proved to be a generic term which comprises all the various modes of applying water, whether by pouring, sprinkling or immersion. ,

I must omit, for the present, to notice any other of the gentleman's arguments, for I wish to read to you the testimony of some eminent biblical critics on the meaning of *baptizo*. I might here quote from twenty-five or thirty of the most eminent critics, from the Reformation to the present time, among them Beza, Olshausen, Moses

Stuart, Dr. Tracy, Bloomfield, Alford, etc., but as I am pressed for time I will read only from Dr. Dwight and Dr. Clarke. My extract from Dr. Dwight will be found in the fourth volume of his *Theology*, pp. 3-15, 3-46:

"1. That the body of learned critics and lexicographers declare that the original meaning of both these words is to tinge, stain, dye or color; and that when it means immersion, it is only in an occasional sense, derived from the fact that such things as are dyed, stained, or colored are often immersed for this end. This interpretation of the word, also, they support by such a series of quotations as seem unanswerably to evince that this was the original classical meaning of these words."

"2. I have examined almost one hundred instances in which the word *baptizo*, and its derivatives, are used in the New Testament, and four in the Septuagint; these, so far as I have observed, being all the instances contained in both. By this examination it is to my apprehension evident that the following things are true:

"That the primary meaning of these terms is cleansing; the effect, not the mode, of washing.

"That the mode is usually referred to incidentally, whenever these words are mentioned, and that this is always the case whenever the ordinance of baptism is mentioned, and a reference made, at the same time, to the mode of administration.

"That these words, although often capable of denoting any mode of washing whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion (since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways), yet, in many instances, can not, without obvious impropriety, be made to signify immerse, and in others it can not signify it at all."

So testifies Dr. Dwight, the greatest critic that America ever produced.

Dr. A. Clarke, who was one of the most eminent classical scholars that the English nation has ever produced, in his *Commentary on Matthew 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; it is certain that *bapto* and *baptizo* mean both."

"John Wesley also says that *baptizo* means indifferently either to wash or sprinkle, and that the mode can not be determined by the force of the term."

I could continue to read from critics whose testimony agrees with Dwight, Clarke and Wesley, indefinitely. I have them with me, and could read from them from now until Saturday night; but, I ask again, what is the use of reading the testimony of the critics, especially when we have the very examples before us from which they drew their conclusions? These I have been presenting to my friend, but he has refused to notice them; but he continues reading the opinions of critics as to the meaning of *baptizo*, instead of answering my arguments. This is a question that must be settled by facts, and not by authorities.

I must now proceed with a direct Scripture argument in support of baptism by pouring or sprinkling, drawn from the examples of the Christian ordinance in the New Testament Scriptures. But I am sorry

I have not more time to elaborate this argument. It is claimed by the advocates of immersion that the places where, and the circumstances under which the New Testament baptisms were performed, are all favorable to immersion. And yet, when you examine those places and circumstances, they give you but three examples: John's baptizing of the people in the Jordan; John's baptism of the people at Enon; and Philip's baptism of the eunuch. The other examples of New Testament baptisms are all against the position of our opponents. Take, for example, the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. It was simply impossible that three thousand persons should have been baptized by immersion on that occasion. All the circumstances forbid the supposition—the scarcity of water that was available, the shortness of time, and everything connected with the whole history of the case precludes the possibility of immersion. There is the case of the jailer at Philippi, baptized at night and within the prison. The whole circumstances of the case prove that he was baptized on the spot, without going out in search of water.

Then we have the case of Paul who was baptized in a house. The command to him was "*Anastas*," "Stand up and be baptized." And he was baptized while standing up in the house. And the other examples are all of the same character.

The household of Cornelius were baptized on the spot, immediately after the question of Peter, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?" for such is implied in the history of the case.

I will now take up one of the examples on which immersionists strongly rely—John's baptism:

In the first place, I deny that John baptized by immersion. John was a Jewish priest, and his baptism was in some sense a Jewish purification, and the Jewish purifications were ordinarily done by simple sprinkling, and no Jewish priest ever did purify any one during the whole duration of the Jewish dispensation, by immersion. The only departure from the rule of sprinkling was in the consecration of the priests, and this was done by washing them at the door of the tabernacle. If there was a general washing, in other purifications, it was done by the persons themselves, and not by the priest. There was not a single personal immersion required by the law of Moses. When the disciples of John and the Jews got into a dispute about purifying, they went to John and began to talk about baptism, John iii. 25, 26; showing that they understood that John's baptism was in some sense a purification.

Again, it is a fact that John did baptize the majority of the Jewish people. "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of John in Jordan, confessing their sins." Now, I ask if it were possible for John to have immersed such vast multitudes in the short period of his ministry? John's popularity was so great that a majority of the Jewish people were baptized by him, and their rulers were afraid to say his baptism was not from heaven for "they feared the people." And how was it possible for him to immerse two millions of people in the short space of ten months. I say that it was absolutely impossible for him to do it. He

could not have done it if he had stood in the water ten hours a day, and baptized ten persons a minute throughout the whole period of his ministry.

In the next place, John baptized in different places, and in some of those places the fact is demonstrable that he did not baptize by immersion. John went out to the river Jordan, not because he wished to immerse the people, but because the river afforded abundant facilities for water for the ordinary purposes of life, to the vast multitudes who attended his ministry. He may have baptized the people in the river, and yet not have immersed a single person. All inside of the banks was in the river. This is admitted even by Carson. But John did not baptize all the people in the river, for it is said, John i. 28: "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." Now Bethabara was a house on the bank of the river, and the very fact that John baptized in the house, on the bank of the river, proves, demonstrably, that he was not an immersionist, for since the world began, no immersionist preacher ever went out of the river into the house on the bank, to baptize the people. Such a supposition is impossible.

The next place we find John is "at Enon, because there was much water there," or properly, "many waters," springs or fountains, for such is the meaning of *"hudata polla."* These "many waters" were not necessary for the purpose of immersion, for it is notorious that it does not require "much, or many waters," for this purpose. Immersionists can get a small bath or vat that answers to immerse the jailer in, but here they tell us it requires "much water" for John to immerse the people in! John selected Enon as one of the places of his ministry and baptism, because its many fountains afforded the necessary supply of water to the multitudes who flocked to his ministry, for the ordinary purposes of life, and not because he wanted "much water" to immerse the people in, for "much water" is not necessary for this purpose. When we come to look soberly at the history of John's baptism, it is as clear as the noonday's sun that he never dipped a single person. This is demonstrated by the symbolical import of his baptism. John said, "I indeed baptize you with water; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." John says: "I do something, and the very same thing that I do Christ shall do; the only difference is I use water, He shall use the Holy Spirit." How did Christ baptize with the Holy Spirit? If we can learn this, we shall know how John baptized with water. Christ baptized with the Holy Spirit by pouring out the Holy Spirit upon the people; consequently, John must have baptized the people by pouring or sprinkling the water upon them, and not by plunging them into it, if there is any agreement at all between the symbol and the thing symbolized.

There is another example of New Testament baptism I wish to call your attention to, and there is not a stronger argument against immersion to be found in the New Testament than this case furnishes. It is the case of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip. I shall here show the whole circumstances of the case, prove demonstrably that the eunuch was not baptized by immersion.

Now, the position of my opponent is that all the New Testament

baptisms were performed by immersion; and the baptism of the eunuch by Philip is regarded by immersionists, generally, as conclusive proof of this practice. They quote with an air of triumph, "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." "Here," say they, "is demonstrative evidence that Philip immersed the eunuch." But do you not see at once that if, in every single instance of New Testament baptism, immersion had been practiced, it would have been true in every case that "they both went down into the water, and they both came up out of the water?" How under such circumstances, I ask, in all the history of baptism in the New Testament is it that we have this universal circumstance mentioned but once? Why, indeed, was it mentioned at all, if everyone knew that in every instance of baptism "they both went down into the water, and they both came up out of the water?"

All the circumstances of the case here go to show that this was not the ordinary way of practicing baptism in the Apostolic Church—that it was not customary for both parties to go to the water at all. The eunuch was returning from Jerusalem where he had been to worship. Philip was directed by the Holy Spirit "to go and join himself to the chariot." When he came he found him reading the prophecy concerning Christ's atoning work, in Isaiah liii. 7, 8. Philip explained the Scriptures to him, and preached Christ unto him from this prophecy. "And as they journeyed they came to a certain water, and the eunuch said, 'See here is water; what doth hinder me from being baptized?' And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both to the water (for this is the meaning of *katabainoo*) both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." Luke, who records this history, is a very accurate historian, and you remark he specially points out the fact, "that they both went down to the water."

Now, I ask, if such were the practice in every single instance, how comes Luke to record it in this instance and nowhere else? I tell you the more you study the history of this case, the more demonstrable it appears that it was not the ordinary practice for both parties to go to the water at all. Ordinarily the water was brought, and the persons were baptized in the house where they were converted; but in this case there was a deviation from this practice, and it was deemed sufficient to make it a matter of official record that "they both went down to the water, and both came up from the water." The more I look at this passage, the more I am convinced that we have in this account the clearest possible refutation of the assumption that the apostles practiced immersion. What would be the use, in writing a history of baptism, by an immersionist preacher, to say "they both went down into the water," for everyone knows that this is the case in every instance. In all the other examples of baptism in the New Testament, you will find that the converts were baptized on the very spot where they were converted, and so it was done in the case of the eunuch.

I will call your attention again to the baptism of the jailer. I told you I could show that he was baptized in the prison. I will prove this from the inspired record itself. Paul and Silas were put into

the prison, and the jailer was charged "to keep them safely." "He, having received such a charge, thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks. And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken: and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the prison door open, he drew out his sword, and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, Do thyself no harm: for we are all here." This proves that the jailer's house was a part of the prison, for he could see that the prison doors were open, and Paul could see him as he was about to commit suicide. Then the jailer "called for a light, and sprang in," that is, into the inner prison into which he had "thrust" Paul and Silas, "and brought them out" into the outer prison, where they had been put by the magistrates. Here the preaching and baptism took place, in the outer prison, and afterward he took them into his own apartments, and "set meat before them."

This prison was evidently built like many of our modern jails in this country, one apartment for the jailer and his family to live in, and another apartment for the prisoners. To prove this, hear what Paul said the next morning: "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Showing clearly and undeniably that they had not been out of the prison, but had remained in the prison all the while. Even if they had attempted to go out of the prison the Roman law was so strict that it would have cost the jailer his life. Had they started out, the guards placed around the prison would have arrested them, or if they had been found in the streets they would have been arrested, and the jailer's life would have paid the forfeit. Such a thing is not at all supposable. The jailer was baptized in the jail. My opponent may suppose that he was immersed in a bath; but he must remember this was a prison, not a palace; nor were the ancient family baths sufficiently large to immerse in; or he may suppose, with some immersionists, that Paul let him down into a well by means of a rope, and thus immersed him. [Laughter.] But I do not think my opponent will adopt so foolish a theory as this. The truth is this case stands out clearly against the possibility of immersion, and with the examples of John's baptism, and that of the eunuch by Philip, proves clearly to my mind, beyond the possibility of reasonable contradiction, that the New Testament baptisms were all performed by sprinkling or pouring, and not by immersion.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—I shall have to ask your close and earnest attention, for this is the last speech in which I can present new matter; and I find I have numerous arguments yet untouched. I will glance at what the gentleman said. He



repeats again his stale, oft-refuted assertions concerning the mass of iron, and the tow. Now the iron could be drawn by a man out of the fire, and he could dip it into water, if he could handle it in taking it out of the fire. Common-sense says he plunged it into the water to cool it. The tow was dipped in the oil, as common-sense says, and the word demands. The case of the baptizing Bacchus in the sea I have shown to be a disputed passage, and I could set it aside. But if sea water was poured into wine in a vessel, would it not cover, overwhelm, or immerse it, in a certain sense? But this is only one, and a disputed case, out of hundreds. I now give the gentleman fair warning that I will not weary the patience, nor insult the common-sense of this audience by noticing these oft-exploded quibbles.

I wish my Baptist friends present to remember hereafter that G. S. Bailey, once President of Shurtleff College, and also once State Missionary Agent, and now the respected pastor of one of your leading churches in Chicago, is a dishonest man; one whose word can not be taken. Also, that his book, one published by your Publication Society, after the Book Committee had verified his quotations, is not a book to be accepted by one so immaculate as my opponent here. Surely a man must be hard driven when he will presume to impeach a man of Bailey's standing, and the whole Publication Committee of a respectable Christian church.

In reference to the blister-plaster, my friend has not the original, and Dr. Conant had it before him, and quoted from it; and says it was a pessary, and must be dipped. He brings up Carson; but Carson refers to a Latin translation, and not to the original. His assertion that Carson had the original is mere assumption. My offer to place it in the original settles the matter.

He refers to nude baptisms as immersions. Yes, they were practiced by Cyprian, the first advocate, or rather apologist, for sprinkling. Such innovations as nude immersions, sprinkling, celibacy, and purgatory started together.

He brings up the passage in Kings concerning the pouring water on the wood. The word *baptizo* does not occur there, but Origen speaking of it, calls it a baptism or overwhelming. Turning to the account we read that four barrels of water, three times in succession, "were poured on the wood. Was it not covered or overwhelmed by the water? What if the water was poured? Suppose my opponent was put under the falling torrent of Niagara, would he not be immersed in the torrent? The wood was overwhelmed or covered; so says Origen. The overwhelming, and not the pouring, was the baptism.

Dr. Clarke is quoted as against me. He places *bapto* and *baptizo* together, and then gives to both the meanings of *bapto*, that as are clearly shown can never apply to *baptizo*. He again asserts that I fail to notice his examples. I have disposed of every sentence quoted from the original Greek. The passages from the fathers I have already disposed of. They contrasted the purification by heathen sprinklings with the cleansing of baptism, but did not use baptism as interchangeable with sprinkling in a single instance. The fathers tell us how they baptized, and as we have shown, and it was always by immersion. They call pouring an abridgment, or change of the ordinance, and deny that sprinkling is baptism.

Now, then, for the gentleman's objections to immersion. He has failed, utterly failed, to sustain sprinkling; and he attempts now to impeach God's word by showing that what it says was done, could not be done. There are two objections to the immersion of three thousand on Pentecost—want of time and want of water— I have a calculation before me that each apostle would have to baptize two hundred and fifty, or in four hours they could have baptized all at the rate of one per minute. If we take the one hundred and twenty present of all the disciples, they could have immersed all in twenty-four minutes. A heavy argument to bring up against the positive declaration of God. Let me ask you how much more time would it take to have a man come to you in the water and you immerse him, than it would to take a basin of water and pour or sprinkle water on him?

Want of water. This is a heavy argument. How could the disciples find water in a city of many thousand people, and one in which millions assembled yearly for feasts? Josephus tells that one and a-half millions were in the city when surrounded by the Romans. Still a city like this had no water! But it was all in cisterns. Another contradiction of history. There were eight large pools of water in and, at the outskirts of Jerusalem, that had names, and several others that Josephus mentions without names. These pools or ponds were from half to three and a-half acres in area. Fifteen or twenty acres of water, and not enough to immerse three thousand persons! What senseless attempts to impeach God's word.

It is said John baptized all Jerusalem, and the country round about Jordan. My opponent does not see how he could immerse one million and a-half of persons. What nonsense! How could he pour or sprinkle them? We are told that Jesus and his disciples baptized and made more disciples than John. Yet John baptized all Jerusalem and the country round about Jordan. Jesus came to his own and they received him not. He made and baptized more disciples than John, and yet John baptized the millions of Judea. It is an instance of strong hyperbole, such as we meet in all languages. We say the whole nation flocked around the funeral cortege of President Lincoln, though but a few thousands assembled at any one point, and not a million out of thirty ever saw it. In the same sense John baptized all Jerusalem, and all the country round about Jordan. Look at the nature of these objections.

I have shown baptism is immersion, and immersion only. Now, the gentleman undertakes to deny that those were immersed that the Bible says were immersed.

My opponent next assumes that the Philippian jailer was baptized in the jail, right in the face of the account in Acts. The jailer brought them out of the jail. But that was into the outer jail, his house, says my opponent, and there he was baptized. No, sir. The account says after he was baptized he brought them into his house. So they were out of the jail and his house, too. There was no need of all this for pouring or sprinkling, but there was for an immersion; hence they were immersed.

Next comes the baptism of Saul of Tarsus. He was commanded to

stand up and be baptized, says my opponent, hence he was poured or sprinkled. I think it says arise, and be baptized. Suppose I was to go to Saul and wish to immerse him. He was lying on his couch. I would say, "Get up and be baptized." Would that show that I sprinkled him? Paul tells us he was buried with Christ—was baptized in the likeness of his death. Was he sprinkled in the likeness of his death? Was he buried in sprinkling?

The baptism of Cornelius is next noticed. We are told that the language "Who can forbid that these should not be baptized," means "Who can forbid bringing water to sprinkle or pour them?" Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, tell us that in apostolic baptism the candidates were led to the water. And so it was here. But what a baseless assumption this objection is?

We are told next that John was a Jewish priest, and his baptism was a Jewish cleansing, and they were all done by sprinkling; therefore he sprinkled them. A more baseless assumption was never made. The Jews asked John only to be baptized. Would they have done so if he were a Jewish priest merely practicing a ceremonial cleansing? He was not a priest, but a prophet, who came to prepare the way of the Lord. Again, God never commanded water alone to be poured or sprinkled on any one for any religious or ceremonial purpose whatever. Again, the cleansing by water in the Jewish law was an immersion, as we have repeatedly shown.

We are told by most writers that Bethabara was a village at the ford of the Jordan. The name means "the house of the ford." John immersing at Bethabara, the same as I would at Vienna, though it was done in the creek out of the village. Jesus was baptized there, and he was baptized in Jordan.

"Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and came up out of the water." All necessary to an immersion, but nonsense if it were pouring or sprinkling. My friend admits we have here a case of apostolic immersion. We shall now show the rest were also.

We shall call your attention now to the following arguments drawn from the Bible for immersion and against pouring and sprinkling. But before we call your attention to this we wish to call your attention to the early practice of the churches, Greek, Latin, German and English:

Greek Church.—Deylingius, "The Greeks retain the rite of immersion to this day."

Buddeus.—"That the Greeks defend immersion is manifest, and has been frequently observed by learned men. Ludolphus informs us such is the practice of the Ethiopians also."

Venema.—"The Greeks immerse the whole man in the water."

Dr. Wall (one of the most learned men England ever produced) "All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, about one-third part of Europe, practice immersion; among whom are (here he enumerates all the nations of the Greek Church.)

Professor Stuart.—"Baptism by immersion the Oriental Church has always continued to preserve. They call the members of the Western Church 'sprinkled Christians,' by way of contempt. They say baptism by sprinkling is as great a solicism as immersion by

sprinkling, and claim the honor of having preserved the ancient rite of the church free from corruption, which would destroy its significance."

Latin Church.—After giving the answers to questions required of the candidate, the rubric says, then let the priest baptize with a trine immersion.

Anglican Church.—Book of Common Prayer in the time of Edward VI.: Let the priest, naming the child, dip it thrice.

Same, in the time of Charles II.: "Naming the child, he shall dip it discreetly and warily."

Council of Colcutti, A. D. 816: "Let the Presbyters also know that they may not pour water over the infant's body, but let them always be immersed in the font."

Lingard's History of the Anglo-Saxon Church.—"The regular way of administering baptism was by immersion."

Tyndale, an early translator of the Bible.—"The plunging into water in baptism, signifies that we die, and are buried with Christ."

Brenner (a great Catholic historian), after a laborious examination of the original authorities, says: "For thirteen hundred years was baptism regularly an immersion of the person in the water; and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling or pouring with water. The latter (pouring and sprinkling) was disputed, even forbidden."

We have here the summing up of the research in the early churches. We will now enter into the scriptural argument:

We will first take the figurative use of baptism. We are said to be baptized in the likeness of His death, buried with Him in baptism, and to rise in the likeness of His resurrection. Rom. vi. 3. Col. ii. 12. Which of the three actions are like a burial—are a burial? Can one be buried in pouring or sprinkling? They are buried in the watery grave in immersion and rise again. Wesley says, "Buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptism—by immersion." So we might read from Macknight, Whitefield, Wall, Archbishop Tillotson, Archbishop Seeker, Sam. Clarke, Burkitt, Olshausen, Conybeare, Howson, Hammond, Hoadly, Storr, Flatt, Luther, R. Newton, Baxter, Bishop Smith, Westminster Assembly, Tyndale, Chalmers, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nyssen, Apostolical Constitution, John Damascenus, Athanasius, Basil, Justin Martyr, Theodoret, Dyonisius Areopagus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Council of Toledo, Photius, Gelasius, Archbishop Cranmer, Scudder, Pictetus, Nicholson, Manton, Augustine, Bengellius, Goodwin, Doddridge, Wells, Whitby, Adam Clarke, Edwards, Edinburgh Reviewers, Bloomfield, Suicer, Bingham, Bishop Sherlock, Warburton, Leighton, Matthies, Rosenmuller, Jaspis, Frankius, Turretin, Theophylact, Leo, Tholuck, Winer, Lange, Jortin, Supernille, Burmanus, Peter Martyr, Albert Barnes, Estius, Brauns, Boys, Rheinhard, Burnett, Cajetan, Cave, Davanant, Fell, Quenstadt, Starke, Locke, Knapp. In all ninety bishops, commentators, divines, archbishops, eminent scholars of all ages, churches, creeds, all say that buried with him means an immersion. Nearly all say because such was the ancient baptism.

Next, the baptism of sufferings. We have already given the opin-

ion of Wesley and eighteen others, such as Bloomfield, George Campbell, and such eminent scholars.

Baptism of the Holy Spirit next. This was, as we have shown, an overwhelming or immersion of the powers of the individual in the power of the Spirit. So say all learned men who have spoken on it. Let me ask how sprinkled with suffering or Holy Spirit would read? Nay, it was an immersion or overwhelming. Here all the figurative uses of baptism require an immersion to make sense of the figure, and pouring or sprinkling would make sheer nonsense of those portions of God's word, and are out of the question.

We come next to the baptism of the children of Israel in the cloud and the sea. We have already shown it can not be a sprinkling or pouring, for there was neither rain nor water that fell on them. They were covered, overwhelmed, or submerged in the cloud and the sea. It was an immersion or submersion. Again the figure demands an immersion, and pouring and sprinkling are out of the question.

The attempt to get up a plentiful rain on them while crossing is contradicted by the account which says they passed over "dryshod," and the rain spoken of in the Sixty-eighth Psalm, was at or after the thunder of Sinai.

We will call your attention next to the places where baptism was performed. They were such as were required by immersion; but such as make fools of John, and Jesus, and the apostles, if it were sprinkling or pouring. John baptized Jesus in the Jordan, and he went straightway up out of the water. Was our blessed Lord so preposterously foolish as to go into a river to have a few drops of water poured or sprinkled on his head? John baptized at Bethabara, at the ford of the Jordan. He baptized at Enon, because there was much water there. Not many springs, nor much water to drink and to water asses and camels, as Pedobaptist perversion has it; but he baptized because there was much water needed for baptism. So says plain common-sense. Philip went down into the water and came up out of the water. Sensible, if he were immersed; but preposterous folly, if he poured or sprinkled. Then the places where scriptural baptism was performed incontrovertibly prove it to be an immersion.

We call your attention next to the law of convertibility. If pouring and sprinkling are baptism then they can be substituted where it occurs and make sense. If they can not, they are not baptism. If immersion can be substituted, it is immersion. If it can be used interchangeably with baptism, and they can not, it is baptism, and they are not. This is all plain. "I have a sprinkling to be sprinkled with," "a pouring to be poured with." Nonsense. "I have an immersion to be immersed with." An immersion of suffering, certainly. "And they were sprinkled of John in the Jordan; were poured of John in the Jordan," What fools to go into a river to have a few drops of water sprinkled on their heads. Were immersed in the Jordan! Certainly. That is what they went into a river for. Were sprinkled by the Holy Spirit, or poured. Had their powers sprinkled or poured in the power of the Holy Spirit. Nonsense. Had their powers immersed, or overwhelmed in the powers of the Spirit! Certainly. Buried in sprinkling; buried in pouring! Utter nonsense.

Buried in immersion? Certainly, and in no other way. Were sprinkled or poured unto Moses in the cloud and the sea? No, for the account says they came over dryshod. Were submerged or immersed by covering in the cloud and the sea? Certainly. Hence the law of convertibility proves, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that baptism can not be pouring or sprinkling, and as clearly that it is immersion.

We will next call your attention to the prepositions construed with the word *baptizo*:

"Come up out of the water." "Baptized in Jordan," "went down into the water;" "come up out of the water." Observe the climax: Come—up—out of—went down—into. "Buried in baptism.". These prepositions make sense with immerse. They are such as are always construed with immerse. They make nonsense with pour and sprinkle. They are never construed with pour or sprinkle in the sense they are in baptism. Hence immersion is baptism and pouring and sprinkling are not. We wish next to call your attention to the exactness of the Greek language, in reference to these actions. It is not so loose a language that you can construe it as you please, as our opponent would fain have you believe. There is no language that will express such nice shades of meaning, and is so exact as the Greek, and this is the reason why revelation was preserved for man in that language. Is it to be supposed that this exact and copious language would express a command so indefinitely as to mean immerse, pour and sprinkle indifferently? President Shannon says:

"I found in the Greek Testament and Septuagint' dip' used twenty-one times. In all these it was a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*, except once where Joseph's brethren smeared or daubed his coat in blood. *Emolunan* is here used. Sprinkle is used twenty-seven times. Never once as a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*. In twenty cases it was a translation of *raino*, or some of its derivatives. In three cases where scattering ashes was meant, I found *pao*. In three cases where pouring was really meant, I found *proscheo*, and in one case spattering blood on the lintels of the door *proschusis*. Pour I found one hundred and nineteen times, but never as a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*, but as a translation of *cheo spuideo*. Wash I found thirty-two times, where reference was had to a part of the person, and not once as a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*. I found wash in the sense of bathe twenty-eight times, every time a translation of *luo*. In Luke Mary is said to wash the Saviour's feet with her tears; here *breko*, moisten, is used." From all this we see the accuracy of the Greek. Where we find dip we find *bapto* or *baptizo*; but never for pour or sprinkle. Then can a command given to us by the apostles, in so exact a language, mean indifferently pour, sprinkle, or immerse, when these actions are so carefully separated by the Greek?

Now look at the state of the argument. Here my opponent has labored for two days, with all his boasted ability, learning, and long experience in discussions of this kind, to sustain his practice of sprinkling. He has not found a single author who will say the word our Saviour used meant pour or sprinkle. He can not find a sentence which he dare so translate. He has not found a passage in the word of God that will for a moment sustain him. He finds nothing in his-

tory to sustain him. He can merely attempt to show that the secondary meaning of *baptizo* can, perhaps, be reached by pouring or sprinkling, and raise quibbles against immersion. If a man so able, so skillful as my opponent, can do no more, in controversy, with so small, so weak a man as he has repeatedly pronounced me, his position must be as baseless as the fabric of a dream. Let me ask you do you believe the command was given in any such mystic and mysterious language, that so able a disputant, after two days, can only say he "can't see how it can be always immersion, but has not found it means pouring or sprinkling, yet it means pouring and sprinkling?"

I wish now to reiterate what he has never yet answered. He dare Dot translate "I pour or sprinkle thee" by "*baptizo se.*" He can and must, as we have seen, from the way the Greek has been translated, as collated by Shannon, translate "I immerse thee" "*baptizo se,*" showing conclusively that when our Saviour said "baptize the nations" he did not mean pour or sprinkle them, but immerse them.

I repeat, again, if the entire extant Greek literature were translated into English, dip, etc., would occur many hundred times, and nine cases out of ten as translations of *bapto* and *baptizo*. Pour and sprinkle would occur many hundred times, and never once as a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*. Hence *baptizo* can never mean pour or sprinkle, and it must always express the specific action expressed in English by the word dip, immerse, etc.

Hence our Saviour used a word which commands the specific action of immersion, and never the specific action of pouring or sprinkling. He has not noticed this argument, nor the one that positive ordinances require always one specific act. He has not found a positive ordinance that can be obeyed by three entirely different specific acts. He can not name a word that represents three entirely different acts. All these are fatal to his argument, and still they have not been honored with a passing glance.

Are not the arguments we have presented easily understood? Why has not our opponent presented arguments of the same nature? If baptism is sprinkling or pouring, why not bring direct argument from classic or scriptural authority to prove it? Can you, who believe in pouring and sprinkling, name a single argument he has produced? Where is the scriptural argument you can refer to? Let me ask you can you then believe that you have been baptized in being sprinkled or poured? Take your Bibles and look over the arguments I have produced. We have gone to the supreme court, and the decisions of that tribunal have been in our favor in every instance, and in every instance against the gentleman. I have every instance where the word occurs in the language so far as examined, and the word means immerse, and never pour or sprinkle.

My opponent, after so many days' labor, has not found a single passage he dares translate rendering *baptizo* sprinkle or pour. He skips over primary meanings, and takes secondary meanings of secondary meanings, and these are only "may be's," and still it means pour and sprinkle! Will you pin your faith to such a leader as this? Take your Bible, read it, and common-sense will guide you to the plain meaning of the ordinance.

Consider first where the ordinance was practiced, and that pouring or sprinkling would make fools of John, Jesus and his disciples, but immersion is in exact accordance with good sense. Secondly, the figurative use of the word. Pour and sprinkle make utter nonsense of the figures, but immersion exactly meets the figure given. Thirdly, the prepositions used with baptism always agree with immersion, but make nonsense with pouring and sprinkling. Above substitute pour and sprinkle for baptize, and see what utter nonsense it makes of the word of God. Substitute immerse, and it alone makes sense by showing clearly that it is the proper word.

If our Saviour left this command in a language which had words to express every possible action, did he not, could he not, use one that would exactly express the act he commanded? Would the Father of Light give so important a command in so ambiguous language that a learned, able, skillful, and experienced debater would have to hunt it for days through ways so devious as my opponent has pursued? Believe it who will, I never can. I stand here able to give a reason for my faith in immersion; I have listened in vain for one for pouring and sprinkling. I can read immersion from classics, from history, and from the word of God. Plain common-sense will enable all to reach the truth. Take no man's opinion. Learn what God announced. Do it and all will be well.

Here, according to arrangement, the direct debate should have closed, but Mr. Hughey requested more time, and it was agreed to continue the direct debate two hours more before the closing speeches.

WEDNESDAY, August 19, 1868.—7 P. M.

MR. HUGHEY'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—In my present speech I will reply to the gentleman's last speech, and in my next I shall not stop to reply to anything he may say, but shall proceed with my affirmative argument. Before passing to reply to his last speech, however, I shall call attention to the exceptions that my friend takes to Gases. This slipped my mind in my former speech. Gases' is a native Greek lexicographer, who, with great labor and pains, compiled a lexicon of the ancient Greek language, at the beginning of the present century, and his lexicon is deservedly held in high estimation, and is generally used by native Greeks. He gives the following definition of *baptizo*: "*Breko, lotto, antleo*;" which Chapin translates thus: "To wet, moisten, or bedew; to wash, lave, or bathe; to draw, pump, or pour out water."—Seiss on Baptism, p. 66.

The idea of immersion is not in any of these words, and he does not give this as any one of its significations! My opponent attempted to make the impression that this was a lexicon of the modern Greek language! Now, he tells us that Gases was not a scholar, that he simply copied Bretschneider, and upon this German lexicon he formed his. Suppose he did avail himself of the labors of Bretschneider, and all other good lexicons; did not Dr. Webster do the same thing, and does not every lexicographer avail himself of the labors of his prede-



cessors? If Gases is simply the copyist of Bretschneider, Webster is simply the copyist of Dr. Johnson. But Gases does not copy Bretschneider; for he defines the word *baptizo* by terms which forbid the idea of dipping entirely. His is the standard lexicon now in Greece as I told you, and is a work of high authority.

Now I wish to call your attention to the latter part of the gentleman's speech. He told you that the Greek language was a very accurate language, and that the Greeks had words to express every kind of specific action; and that they had a very accurate manner of constructing their sentences, making them so clear and distinct that it was almost impossible to be mistaken. This is all so; he stated what is certainly true. And you remember also, that in my opening speech, I particularly stated this very fact. I showed you also, that the word *baptizo* is not a word of mode—that it does not express the specific action of dip or immerse. The Greeks had a word to express that specific action; but that word is never applied to the ordinance of Christian baptism. That word is *duoo*, in its simple, or compound forms, and it is the word the Greeks themselves used when they spoke of immersion. And this I proved to you from those examples where they speak of the three *kaduseis*—"the three immersions of baptism." Now while it is true that the Greek language is a very accurate language, it is not true that they use that word which accurately expresses the action of immersion when they speak of Christian baptism. My friend assumes that *baptizo* is a specific word expressing specific action; but I proved by the Greeks themselves that it is not a specific word; for when they speak of the specific action of dipping they use another word; but when speaking of the Christian ordinance, whether by sprinkling, pouring, or dipping, they use *baptizo* and *baptismos*.

The accuracy of the Greek language stands squarely against my opponent. The gentleman stated that the Greek prepositions used with *baptizo* shows that it means immerse, that "when Jesus was baptized he went up out of the water," but it is *apo* and not *ek* that is used here, which signifies *from* and not *out of*. And this is the way the Bible Union has translated this passage: "And Jesus when he was immersed went up straightway *from* the water."

Here the preposition *apo* shows clearly that Jesus walked away from, and not out of the water, when he was baptized. This is the way we find it in the Greek.

In the case of the eunuch's baptism by Philip, the verb *hatabainoo* is used, which does not signify properly, going down into a place, but simply going down to a point. On this passage, Professor Stuart says: "That *eis*, with the verb *katabainoo*, often means going down to a place is quite certain. E. g. John ii. 12, Jesus went down to (*eis*) Capernaum. Acts vii. 15, Jacob went down to (*eis*) Egypt. Acts xvii. 25, they went down to (*eis*) Attalia. Acts xviii. 22, he went down to (*eis*) Antioch. Acts xxv. 6, going down to (*eis*) Cesarea. So common indeed is the meaning of *eis* when it designates direction to a place or toward it, that Bretschneider has given this as its first and leading signification. But I have confined my examples to its connection with *katabainoo*."

"On the other hand, I find but one passage in the New Testament

where it seems to mean into when used with the verb *katabainoo*. This is Rom. x. 7, Who shall go down *eis abussou*, into the abyss. Even here the sense *to* is good. And, in fact, when one analyzes the idea of *katabainoo*, going down, descending, he finds that it indicates the action performed before reaching the place, the approximation to it by descent, real or supposed, and not the entering into it. *Eisrchonai* is the appropriate word for entering into, or rather (in distinction from *katabainoo*) *embainoo* is the appropriate word to signify entrance into any place or thing." (Stuart on Baptism, pp. 95, 96.)

So according to Professor Stuart, *eis* when used with *katabainoo*, means going down to a point, and not into it. Now in the case of the baptism of the eunuch, there was a difference from the ordinary manner of proceeding, and my opponent seems to have understood me to say that Philip immersed the eunuch ! I said no such thing. I said "they both went down to the water, and Philip baptized him, and they both came away from the water." And this very manner of expressing it by Luke, excludes the idea of going down into the water at all. So the exactness of the Greek language stands squarely against my opponent again.

He tells me that he has a square issue and he wants me to meet it. He assumes the point in debate and that point is, "is *baptizo* a specific word, or is it a word that expresses of a variety of actions." He assumes that it expresses specific action, and calls on me to translate it by a specific term, and because I will not make such a simpleton of myself as to attempt to translate a *generic* term by a specific one, he says I can not bring forth a single argument in support of my position!! He wants me to translate *baptizo* sprinkle. Just let him translate it uniformly immersed, and see what sense it will make. He dare not do it. How would it sound to say, "I have an overwhelming to be overwhelmed with," or "I have an immersion to be immersed with!" Even his own translators substitute the word endure and undergo for *baptizo* in these passages, and send it out to the world! I brought forward a score of examples for him to translate baptize by immerse. "These two baptisms he poured forth from his side," for instance, and because I have not the original works from which my examples are taken, which he knows are not to be found except in the largest college or city libraries, he says he will not do it! But should I bring the original, would he translate it in that way? He would do no such thing, and there is not a schoolboy ten years old, who knows anything about the Greek language, but knows the thing can not be done. And yet, because I will not do what he knows neither of us can do in this Western country (produce the original work from which these quotations are taken), he says I do not meet the issue ! I have met the issue fully and clearly; but I can not get him to meet the issue. It is impossible to get him to it. It has rarely been my lot to meet a man who pursued the course my opponent does. Indeed, I never knew a man to make a popular appeal to the congregation to decide the question in debate, as he did this afternoon, and I do hope we will have no more exhibitions of this kind. The argument is to go before the world, and those who read it can form their own conclusions from it, and I shall never stoop to anything of that kind in order

to bolster up a bad cause, when I know the sand is slipping from under me and the rock of eternal truth is not there to catch me. I compliment the good sense of the gentleman's friends for not responding to his call, and the good sense of my friends for pursuing the same course. Doubtless there are persons present who agree with the gentleman, and suppose with him, that I have entirely failed with my proposition, and there are others who agree with me, and who are perfectly satisfied that I have fully proved my proposition, but both parties had too much good sense to get up when the gentleman asked them to. I hope that he will take this as a sufficient rebuke, and attempt nothing of the kind in the future.

In the case from Origen where pouring is called baptism, there was no overwhelming. The altar, the wood, and the sacrifice had the water poured on them; but they were neither immersed nor overwhelmed. There was one thing done, however, the wood was baptized; how was it done? It was done by pouring. The baptism here was a pouring. Immersion or overwhelming is out of the question. If the wetting of the wood was the effect, the pouring was the thing done, and my opponent may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases; for *baptizo* in this example means either to pour or to wet without reference to mode. My examples from the fathers were given to show that *baptizo* expresses the action of pouring or sprinkling, and that the fathers use *baptizo* to express the act of pouring or sprinkling, and we will let that matter rest for the present. I will leave you to judge if I have not brought forward thirty or forty of the clearest examples that could be produced to show that the fathers used *baptizo* in the sense of pour or sprinkle.

That in regard to the baptism on the day of Pentecost I said that the number baptized and the scarcity of water available, precluded the idea of their having been immersed. Now I happen to have in my hands Dr. Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, and he is a strong believer in the original mode of baptism by immersion. He says on page 509:

"The improbability of three thousand persons during the feasts of Pentecost (Acts ii. 41), and soon after five thousand (Acts vii. 4) having been baptized by immersion at Jerusalem in one day, since there is no water in the neighborhood of the city in summer but the springs, and the brook Siloam, and the houses are supplied from cisterns and public reservoirs, so that there as in all Palestine private baths in dwelling houses, are very rare. In these cases we must give up the idea at least of a total immersion and substitute perhaps that of a copious affusion upon the head."

So Dr. Schaff tells us that the idea of immersion must be given up in this case; that those large pools so frequently spoken of by immersionists, were in the hands of their enemies, and that private baths in dwelling houses are very rare in all Palestine.

The gentleman tells us that Christ baptized more persons than John. I am sorry to hear a man make such a statement as this. Do the scriptures say that Christ baptized more persons than John? No, they say, "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus

himself baptized not but his disciples). When did this occur? It was after John had been baptizing for eight or ten months. At that time the people were coming in larger crowds to hear Jesus, than they were to hear John. Then John was waning and Christ was increasing. This passage can not mean that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John did during his entire ministry; but it states what was then taking place, as is illustrated in John iii. 26. The history of John's baptism shows that he baptized the majority of the Jewish people, for they as a people received him, and they would have stoned those who would have questioned the fact of John's baptism being from heaven.

In regard to the baptism of the jailer, the whole history shows that it was performed in the prison. The jailer first brought Paul and Silas out of the inner prison, into the outer prison, where they were put by the magistrates; here the preaching and baptism took place. Then he took them into his own apartments, and set meat before them, but they were still in the prison, and remained there until the magistrates brought them out the next day.

I was surprised, and a little amused, at the gentleman saying that Bethabara was at or on the bank of the river, and that *en* in this place means at. I used to hear immersionists dwell largely on the meaning of *en*, contending that it proved that John immersed the people in Jordan; but now the thing is changed! I say that *en*, when it signifies place, primarily means in; but Mr. B. says in this place it means at or about! Bethabara was a house on the bank of the river, and when the people were baptized *en* Bethabara, they were baptized in the house, not at or about the house, that is, down in the river, near by where the house stood, as my friend imagines. This, I say, demonstrably proves that John was not an immersionist.

There is one other point to which I will call your attention, and then I think I shall be through with the gentleman's speech. It is in reference to the baptism of the Israelites. He says I dropped out a part of the passage in the Sixty-eighth Psalm, which I know I did not. I told you the children of Israel were baptized by the cloud while they were under the cloud; but that they were not under the cloud while passing through the sea, for the cloud passed from before them, and came behind them, before they went into the sea, and remained between them and the Egyptians during their passage through the sea. They were baptized by the cloud before Sinai, at the giving of the law. The Psalmist says, Psalm lxxviii. 7-10:

"O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness; Selah: The earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary. Thy congregation hath dwelt therein."

That is, in that state of confirmation into which they were brought by this plentiful rain, which Paul calls baptism. Did God ever send a rain to supply the natural wants of the Israelites during their journey through the wilderness? Paul calls this a baptism by the cloud and the manner of the baptism was by sending the rain upon them, as they stood at the foot of Mt. Sinai. The baptism by the sea was re-

newed and confirmed by the baptism by the cloud at Mt. Sinai, when God sent the "plentiful rain." Thus they were baptized unto Moses by the cloud and by the sea.

We come now to the figurative use of the term *baptizo*, in Rom. vi. 1-6, and Col. ii. 12. If the gentleman will turn to his Greek Testament, he will see the genitive of instrument is used with *baptizo* in Romans, and the dative in Colossians. We are not said to be buried in, but by baptism, in both these passages. Baptism is the agent by which the burial is effected, and is not the burial at all. Buried by baptism into what? Why into death—into the benefits of Christ's death; and not into water. It is not the mode of baptism which is here alluded to, but the symbolical import of baptism. The burial which is here said to be accomplished by baptism, is also called a "planting in the likeness of Christ's death."

What resemblance is there between the death of Christ upon the cross, and an immersion in water? I happen to have Prof. Stuart on my side on this passage, and he is good authority with my friend, and I will read you what he says on the symbolical import of baptism in these passages.

Professor Stuart says, Commentary on Romans, pp. 252, 253 and 254:

"Most commentators have maintained, that *sunetaphemen* (buried with him) has here a necessary reference to the mode of literal baptism, which, they say, was by immersion; and this, they think, affords ground for the employment of the image used by the apostles because immersion (under water) may be compared to a burial (under the earth). It is difficult, perhaps, to procure a patient rehearing for this subject, so long regarded by some as being out of fair dispute. Nevertheless, as my own conviction is not, after protracted and repeated examination, accordant here with that of commentators in general, I feel constrained, briefly, to state my reasons.

"The first is, that in the verse before us, there is a plain antithesis; and so plain that it is impossible to overlook it. If now *sunetaphemen* is to be understood in a physical way, *i. e.*, as meaning baptism in a physical sense, where is the corresponding physical idea, in the opposite part of the antithesis or comparison? Plainly there is no such physical idea or reference in the other part of the antithesis. The resurrection there spoken of is entirely a moral, spiritual one; for it is one which Christians have already experienced, during the present life; as may be fully seen comparing vs. 5 and 11, below. I take it for granted that after *hemeis* in v. 4, *egerthentes* is implied; since the nature of the comparison, the preceding *hoosper hegerthe Christos*, and v. 5, make this entirely plain.

"If we turn now to the passage in Col. ii. 12 (which is altogether parallel with the verse under examination, and has very often been agitated by polemic writers on the subject of baptism), we shall there find more conclusive reason still, to argue as above, respecting the nature of the antithesis presented. We have been buried with him (Christ) by baptism. What now is the opposite of this? What is the kind of resurrection from this grave, in which Christians have been buried? The apostle tells us: 'We have risen with him

(Christ) by faith wrought by the power of God (*tees energieias tou, theou*), who raised him (Christ) from the dead.' Here there is a resurrection by faith, *i. e.*, a spiritual, moral one. Why then should we look for a physical meaning in the antithesis? If one part of the antithesis is to be construed in a manner entirely moral or spiritual, why should we not construe the other in like manner! To understand *sunetaphemen*, then, of a literal burial under water, is to understand it in a manner which the laws of interpretation appear to forbid.

\* \* \* \* \*

"But my principal difficulty in respect to the usual exegesis of *sunetaphemen* is, that the image or figure of immersion, baptism, is, so far as I know, nowhere else in scripture employed as a symbol of burial in the grave. Nor can I think that it is a very natural symbol of burial. The obvious import of washing with water, or immersing in water, is, that it is symbolical of purity, cleansing, purification. But how will this aptly signify burying in the grave, the place of corruption, loathsomeness, and destruction?"

"For these reasons, I feel inclined to doubt the usual exegesis of the passage before us, and to believe that the apostle had in view only a burying which is moral and spiritual; for the same reasons that he had a moral and spiritual (not a physical) resurrection in view, in the corresponding part of the antithesis.

"Indeed what else but a moral burying can be meant, when the apostle goes on to say: 'We are buried with him (not by baptism, only) by baptism into his death?' Of course it will not be contended that a literal physical burying is meant here, but only a moral one. And although the words, into his death, are not inserted in Col. ii. 12; yet, as the following verse there shows, they are plainly implied. In fact it is plain that reference is here made to baptism, because, when that rite was performed, the Christian promised to renounce sin and to mortify all his evil desires, and thus die unto sin that he might live unto God. I can not see, therefore, that there is any more necessary reference here to the *modus* of baptism, than there is to the *modus* of the resurrection. The one may as well be maintained as the other."

So says Prof. Stuart. This argument to my mind is clear and conclusive; and I have long since been fully satisfied that there is no allusion whatever in these passages to the mode of baptism; but only to its symbolical import, as setting forth our death to sin, and resurrection to newness of life, through faith in the death of Christ. This is made demonstrable by the fact that baptism is the agent by which the burial is effected, and not the burial at all.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—When I set aside the lexicon that bears the name of Gases, I did not say that he was not a Greek, nor that there was no lexicon bearing his name. I said he was not an ancient Greek and did not speak the classic Greek—the language in which we have commission given by Christ to his apostles. He spoke the Romaic, a language that bears about as much resemblance to the classic Greek as does the gibberish of

our Southern negroes to the classic English of Irving or Prescott. He did not write the lexicon that bears his name—he merely translated the dictionary of Schneider, who based his dictionary on Passow. Passow, his mister, gives *baptizo* as follows: "To dip repeatedly of ships, to sink them." We will take master before the pupil.

We made these remarks because a play was made on the word Greek, and left you to draw the inference that he was a learned man who spoke the classic Greek. He did not speak the classic Greek, and did not even write a book about it, but copied another man's work. I give this on the authority of Dr. Hall, who quotes Gases in his book defending the same position taken by my opponent.

Next my opponent claims because the fathers sometimes used *katadusis* to express the action of immersion, therefore *baptizo* can not be a specific word to represent immersion, but *katadusis* is the word.' I say of a man when he is immersed that he is dipped; that he is plunged; that he is submerged; that he is overwhelmed. Do I thereby deny that immersion is a word of specific action? Do I make immerse a generic word representing a result that may be reached by several different actions? No. I rather show that these words are nearly synonymous; so nearly so that they express the same specific act in the case before me.

Does it controvert the idea that the act of baptism was regarded by the Greeks as a specific action and only one specific action, because they used two or more nearly synonymous words to represent it? Our Baptist brethren often call their baptism dipping. Do they deny that immersion is a specific word, representing one specific act, the same as they express by dip? Certainly not. In like manner when the Greek fathers call baptism *katadusis* do they deny that *baptizo* is a specific word? That baptism can be anything else than a sinking under the water or an immersion? Certainly not. They, in passages I have already quoted, call baptism an immersion, and a sinking down in the same passage.

My opponent to avoid the force of the argument on prepositions, says Christ went away from the water. But he was in the Jordan, and he must have went out of the water. The translators say he went up out of the water, and rightly too, for such is the original meaning of *apo*. *En* means in, unless we are compelled by the context to give some other meaning, and there is no such necessity; hence the Bible is right. He was in the water, and went up out of it. It is asserted that *eis* construed with *baino* means "To come to" (the water). But if we take the account we read "they came to the water." *Elthon* and *epi* brings them to the water. For what purpose was *katabainoo* and *eis* used here? To show that they descended or went down from the chariot into the water, where the eunuch was immersed; for common sense says they would go down into the water for no other purpose. Then they went up out of the water, as we always do after an immersion.

But *eis* means to or at. Bullion, one of the first grammarians of our day, gives into, in reference to, in order to, as its leading ideas, and never to or at. It means into, and is always so translated, unless the passage demands a variation of the meaning, and these variations

are always in accordance with the primary meaning into. There is no necessity for varying the primary meaning here, for *elthon* and *epi* brings them to or at the water. Let us try at in a few instances: "The righteous shall enter at life eternal. Shall go away at life eternal. The wicked shall be cast at hell. Jesus went, not into, but at heaven." You certainly have had enough of such nonsensical perversions of God's word. It is strange that it always means into in the Pedobaptist vocabulary except in connection with baptism. *Eis* will take a Pedobaptist into anything in the universe but into the water.

We will next examine the passage from Origen. He is speaking of the water poured on the altar on Mt. Carmel, when Elijah and the priests of Baal worshiped and sacrificed there. (1 Kings xviii. 33.) He calls something done here a baptism. My friend says it was the pouring of water. I claim it was the covering or overwhelming of the wood by the quantity of water poured on it. There were twelve barrels, or over three hundred gallons of water poured on it, till it was overwhelmed. This added to the grandeur of the miracle, when the fire from God licked up the water, wood and sacrifice. It was not the pouring that was the baptism, but the overwhelming. I wonder if my opponent were to be placed in a vat, and water poured on him till he was covered, if he would not say he was immersed? Again we find no contradiction.

We come now to his quotations from the fathers. We have repeatedly shown you that the fathers do not call pouring or sprinkling baptism. They contrast Jewish and heathen rites with the ordinance of baptism. They do not say that the actions are the same. There is no necessity to infer it any more than to infer we inaugurate our President by crowning, because the British people do their Sovereign. We call both inauguration, though the acts are different. So the fathers call both heathen rites and baptism a cleansing, though the acts were different. We produced the direct testimony of the fathers that they always immersed, went down into the water, that the candidates sank into the water. Such is their direct testimony. Is not that better than inferences drawn from indirect allusions? My friend has not had time to notice this testimony.

I have offered to translate every passage where *baptizo* occurs by immerse, or words of kindred meaning. My friend asserts I have failed to translate some he has produced. I have already exposed that petty trick. I have translated and can translate all of them where the original Greek is given. He thrusts out toward me books, and challenges me to translate passages. I take the book and find not a word of Greek given, but a translation of some Pedobaptist. I am asked to translate what I have never seen. I hope we have done with such unfair pettifogging tricks.

It is again urged that there was not water enough to baptize three thousand. I met one Methodist preacher who affirmed that there was not water enough in Jordan to immerse! What a notable miracle our God performed when he parted the waters of such a rivulet, and led over the children into the promised land! We have already said that there were pools covering from a quarter to three and a half



acres, eight that had names; and others unnamed, covering over fifteen acres in all—and yet there was not water enough! Over two millions of people could assemble, for Josephus tells that one and a half millions perished in the siege of Jerusalem by Titus; on just such an occasion as this baptism was performed, as they could not find water enough for the immersion of three thousand.

We read of the following pools: Bethesda, twenty-two rods long and eight rods wide; Solomon's pool, fifteen rods long and six rods wide; pool of Siloam, fifty-three feet long and eighteen feet wide, with a smaller pool; old pool, twenty rods long and thirteen rods wide; pool of Hezekiah, fifteen rods long and nine rods wide; lower pool of Gihon, thirty-six rods long and sixteen rods wide now; in the days of the apostles it covered over four acres. Here we have acres of water, and not water enough to immerse three thousand! On a certain occasion a great multitude of diseased used to rush into the pool of Bethesda; still the apostles could not immerse such multitude a few at a time.

But the water was in the hands of the enemies of the Christian movement, or of the apostles? What next? The water was in no one's hands any more than the streets of the city, or the air around Jerusalem. The Jews had crucified Jesus, and supposed that his effort was dead. Now we are told they were holding the pools from the apostles, when they did not know that the apostles were preaching or immersing; not even dreaming of it. Verily a Pedobaptist has a fertile imagination. I hope to hear no more of such consummate nonsense as this.

My opponent is still troubled about Bethabara. It was a city, and not on the Jordan. Hence there was not water enough to immerse. A city and not water enough to immerse! What next? But we will prove from the Bible where Bethabara was. We read in Judges vii. 24: "And Gideon sent messengers throughout all Mount Ephraim, saying, Come down against the Midianites, and take the waters unto Bethabara and Jordan. Then all the men of Ephraim gathered themselves together, and took the waters unto Bethabara and the Jordan." The children of Israel here took possession of the fords of the Jordan. The lower ford was at Bethabara. Bethabara was a city on the east bank of the river, at one end of the ford. Its name means "house of the ford." John was baptizing in the Jordan, and at Bethabara, or in the Jordan in Bethabara.

Next comes the baptism into Moses by the cloud on the sea, or in the cloud and sea. It is urged it was a sprinkling, and the Sixty-eighth Psalm is quoted where it says: "Thou didst send down a plentiful rain." My opponent, when he first read it, omitted one verse, because that would place the rain at or after Sinai. I turn to the account in Exodus, and I read that the waters were congealed, stood as a wall on either hand, that a cloud of fire was over them. No rain out of that cloud; and finally we are told that they passed through dryshod, or dry. Not a particle of pouring or sprinkling. How were they immersed? They were covered by the cloud and sea, or immersed by them. I have some authority to quote here on the burial by baptism. My opponent quoted authority. I suppose I may. I gave you

the names of over ninety commentators, theologians, divines, scholars and paraphrasts, who with one accord say it has reference to immersion, and that we are buried by immersion, that baptism is called a burial because it was then a burial in the water. My opponent claims that he has a special inspiration as to what it means, and that common-sense and these great men were all deceived till his day. Baptism is a figure. Granted. But the burial is also a figure. Of what? The putting away the old man who is dead. Who is the old man? Our sinful nature, now figuratively dead. Baptism is a figure of a burial which is a figure of putting away the dead old man, which is a figure of the end of our sinful life! Here we have a figure of a figure of a figure of a figure. If that is not figuring all sense out of God's word, and figuring it into gross nonsense, it can not be done! All to avoid the plain, common-sense conclusion that baptism, literal baptism, is like a burial, as is our immersion.

But, says my opponent, Christ was never buried. How these men will give the lie direct to the word of God. Paul says he preached as one of the great facts of the gospel, by believing which they were saved, that Christ was buried. He preached a lie, and they believed a lie, and were saved by believing a lie! What must be the nature of a position which requires such gross perversions of God's plain word, and such contradictions of its greatest truths, to sustain it. Now take your Bibles and read, we are buried with him in baptism; baptism is a likeness of his death, his burial. What is it then? An immersion.

We call your attention now to another most conclusive argument. There have been, or was before this controversy began, eighteen important translations of the Bible into other languages. Some were made in the times of the apostles or their converts, and by their converts. Four have transferred the word and have not translated it. Fourteen have translated it immerse. Fifty-nine important translations have been made in all. In ten it is transferred, because a sacred word, or because sprinklers could not translate it without using immerse. Seven have rendered to make the sign of the cross, because they falsely make the sign of the cross the most important part of the ceremony. But they always immerse. Four render it bathe, or wash, which is done by immersion. Twenty-nine render it by dip or immerse. Did not these learned men know what the word meant? Here is an argument that can not be set aside.

My opponent is still troubled about the baptism of sufferings. Wesley says: "Our Lord was filled with sufferings within, and covered with them without," immersed, in other words. So say Doddridge, Hervey, Trelawney, Bloomfield, Poole, Geo. Campbell, and Professor Stuart. They say he was immersed. The figure requires it. Sprinkled- with sufferings! Nonsense. We do now speak of a man as immersed in cares, business, grief, afflictions, sufferings and sorrow. We never say sprinkled. Hence the baptism was an immersion, and Christ used *baptizo* because it means dip or plunge or immerse.

How are we buried with Christ in baptism? He was buried in the grave, we are buried in the water. We are with him in the resemblance of the two acts. This resemblance is found in immersion, and

not in sprinkling or pouring; hence immersion is baptism, they are not.

There are several arguments I presented in my last afternoon's speech, that I hurried over, as I supposed that was the last speech before the closing speeches. I will recall and amplify them to-night. I will call your attention again to the argument based on the convertibility of terms. It is a rule in lexicography, that a perfect definition of a word will make sense when substituted for it. All can see that this must be so. Now if pouring and sprinkling are baptism, they will make sense when substituted for it. Let us try: "They sprinkled themselves after coining home from market?" No they did not. The law required no such ceremony. Jewish writers say they did not. Pour "themselves?" No, they did not. The law never required, nor did they do it, say all Jewish writers. "Immerse themselves?" Certainly; for the law commanded them to bathe or immerse their whole person. Jewish writers say they always did this. "Pouring or sprinkling pots, tables, couches, vessels?" No, for the law did not require, and they did not do it, say Jewish writers. But they did put them in water, or immerse them, thus rinsing them; so the law commands, and so Jewish writers say they did. Then pouring and sprinkling are out of the question, for they contradict the word of God and Jewish history. Immersion is the action, for that accords with God's law and Jewish history. "Baptism of sufferings?" Pouring of sufferings? A sprinkling of sufferings? How flat! Immersion of sufferings? A bold and beautiful figure. "Were sprinkled of him in Jordan, poured of him in Jordan?" Nonsense, both as to place and action. "Go into the water to pour or sprinkle a few drops of water?" Did John pour or sprinkle the people in Jordan? Immersed of John in Jordan? Certainly. Sensible in place and action. "John was pouring and sprinkling at Enon because there was much water?" Nonsense. Immersing because there was much water. In exact accordance with the action. "Went down into the water," to sprinkle or pour? "Came up out of the water" after sprinkling or pouring? Nonsense. "Went down into the water" to immerse? "Came up out of the water" after immersion? Certainly. "Sprinkled or poured by the Holy Spirit?" How? The powers of the individual sprinkled or poured by the power of the Holy Spirit? Absurd. Immersed by the power of the Holy Spirit? Certainly, for their powers were overwhelmed by the power of the Spirit. "Be sprinkled and wash away thy sins?" No, immersed, as our souls are in the blood of Christ. "Buried with him. in sprinkling or pouring? Sprinkled in the likeness of his death?" Sheer nonsense. Buried by immersion? Immersed in the likeness or resemblance of his burial? Certainly. Now look at this argument. You can hunt it up in your English Bibles, and can understand it. If pouring and sprinkling can never be used where we find baptism, are they meanings of baptism; are they baptism? If immersion and immersion alone can be used, is not immersion alone baptism?

Let me again remove a little fog about the prepositions construed with baptism. We again repeat, that their plain and common-sense meaning is in, not at, out of, not away from, down into, not down at, up out of, not up away from. We will take them in this meaning, for

there is nothing in the context that requires any other; and when we do so, it makes nonsense of the conduct of Christ and his apostles in baptism, if it were pouring or sprinkling. Went down into the water to pour or sprinkle a little on their heads? Came up out of the water after such a farce? But we do go down into the water to immerse, and come up out of the water.

Contrast these plain, palpable arguments, drawn directly from the word of God, with the far-fetched assumptions and analogies of my opponent. Where is the argument, drawn from the word of God, that is not based merely on weak objections, seeming difficulties in the way of immersion, as if even if immersion is not the baptism, sprinkling and pouring must be.

#### MR. HUGHEY'S NINTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I am exceedingly sorry that circumstances are such that I can not reply to the gentleman's speech to-night. I like amusement in debate sometimes, and the review of his speech would furnish us a good evening's entertainment. But leaving the review, which I can go through with in about ten minutes in the morning, I will proceed with my affirmative argument.

I have given up the hope of making my opponent understand—he is such a poor learner—that we do not look upon sprinkle as equivalent to *baptizo*, and I can not get him to see that immerse is not equivalent to *baptizo*. I can not get him for the life of me to translate the passage "These two baptisms he poured forth from the wound of his pierced side." He does not think it would read well to say, "These two immersions he poured forth from the wound of his pierced side." For immersion will not pour very well. [Laughter.] Neither can I get him to translate the other examples which I have produced from the fathers again and again. And still he contends that these two terms are convertible! I have shown demonstrably that they are not convertible, and if he would translate *baptizo* immerse, in a great portion of the Greek language, he would make the most unpardonable nonsense.

However, I must proceed with my final argument, which is: The history of baptism shows that pouring and sprinkling were in common use in the earliest ages of the church—from the very days of the apostles.

Immersion was never regarded as essential to baptism in the early ages of the church; this all ecclesiastical history shows. It was never considered necessary to baptism by any sect of Christians until after the Reformation of the sixteenth century. And the further back we go, the nearer we get to the age of the apostles, the clearer the evidence becomes that the original mode of baptism was sprinkling or pouring. And when in after ages, in the third, fourth and following centuries, trine immersion became general, the validity of pouring and sprinkling was never called in question.

I have a few facts to present concerning the practice of the early church, which do not consist in the opinions of modern ecclesiastical

historians, such as Mosheim and Neander, but they are evidences furnished by those who lived in the early ages of the church, and who testify concerning the things which transpired in their day, and came under their own observation.

My first historical testimony is taken from the "Apostolic Fathers." I will quote from Hernias, and though he is supposed to have lived in the second century, still his testimony is good concerning the practice of the church in his day. In the similitudes of Hernias he represents the church as a tower built upon the water. He tells us how the tower was cleansed:

"Then these virgins [the builders] took besoms, and cleansed all the place around, and took away all the rubbish and threw on water: which being done, the place became delightful and the tower became beautiful."—Similitude ix. *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 399.

Here is a plain and manifest allusion to baptism by pouring or sprinkling.

In Similitude xi. of Hermas there is a supposed allusion to the mode of immersion; but this supposition is founded in a misapprehension of the similitude. Speaking of the apostles baptizing the spirits of the righteous who died before the coming of Christ he says:

"They, therefore, being dead, were nevertheless sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God. For before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is ordained unto death; but when he receives that seal he is freed from death, and assigned unto life. Now that seal is the water of baptism, into which men go down under the obligation unto death, but come up appointed unto life."—*Ibid* p. 408.

The stones coming up out of the water and entering into the building, were the righteous men who died before the coming of Christ; and their receiving the seal (baptism) in the water represents them as being baptized in the spirit world, where the apostles had gone for this purpose. There is no allusion here to immersion at all.

There is manifest allusion also to the mode of baptism by sprinkling in the epistle of Barnabas, when he compares the ministers of the gospel to the young men who sprinkled the water of separation upon the unclean. He says:

"But the young men that performed the sprinkling, signified those who preach to us the forgiveness of sin, and the purification of the heart, to whom the Lord gave authority to preach his gospel; being at the beginning twelve, to signify the tribes, because there were twelve tribes in Israel."—*Ibid* p. 244.

Now, in this passage the ministers of the gospel are compared to the young men who sprinkled the water of separation which Barnabas understood was a type of baptism. If this were a type of baptism, then baptism in Barnabas' days must have been by sprinkling.

I have already given you the testimony of Justin Martyr who calls baptism "the sprinkling with water" of Irenaeus, who calls it "the rain from heaven;" and Clement of Alexandria, who calls the hand-washings of the Jews baptism. All these date anterior to the first mention we have of immersion.

Tertullian, A. D. 200, is the first to mention immersion, and then

it is trine immersion; and he states it is "fulfilling somewhat more than our Lord has decreed in his gospel." TRADITION is the first authority for immersion!

The next fact I shall present to you I find in Schaff's Apostolic Church, taken from Robinson's Researches in Palestine. Schaff, p. 509. He says:

"Dr. Robinson further adduces s. c, and in his Biblical Researches in Palestine ii. 182; iii. 78, that the baptismal fonts found among the ruins of the oldest Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Cophna, are not large enough for the immersion of adults, and were evidently not intended for that purpose."

And these are the oldest that have yet been found, according to Robinson.

There is another fact which I wish to call your attention to in this connection and that is: There have been numerous pictures and engravings of baptism found in ancient baptisteries and churches, dating from the second to the tenth centuries, and every one of them represents baptism as performed by pouring—not one by immersion. How could an immersionist represent baptism by pouring? When the early Christians drew a painting or an engraving of baptism, they always represented it by pouring and not by dipping. Look at this picture [holding it up]. It is an engraving representing the baptism of the Saviour. Jesus is represented as standing in the water, and John the Baptist is pouring the water on his head. This picture was found in the baptistery in the catacomb of Pontianus, outside of the Portese gate at Rome, and dates back to the latter part of the first, or beginning of the second century, according to Taylor. The baptismal font in the chapel in the catacombs, where this representation of the Saviour's baptism was found, was a place dug out of the rock one foot deep and two feet long, while the engraving shows how the baptisms were performed in this subterranean retreat in the days of the early persecutions of the church.—See Capman, p. 125.

Here is another [holding it up before the audience"]. This is also a representation of the baptism of the Saviour, and John is pouring the water on his head.

"On the door at the church at Beneventum, one of the first cities of Italy where the gospel was preached, and Christianity was introduced, the original of this was beheld by all who entered. There it stood, continually teaching the old and the young how John baptized the Saviour. \* \* \* \* It is, says Taylor, extremely ancient."—Ibid. 127.

Here is another [holding it before the audience]. "This is a representation in mosaic of the baptism of Christ in Jordan, preserved in the church in Cosmodin, at Ravenna, which was erected A. D.401. Taylor. (Ibid. 129.) "Christ is in the water of Jordan. John stands on a rock, pouring water out of a *patera* (shell) on his head. The Holy Ghost, in the form of a dove, is emitting rays of glory and of grace."—Ibid. p. 129.

Here is another [holding it up]. This representation is the center-piece of the dome of the baptistery at Ravenna, which building was erected and decorated in 451. John the Baptist is drawn as

standing on the bank of the river, holding in his right hand a shell from which he pours water on the head of Christ, who is standing in the water. Over the Lord is a crown of glory, and the figure of a dove symbolizing the Holy Spirit.—Ibid. 131.

Here is another [holding it up]. Here Christ is not represented as standing in the water at all, but John is simply pouring the water on him, and the Holy Spirit is descending in the form of the dove. "This picture is taken from the church on the Ostiensis at Rome. The outside is a plate of brass covering a substance of wood. The figures are partly in relief, partly engraved. Some of the letters are inlaid with silver. The inscriptions are in Greek, with the motto, "BAHTICHC."

The door which it covers is dated 1070; but the plate is much older than the door; and from the letters, it is manifestly of Greek origin, and very ancient workmanship.—Taylor. (Ibid. 133.)

These pictures could easily be multiplied indefinitely. Charles Taylor furnishes us with thirteen of them, and he had seen over fifty of them; yet not one has been produced from antiquity representing the Saviour as baptized by immersion!

How, I ask in the name of reason, if immersion was the ancient and exclusive mode of baptism, did these ancient immersionists come to always represent the Saviour's baptism by pouring? The very fact that every picture or engraving of the Saviour's baptism which comes down to us from antiquity represents it as done by pouring, shows that in the early ages of the church it was the unanimous opinion of Christians that he was baptized by pouring. If this is not the case, on what ground can you account for this fact? For since the world began, no one holding the views of modern immersionists concerning the baptism of the Saviour, would ever represent it as done by pouring. Here we have the testimony of persons whom my opponent tells us were all immersionists, and they lived at a time when he tells us the whole church practiced immersion; yet when they give us a representation of baptism they always represent it as done by pouring! Here are admissions from immersionists that amount to something.

The enemies of baptism by affusion have never dared to meet this argument. They attempt to ridicule it, calling it the "picture argument," etc. I expect my opponent will pursue the same course, just as though a great part of the history of the world was not written in pictures. Now, these are things which can not be argued against, for they show us what the views of the early Christians were on the original mode of baptism.

There is one other fact to which I wish to call your attention. It is the fact that in the second and third centuries, during the heathen persecutions of the church, Eusebius, and other ecclesiastical writers of those early times, speak of the baptism of catechumens in prison and at the stake, sometimes expressly saying that they were baptized by pouring, and at other times speaking simply of their being baptized in prison, where immersion was wholly out of the question. Eusebius, speaking of one Bassilides, says:

"On this, the brethren gave him the seal in the Lord (that is

baptized him), and he bearing a distinguished testimony to the Lord was beheaded."—Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, p. 224.

Bassilides was in the prison when he was baptized, and Eusebius narrates this as a common occurrence.

Professor Stuart gives us two examples taken from the acts of St. Lawrence, showing that this custom was common.—See Stuart on Baptism p. 149.

Again, Eusebius, quoting from Clement of Alexandria, who in speaking of a certain backslider who was reclaimed by the Apostle John says:—"As if baptized a second time with his own tears."—Eusebius, p. 107.

Here the tears trickling down the backslider's face is called a baptism.

Eusebius, in his Panygeric on the Church of Tyre, while describing the various outer stations for the catechumens, and those who were not permitted to enter the church, and take part in the full worship of the sanctuary, in describing the arrangements for baptism, says:

"Here, too, he has placed the symbols of the sacred purification, by providing fountains, built opposite the temple (nave), which by the abundant effusion of its water, affords the means of cleansing to those that proceed to the inner parts of the sanctuary.—Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, pp. 416, 417.

Again he says, speaking of the same thing:

"Which buildings were erected by this our most peaceful Solomon, the founder of the temple, for those who require yet the purification and the sprinkling of water and the Holy Spirit."—Ibid. 418.

Here we find that in Eusebius' day, A. D. 315, baptism by affusion, baptism by sprinkling, was common in the church. This testimony is decisive as to the mode of baptism in Eusebius' time.

I wish now to read a number of passages from the early fathers, showing that pouring and sprinkling were commonly practiced in baptism:

Ambrose, A. D. 385, addressing persons baptized observes: "Ye received white garments that they might be an indication that ye have laid aside the garments of sin, and put on the chaste robe of innocence, concerning which the prophet said thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed. Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. For he who is baptized, both according to the law and according to the gospel, is made clean. According to the law, because Moses, with a bunch of hyssop, sprinkled the blood of a lamb." Chapman on Baptism, p. 233.

Here sprinkling with blood is called the baptism according to the law.

Lactantius, A. D. 320, says: "So also he—Christ—might save the Gentiles by baptism, that is, by the pouring on of the purifying dew." Ibid.

Nicephorus, speaking of the baptizer, and the person baptized, declares: "And he baptized him even upon his couch upon which he lay."—Ibid. 234.

Aurelius Prudentius, A. D. 390, some date 405, speaks thus: "Wor-



shiper of God, remember that thou didst go under the holy dews of the font and laver, in other words that thou wast sprinkled in baptism."—Ibid.

Aurelius Prudentius also represents John as baptizing by pouring, "*perfundit fluvio.*"

Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, says: "He [John Baptist] washes away the sins of believers (*infusis lymphis*) by the pouring of water." Ibid. 235.

Augustine, A. D. 400, says: "Unless wheat be ground and sprinkled with water, it can not come to that form which is called bread. So you also were first ground as it were by mystic exorcisms. Then was added baptism; ye were as it were sprinkled, that you might come to the form of bread."—Ibid.

Sulpicius Severus, A. D. 403, says: "Worshiper of God, remember that thou hast under the hallowed dew of the font and of the laver, being signed with the chrism." Baptism, by affusion, is here presented by the idea of descending dew.—Ibid. pp. 243, 244.

St. Cyril of Alexander, A. D. 424, says: "'And he will make the early and the latter rain come down upon you as of old, and the floors shall be filled with wheat and the presses shall overflow with wine and oil.' Joel ii. 24. There has been given to us as in rain that living water of holy baptism."—Ibid. 242.

"The Centuriators (quoting from Socrates, Lib. vii. chap. 17) tell us of a celebrated font, out of which (*baptizato aqua superfusa*) the water is poured from above on the baptized person."—Ibid. Socrates is dated A. D. 429.

Genadius, A. D. 495, says: "The person to be baptized makes confession of his faith before the priest; and when the interrogatories are put to him makes his answer. The same does a martyr before a heathen judge; he also makes confession of his faith, and when the question is put to him makes answer. The one, after confession is either wetted with water or else plunged into it; and the other is either wetted with his own blood, etc.

In the year 499, Clodovius, King of the Franks, was baptized by Remigius, Archbishop of Rheims, not by immersion but by pouring of water.—Ibid. 243.

The great Constantine was baptized by pouring and not by immersion.

St. Bernard, who was born 1091 A. D., thus speaks of the baptism of Christ: "The King of glory, the brightness of the light, and form of the substance of God is divested of his garments. The flesh which was taken from the virgin, and derived from a purer source, is made naked in the river, to be affused by the hands of the happy Baptist. The angels descend, and all the host of heaven hasten in reverence to their Creator. The ruling powers surround the baptizer and the baptized. A creature of a superior kind pours water on the head of the Creator, and a mortal right hand touches and moistens the head of God."—Ibid. 138, 9.

Here are testimonies that clearly set aside the idea of exclusive immersion, and although immersion was ordinarily practiced in many places, it was never considered essential to baptism. And all through

this long period of the prevalence of trine immersion, we find pouring and sprinkling spoken of and recognized as true apostolic baptism. And not only so, but all through this period the baptism of Christ is represented as having been done by pouring. There are other testimonies of the same character, but I have produced sufficient to establish my proposition. From the second down to the twelfth century we find these evidences scattered through every century, confirming my position. The gentleman tells us that the Greek Church practices immersion, and that they know what the word *baptizo* means. This is a great mistake. The Greek Church does not practice immersion; nor do those who now compose the Greek Church know any more about the meaning of *baptizo* than do those who compose the Latin and the Protestant churches. I will read the testimony of Dr. Nast, one of the most learned German scholars of the present time, and though he is a Methodist, his character as a scholar will not be questioned. I will read from his dissertation on baptism, found at the end of his commentary on Matthew, p. 651. He says:

"There is no historical testimony on record to prove that in the first centuries of the Christian era, baptism was administered exclusively by immersion. It is, on the contrary, very remarkable that a painting from the fourth or fifth century, when immersion was still the order of the day, represents Christ as standing in the water, while John pours water on his head from a bowl. In the same way, a painting of the baptism of Constantine the Great does not represent the emperor as being immersed, but as sitting in a basin while water is being poured upon his head. To this very day, baptism is administered by pouring, not only in the whole Greek Church, but also in the churches of Asia Minor."

Will you call this testimony in question? If so, I will read you the testimony of an eye-witness to the administration of baptism in the Greek Church, in Constantinople. Chapman on baptism, pp. 2t62, 263:

"I resided upward of three years in the capital of the Grand Seignor's dominions, in a Greek family of the first respectability. During that time I was present at four baptisms—two in the family and two in the immediate neighborhood. It is the custom among the Greeks, either to have their children baptized publicly in the churches or else in their homes; in which latter case, the parents invite the nearest relatives and neighbors; and after the ceremony, while refreshments are passed round, the father gives to each person present a token of witness-ship, consisting of a small piece of Turkish money, either of one *para* or five *paras*, through which a hole is pierced and a piece of narrow ribbon is inserted. I was thus invited to attend the four above-mentioned baptisms, and I still have in my possession two tokens. The other two may be seen in Mr. McDowell's Museum, in Danville, Ky.

"The company were all seated on the sofas round the room. A table stood in the middle of the room with a basin of water on it. The papa or priest was then sent for, who upon entering the room was received by the father of the infant, and led to the baptismal water, which he consecrated with a short prayer and the sign of the cross; then the mother presented to him her babe, which he laid on his left arm, and in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he thrice dipped his

hand into the water, and dropped some of it on the child's forehead, giving it a name. I may here remark that I never heard, during my stay in Constantinople, of adult baptism, nor of the ordinance being performed by immersion, in a single instance. Most generally infants are baptized in the churches. Before the altar stands a tripod holding a basin of consecrated water for baptism." This witness was a man of great learning and veracity.

"Rev. Mr. Bert, a Waldensian minister, informed Rev. J. E. Dwight, in 1825, that the Waldenses had always baptized their infants and had always done it by affusion."—*Ibid.*

So by going to the very sources of information we became convinced of the fact that baptism was anciently performed by affusion and not exclusively by immersion. Here we have all these testimonies, and they are but a tithe of what might be produced. I have given you examples from Justin Martyr of the second century, to St. Bernard in the twelfth, and we find perfect harmony running throughout the whole testimony of all these witnesses. I might have confined myself to the opinions of learned men, but I know that the value of their opinions would depend upon the evidences upon which they predicated their opinions. I have therefore gone to the sources of authority themselves, the testimony of the fathers; and the writers who lived in the very times concerning which they testify. I have given you numerous examples where immersion is absolutely excluded, where pouring or sprinkling must be the meaning of *baptizo*, and then I have presented the evidence of history, showing that pouring or sprinkling has ever been the practice of the church, and that immersion was never considered essential to Christian baptism until after the reformation of the sixteenth century by any body of Christians, Greek or Latin. These facts and evidences I have presented to you, so that you can form your own conclusion from them. It is not authority we want, but it is facts. Hum in authorities are worthless unless the opinions they express are founded upon facts. I have but little use for that kind of argument in debate. I want to have the facts presented, and then I can draw my own conclusions from these facts. I was surprised at my friend's speech, when he brought forward eighty-six learned men, who gave it as their opinion, that to "be buried by baptism" (Rom. vi. 4) meant immersion. Did my opponent answer my critical argument on that passage? No, he did not attempt it, but simply quoted the names of eighty-six men, who gave it as their opinion that the passage referred to the practice of immersion! Let him answer my argument and not give us human opinions.—(*Time expired.*)

MR. BRADEN'S NINTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will first notice what the gentleman has presented in his last speech. Notwithstanding I have often exposed it, he repeats the stale assertion that I have not translated all the passages he has brought forward, in which *baptizo* occurs. I have translated all that have been presented in the original Greek. He persists in thrusting at me passages already translated, and which have not a word of the original, and asks me to

translate them, endeavoring to deceive you into the supposition that the original is offered to me, and I decline to translate. There is not a word of the original given in the passage about the three immersions. It is a translation he is using, and doubtless one doctored to suit his purposes; just as he tampered with and perverted the passages where he represented the general as baptizing the shield, instead of baptizing or dipping his hand; and where he represented the soldiers as baptizing themselves from wine casks, instead of dipping with cups from wine casks. Here we had the original, and we exposed his perversions.

The gentleman is now ready to cry *eureka*, I have found it! Here is an argument in favor of pouring. He has twelve pictures showing how certain Roman Catholic painters, who lived one thousand years after Christ, painted his baptism. Yes, and I might bring pictures of saints, and of purgatory, and pieces of the true cross, and thousands of such shams. I could bring in pictures of immersion, but what does that amount to? But, says the gentleman, they are pictures painted in the days of the early church. One is from the door of a church on the Via Ostiensis, near Home. This church was founded in the days of the apostles. Suppose we grant all that. The door on which this was painted is dated A. D. 1070, and the picture can not be older than the door. This is his oldest picture. We all know, too, that five or six hundred years is as long as any picture can be kept with the best of care. Indeed, the paintings of Raphael, and the Italian masters, are preserved now only by continual restoration. In all his pictures we have merely the opinion of painters who were raised in the Catholic Church, after her corruption, and none of them within one thousand years of Christ. So much for his picture book. He might as well have introduced pictures from the nursery book—Mother Goose.

Next the case of the soldier. He was sealed in prison. There was a washing there, and the giving of the Lord's Supper. He assumes that baptism was the seal, and was called a washing, and as there was not water enough for immersion, it must have been sprinkling or pouring. Let us take the assumptions. It is assumed there was not in the prison or about it water enough for an immersion, a thing by no means certain. It is assumed that the washing was a baptism, another thing that no one but a Pedobaptist hunter of sprinkling would ever have thought. It is assumed that the seal of the soldier's confirmation was baptism, which I deny. It was the eucharist. Here we have a proof of sprinkling or pouring on these baseless assumptions?

He reads from Clement of certain persons being perfused, or poured upon, and after awhile in the same author of others being washed, and assumes that the acts are the same, and assumes that they refer to baptism. If he can find pouring, no matter for what purpose, and then baptism in another place in the same author, he assumes they are the same. Even were the passages right in the same context, it would not prove that perfusion and washing were the same, and were baptism. But the washing was an immersion, and while the perfusion had no reference to baptism, even if it had it would be no argument, for at that time pouring persons on sick beds was struggling for recognition as baptism; though if they recovered they had to be baptized or immersed.

He next assumes that the three immersions spoken of by Tertullian are one act, in violation of all common-sense. Why does he make such a gross assumption? For the purpose of claiming that when Tertullian speaks of performing somewhat more than the Lord commanded, he meant that immersion was more than the Lord commanded. I am sorry to have to say so, but the gentleman knew better when he was making the assertion. Tertullian says, "We immerse the candidate three times." How can that be one immersion? "We perform in so doing," that is in immersing three times, "somewhat more than the Lord commanded."

He next brings up the Waldenses, and attempts to impeach Jones' Church History. Rice did the same. It has since been clearly shown that the Waldenses in their confession presented to the French king, did say they practiced immersion as did the apostles. The circumstance brought up by Rice, was the act of a set of persons who had attempted a reformation of the Romish Church, and like many other Protestants they retained sprinkling. The confession of the Waldenses was just as Jones stated it, showing that the only pure church left at the time of the great apostasy retained immersion as the apostolic baptism.

My opponent reiterates his opinion in regard to the burial by baptism. We have already shown its gross absurdity. The baptism was a figure, not literal. A figure of the burial, which was a figure of the death of the old man—our sins, which was a figure of our ceasing to sin. A figure of a figure of a figure of a figure! But how are we buried with Christ? We are buried by baptism. "Buried with Christ. Then Christ is baptized with us, for we are buried with him or together." O perverseness! We are buried with him when we are baptized, just as Paul says we are crucified with him, just as we die with him when we throw off our sinful life. We have shown you that the common-sense of the church in all ages has understood the baptism here to be the ordinance, and a burial, and an immersion, because we are immersed when we are baptized as were the early Christians.

But the gentleman now appeals to history to sustain pouring and sprinkling. But the earliest allusion he finds to pouring, the first of these innovations, is no nearer than one hundred and fifty years to the times of the apostles, or nearly double the time the American people have been a nation. Go back one hundred and fifty years from this time. Generation after generation has passed away. What changes of government, laws, customs, and state of society. Great discoveries have been made, and were a man of those times to return now, he would scarcely recognize the earth as his former place of abode.

In like manner great changes had begun in the Christian Church at the period he finds his first references to pouring. Celibacy, purgatory, priestly power, and all the abominations of the Papal apostasy began then, and pouring and sprinkling were among them. I will now show you again that the early fathers immersed, and next that when pouring was introduced it was regarded as a change of the apostolic ordinance, and excused only on grounds of necessity.

Barnabas, the companion of Paul, says, "Blessed are they who put

their trust in the cross and descend into the prater. We go down into the water full of sins, but come up again bringing forth fruit." They went into the water in the days of Paul. They were immersed.

Hernias, also contemporary with Paul, Rom. xvi. 14: "The apostles went therefore into the water with them and again came up."

Justin Martyr: "They (the candidates) are led by us where there is water, and are born again in that kind of new birth, in which we ourselves were born again. For upon the name of (rod the Father and Lord of all, and of Jesus Christ our Saviour, and of the Holy Spirit, the immersion in water is performed."

*Mr. Hughey*—Does not the gentleman know that *baptizo* does not occur in that passage?

*Mr. Braden*—He is describing a baptism, and he calls it an immersion. That is the point I am making now. He says it is a *katadusis*, the very word the gentleman says means immersion.

Clement of Alexandria: "You are led to a bath as Christ was led to a sepulcher, and were thrice immersed to signify his three days' burial."

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, about the year 257, or two hundred years after Christ, gives the first mention of pouring. Magnus asks him whether those who were only poured could be called baptized. Now how easy to say, "Yes, for the apostles poured." But he answers: "You ask, dear son, what I think of those who in sickness receive the sacred ordinance, whether, since they were not washed (*loti*) in the saving water, but only have it poured upon them, they are to be considered right Christians. In the saving sacraments, when necessity obliges and God grants his indulgence, abridgments of divine things will confer the whole on believers."

Now observe he calls pouring an abridgment of the ordinance, and only tolerated when sickness compelled it as a necessity. Thus does the gentleman's first authority speak of pouring. Now for the first recorded case of sprinkling. Cornelius, Bishop of Home, 250, or two hundred years after Christ, says: "Novatian fell into a grievous distemper, and it being supposed he would die immediately, he received baptism, being sprinkled with water on the bed whereon he lay, if that can be called baptism." Again a case of necessity, and Cornelius plainly denies that it was baptism. Such persons were denied office because their baptism was not valid.

Look now at the evidence. I have shown you how the fathers baptized. I might have quoted over forty more, ranging from the time of Paul to the fifth century, all positively declaring they immersed. I gave you in a former speech their names and declarations, I will now give you the declarations of our best historians on the origin of pouring and sprinkling. They are Pedobaptists in practice and belief, and can have no motive for misrepresentation in my "favor. Candor compelled them to speak the truth and against pouring and sprinkling. My opponent attempts to set them aside as mere opinions, but he owes all he knows of church history to these men. Take them out of his hands and he would be as ignorant of church history as a Hottentot.

We begin with Mosheim, the highest authority in ecclesiastical

history, and a book now published and indorsed by the Methodist Book Concern: "Jesus himself established but two rites, which it is not lawful for man to alter or abrogate, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In the first century baptism was administered in the most convenient places, by immersing the candidate in water. In the second century the candidates were immersed wholly in water. In the fourth century baptisteries were erected in the porches of the temples, and the candidates were baptized by immersion."

Neander.—"In respect to the form of baptism, it was in comport with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, by immersion."

Robinson.—"The administration of baptism by sprinkling was first invented in Africa in favor of clinics, or bedridden people."

Venema.—"Immersion was one of those acts that were considered essential to baptism, nevertheless sprinkling was used in the last moments of life on such as were clinics."

Edinburgh Encyclopedia.—"The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: The Monks of Cressy in France asked Pope Stephen whether baptism performed by pouring or sprinkling would be lawful. He declared it would. But it was not till A. D. 1311 that the Council at Ravenna declared immersion to be indifferent."

We might go on and read pages of such statements had we time, but will merely sum up our conclusions and name our authorities.

I. Immersion alone was the apostolic and primitive custom. No other was established and sanctioned by divine authority. So say Mosheim, Knapp, Cyprian, Venema, Calvin, American Encyclopedia, Salmasius, Valesius, Wall, Petronius, Cheyne, Floyer, Chamierius.

II. Pedobaptists say men have changed the ordinance from immersion to pouring and sprinkling without authority from God. So say Robinson, Knapp, Cyprian, Calvin, Stillingfleet, Prof. Stuart, Fritsche, Geiseler, Wall, Bishop Smith, Grotius, Turretin, Storer, Matthies, Dr. Johnson, Wetham, Petronius, Burnett, Floyer and Chamierius.

III. Pouring was first permitted in Africa by Cyprian, as a substitution for immersion in case of clinics, or those who were on beds at the point of death, but as an abridgment, or change of the ordinance. So say Cyprian, Venema, Monks of Cressy, and Pope Stephen, Salmasius, Valesius and Petronius.

IV. Sprinkling was after this adopted as a more convenient action, and pouring and sprinkling were used for a long time only for the sick. So say Knapp, Robinson, Venema, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Monks of Cressy and Pope Stephen, Encyclopedia Britannica, American Encyclopedia, Salmesius, Valesius, Baronius, Rheinwald, Neander, Winer, Von Coln, Eusebius, Geiseler, Du Fresne, Wall, Smith, Hamelius, Burnett.

V. Pouring and sprinkling came into use very slowly, and not till the Council of Ravenna, in A. D. 1311 were they placed equal to immersion. So say Brenner, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Venema, Basnage, Prof. Stuart and Wall.

Look at this tremendous array of authority,—all Pedobaptist authority, too. Do they not tell the truth? If these men with their Pedobaptist prejudices, have, by examining history, reached such

conclusions, are they not correct? They are the teachers of this man. He owes all he knows about this subject, historically to them. Consider also that these men in writing histories and encyclopedias had no motive to misrepresent, and had they done so would have been easily detected. Are pouring and sprinkling then apostolic baptism?

We will not take up the Greek Church practice. My opponent appeals to a few cases of churches which have been corrupted by contact with the Catholic and Protestant churches. We will offset to them universal practice and early history.

Deylingius—who spoke from observation—says: "The Greeks retain the rite of immersion till this day."

Buddeus.—"That the Greeks defend immersion is manifest, which Ludolphus tells us, is the practice of the Ethiopian Church."

Venema.—"The Greeks immerse the whole man in water."

Wall.—"All the Christians of Asia and Africa and the Greek Church of Europe practice immersion."

Prof. Stuart.—"The Oriental Church has continued to preserve the mode of baptism by immersion down to this day. They call the members of the Western Church "sprinkled Christians," in ridicule and contempt. They say baptism by sprinkling is as great a solecism as immersion by sprinkling. They claim the honor of having preserved the ancient rite free from corruption which would destroy its significance."

I think the testimony of these men will settle the matter as well and far better than the letters of men who have seen only a few churches corrupted by contact with sprinkling churches.

As the practice of the early Latin Church has been questioned, I will read from their rubric:

"Then let the priest baptize with a trine immersion, invoking the name of the Holy Trinity, once only saying—

"I baptize thee in the name of the Father' (and let him immerse him once), 'and of the Son' (and let him immerse him the second time), 'and of the Holy Spirit' (and let him immerse him the third time)."

This settles the practice of the old Latin Church. Tertullian, the great father in this church, says of the commission given to the apostles: "And last of all commanding that they should immerse them into the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit."

Now let me ask you to weigh well all these things. We can give the first instance in which pouring was mentioned, and show it was challenged as not being baptism; and was acknowledged by its apologist to be an abridgment or a change of the ordinance. We have given you the first instance of sprinkling, and read and shown you that it was denied to be baptism by the bishop who mentions it. We have quoted from the fathers, my friend's greatest refuge, and shown you that they declared themselves they immersed, went down into the water, and came up out of the water, in imitation of the burial and resurrection of our Saviour and of his example.

We will now call your attention to the last argument we shall present against pouring and sprinkling, viz: the absurd objections offered against immersion. The attempt is made to urge difficulties



that seem to be in the way of immersion, and then conclude that because some objections can be urged against immersion, of course pouring and sprinkling must be baptism; like the man who attempted to rebut the positive testimony of five witnesses who saw him commit the crime, by the testimony of a thousand that they did not see him do it. One tells you that it is too cold in this country; another that it is not decent. The Son of God commanded an indecency! Another that so many persons could not be immersed; another "don't see how John could immerse so many." About as easily as he could pour or sprinkle them. But then he had a bush and flirited water on them, or a squirt and squirted water on the multitudes! A poet thus hits off this idea:

"The Jews in Jordan were baptized,  
*Ergo* ingenious John devised  
 A scoop or squirt, or some such thing,  
 With which some water he might fling  
 Upon the long extended rank  
 Of candidates that lined the bank.  
 Be careful, John, some drops may fall,  
 From your rare instrument on all.  
 But point your engine, nevertheless,  
 To those who first their sins confess,  
 Let no revilers in the crowd,  
 The holy sprinkling be allowed.  
 'Die Baptist had not time, we dream,  
 To dip the people in the stream!"

Again, there was not water enough to immerse three thousand. A city with ten or twelve large pools or ponds covering in the aggregate fifteen or sixteen acres; a city where often two millions and over of people lived for days, and there was not water enough to immerse three thousand! There is not a sensible person in the house who for a moment believes such stuff.

My opponent has labored for five mortal hours to prove pouring and sprinkling. What author or lexicon has he quoted who dares to say *baptizo* can mean sprinkle or pour? What sentence has he found where it can be so rendered? What passage of scripture has he quoted that you can now name that supports such position? What history has he quoted to prove that apostolic baptism was either pouring and sprinkling? Not one that he can now name or you can mention.

His argument is all to show that baptism can not be always immersion. It perhaps may be something else, therefore it is pouring and sprinkling. He has in no instance brought up an argument that fairly met the issue. After granting his premises, his conclusion was a mere inference, or may-be-so. His favorite quotations are such as the soldier in jail. It is assumed that the seal and washing were baptism, when there was not a scrap of evidence. It is assumed there was not water enough in the jail to immerse the soldier. All mere assumptions. What can not be found in that way? Where he finds baptism contrasted with heathen sprinklings he assumes the act must have been the same. By such inferences, far-fetched analogies,

and such barefaced assumptions does he attempt to determine the meaning of a plain, positive command of God.

Now I would, for my own benefit like to know of any one who can name a passage of scripture adduced by my opponent that clearly and plainly sustains pouring and sprinkling?

[A voice near the door—"Name one for immersion."]

Mr. Braden—Yes, sir, I have shown that the word means immerse, and when baptism is spoken of it can only mean immersion. Again, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, we are said to be buried in baptism. We are buried in immersion. We are not in pouring and sprinkling. Hence it means immersion, and not pouring and sprinkling. Again we go down into the water to immerse. We come up out of the water after immersion. We never go down to the water to pour, or sprinkle or pour. The Saviour and his disciples went down into the water and came up out of the water. Hence they immersed; they never poured or sprinkled. There are several such passages. Again, immersion can be substituted for baptism. Hence it is a meaning or rendering of baptism. Pouring and sprinkling can not be substituted. Hence they are not baptism. Contrast these plain, palpable arguments with the far-fetched assumptions, inferences, and quibbles of my opponent, and judge in which the truth lies.

Now I hope my friend will give us one plain scripture, one positive "thus saith the Lord," on which you can rest your faith. Certainly if pouring and sprinkling are baptism—scriptural baptism

---

it must be found in the scriptures. Again, I will make this offer: if half the passages where *baptizo* occurs can have the rendering pour and sprinkle—can by any means have such a rendering—I will admit the validity of such baptisms. But on the contrary there is not one where it can have such a rendering. I can render it by immerse, and in nine cases out of ten it must have such rendering. In the balance the action must be immersion. Hence baptism is immersion. If it makes nonsense of the word of God to translate *baptizo* by pour and sprinkle, *baptizo* can not be pour and sprinkle. That is plain. If it makes sense and is demanded by the context to translate baptize immerse, it must mean immerse.

Now if a man so able, so learned, and so experienced in discussing this very question has had to work so hard, and not get beyond mere inference; if he has had to ask for more time, when he had already spent two days, what must be the nature of his position? If so small a man as he considers me, so weak a disputant as he has for months and repeatedly called me, has been able to bring up so much that with all his ability, skill and experience he has been unable to shake,—then is not my position right? Why, we were assured I could not stand before this Ajax two days. At the expiration of two days he calls for more time, and leaves the matter worse to-night than it was this afternoon. I am glad he did so. It gave me an opportunity to elaborate into crushing proportions what I had to merely state this afternoon. Think of these things, and come back to-morrow morning ready to weigh the summary of arguments, and decide, as sensible men and women, where the truth of God's word stands.

THURSDAY MORNING, August 20.—10 A. M.

MR. HUGHEY'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I arise before you this morning to close the discussion on my part on the first proposition. I shall first give a brief review of the gentleman's speeches last evening, and then, in the little time that will be left, I will sum up, as well as I can, my arguments as I have presented them. There are some points which I wish to notice in the gentleman's first speech, which I think I can dispose of in ten minutes; his second speech I can review in ten minutes more, and there will then remain forty minutes for summing up my own argument.

You will remember that I proved to you that the Greeks, when they wished to express the specific action of immersion, used not *baptizo*, but *duoo* or *kataduoo* (which is only a compound formed of the same word), or some word of that family. When they speak of baptism as accomplished, whether by immersion or by sprinkling, they use the word *baptizo*. The point I here proved was, that *baptizo* does not express the specific action of putting into water or immersion; and why?—Because when the Greeks wished to express that specific action they used another word, *kataduoo*; and when they speak of the thing done, whether by sprinkling or immersion, they called it baptism. I thus showed that *baptizo* does not express the specific action of dip; and if the Greeks are to be judges of their own language, it is not the specific word to express that specific action in their language.

But he tells us in regard to Christ "going away from the water," which I quoted from his own translation, that "he went out of the Jordan; that he was baptized in the Jordan." Suppose I admit that he was baptized in the Jordan; does this prove that he was immersed in the Jordan! Certainly not. It simply gives us the place where he was baptized. I have baptized persons in the river and baptized them by pouring. I have given you some examples from the practice of the ancient church, and I will give you others, where persons were baptized in the water and yet baptized by pouring. It is uniform when the manner of John's baptism is spoken of, that it is with and not in water. In Jordan, gives you the place, and with water gives you the manner or mode of John's baptism. It will not do to say that the preposition *en* is not used in the sense of locality, simply in the one instance, and of instrument in the other; for every scholar knows that such is the case. John baptized with, not in water, it matters not where the baptism was performed.

But he told us that "*en* Bethabara" meant "at Bethabara." It does not mean in the house; it means at or near by the house! Now if "*en* Bathabara" means "at or near by Bathabara," "*en* Jordan" means "at or near by Jordan." If to be baptized "*en* Bethabara" means to be baptized "at Bethabara," then to be "baptized "*en* Jordan" means to be "baptized at Jordan." Christ was then baptized at or near by the Jordan, and then the gentleman's own translation informs us "he walked away straightway from the water."

But then I told you that the preposition *eis* in connection with *katabainoo* signifies descent to a point, and that this was the exact

form of expression the Greeks used to express descent to a point and not into it. This position I abundantly demonstrated from Prof. Stuart whose authority as a critical scholar Mr. Braden will not call in question.

I did not say that *eis* always signifies to or at, but I was speaking of the accuracy of the Greek language in this construction. They went down to the water, they descended from the chariot, and while they were at the water, Philip baptized the eunuch. But all the circumstances of this baptism show that it was not the custom for both parties to go to the water at all. The peculiar circumstances attending this case, and the minuteness which it is related, prove this to be true; for if it were the universal custom for both parties to go down to the water, as is the case in immersion, why mention it at all in this case? Can the gentleman give any reason for it?

But the gentleman tells us he takes it as it reads. Well, so do I when it reads right. But in a critical investigation of the word of God, I am not going to stand by any translation, when I am able to go to the original. When we are making a critical examination of the word of God we have a right to go the standard itself—the original. This is what the gentleman does and I intend to do the same. I will "take it as it reads," when it reads right, and that is just what my opponent proposes to do, and that is just what any man ought to do when he is making a critical examination of the scriptures and trying to find out the real meaning of the word of God.

My opponent reiterates the assertion that in my examples of the usage of *baptizo*, taken from the fathers, no reference is made to Christian baptism. You will remember that I told you that many of these examples did not refer to Christian baptism; but many of them do; and that my intention was simply to show the use the fathers made of the word *baptizo*. I showed by numerous examples from thorn that they used the word to express acts of sprinkling; that they called sprinkling baptism; and, therefore, according to the usage of the fathers *baptizo* does not express the specific action of dipping. Does not my friend see the point now? Of course he can not fail to see it. I brought these examples to show the use of the word. It does not matter whether they refer to the Christian ordinance or not. They give the use the fathers made of the word. My friend's course in regard to these examples reminds me of the ostrich when it is about to be captured. It runs its head into the sand, and thinks by this means it hides its whole body. [Laughter.] So my friend when he gets pressed says that I have not brought forward any passages which allude to Christian baptism, and he thinks he hides his whole system by thus sticking his head in the sand! [Laughter.] But it is a fatal delusion in both instances.

All the circumstances connected with the baptism on the day of Pentecost are against immersion. This I have shown you from Dr. Schaff, an author whom my opponent will not call in question. It is notorious that all the water fit for the purpose of immersion in Jerusalem was in the hands of the enemies of the apostles. The pools and reservoirs, the place where water could be obtained, were appropriated to supply the ordinary wants of the people, and how, under these circumstances, could it have been possible to have immersed three thousand

persons on the day of Pentecost? In this, and other instances that I have named, all the circumstances and probabilities are against the idea of immersion and not in favor of it; while in some of them, immersion is wholly out of the question.

I wish, in this place, to say one word more in regard to the baptism of the Israelites. The gentleman now tells us, that the baptism by the cloud and by the sea were one and the same thing. He tells us that the cloud was over the people and that the wall of water stood upon either side of them, and they were thus figuratively immersed. But I showed from the history of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, that "the cloud went behind them before they entered the sea, and remained there during the passage of the sea." I showed you that the cloud was not over them at all while they were in the Red Sea. And yet they were under the cloud when they were baptized by the cloud. The preposition *en* is not here used in the sense of locality, but as expressing the instrument as my friend very well knows. The cloud was the instrument by which the baptism was performed. The baptism by the cloud was not at the same time of the baptism by the sea. They were under the cloud at the foot of Sinai when they were baptized by it. But the baptism by the sea was not an immersion. It was merely a deliverance of the children of Israel by their passage through the sea from the power of their enemies. Paul declares that they were thus "baptized into Moses by the cloud, and by the sea." I will now notice the argument drawn from Bom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12. You will remember that in presenting this argument, I read to you from Prof. Moses Stuart, because he expressed my own views and is also good authority with my friend. Now bear in mind, that in Romans the genitive of instrument is used. Baptism is not the burial. The baptism is one thing and the burial is another thing. The baptism is the agent by which the burial is effected. In Colossians it is the dative of instrument that is used. Into what is the individual buried? Buried with him by baptism into water? Is that the language? Buried with him into baptism into death? What death? Into the death of Christ. We are buried by baptism into his death. The antithesis of this burial is a resurrection unto newness of life, and the antithesis shows the burial is a spiritual one, and not a physical one at all.

Again, we are told we are planted (by baptism) in the likeness of Christ's death, not in the likeness of his burial, but in the likeness of his death. What likeness is there between the death of Christ on the cross, and the plunging of a man into the water? Just none at all. Again, we are said to be crucified with Christ (all by or through baptism). What resemblance is there between crucifixion and immersion? The burial here is not a physical, but a moral or spiritual one. The resurrection standing in antithesis to the burial, proves that the passage has no reference to immersion whatever; that modal action was not in the mind of the apostle. Baptism imports a death to sin; it imports newness of life, and baptism is here said, instrumentally and symbolically, to bury us into the benefits of Christ's death. The burial and resurrection here are not two states, but are different figures to represent the same state. The burial and resurrection are coexistent.

The burial into Christ is the resurrection to newness of life; there is no raising of the buried person out of the element into which he is buried; he remains in that state. What was the gentleman's reply to this argument which I conceive to be wholly unanswerable? Did he attempt to meet it at all? No! but he proceeded to read the names of some eighty-six persons, who were of the opinion the passage referred to immersion! But it is merely the opinion of these individuals after all. I could, if I wished to, produce as many names to sustain my interpretation of the scripture, as he can; what would they all be worth? Nothing at all. I do not know that all the names the gentleman has read agree with him in the interpretation of these passages of scripture. He read Dr. A. Clarke's name; but Dr. Clarke does not agree with my friend on Rom. vi. 4. He says: "I say it is probable that the apostle alludes to the mode of immersion; but it is not absolutely certain that he does so, as some do imagine;" etc. But Dr. Clarke, in his comment on Titus iii. C, says: "Which he poured out on us; as the water was poured out on them in baptism, to which there is here a manifest allusion." Perhaps many of the names read by my opponent, if we had their testimony here, would testify as Dr. Clarke does on these passages. But then the opinion of these men amounts to nothing. So far as the point in controversy is concerned, the appeal is to the word of the Lord and not the opinions of men. When I asked my friend for his authority for immersion, he could not find it in the word *baptizo*, for it is not there. He then gave this passage of scripture, Rom. vi. 1—6 as his authority; and I venture to assert that if you were to ask nine-tenths of those who practice immersion, for their authority for this practice, they would refer you to this passage. The figurative or symbolical import of baptism in this passage is their authority, after all, for their practice of immersion. They may attempt to base it on the specific meaning of the word *baptizo*. but I have shown clearly and demonstrably it has no such specific meaning. I have also showed demonstrably that the passages in Rom. vi. 1—6, and Col. ii. 12, have no reference whatever to immersion, but only to the symbolical import of baptism. Where then, I ask, is the authority for immersion?

The gentleman next brought forward his "table of versions." That was not anything new to me. I have it right here in Alexander Campbell on Baptism, p. 137. He gives us thirty-seven different versions, ancient and modern; five of these translate *baptizo* by *amad* or *amada*, which we have seen signifies "to wash" in a general sense. Nine of them simply transfer the word *baptizo* which I have demonstrated does not have the specific meaning of immerse. Seven of them translate it by a word which signifies to cross, and the remainder translate it by a general term, a word which signifies to wash or cleanse without reference to mode. Not a single one of these "versions," translate the word *baptizo*, by the word specifically signifying to clip or immerse. Every one of them that translate it at all, translate it by a general term, signifying to wash in a general sense, or by a word signifying to cross. Mr. Chapman, whose work I hold in my hand, traces out the meaning of these various terms employed to translate *baptizo* in these different "versions," and shows that in every single instance they trans-

late it by a general term, which expresses the thing done, without specifying the manner of doing it. The "versions" all agree with me.

I come now to "the picture-argument." Mr. Braden told us that these pictures—the oldest of them—only date back to the tenth century. I am astonished, I must confess, that any one should make such a reckless assertion. It has rarely been my lot to debate with a man so reckless in his assertions. The gentleman told us that the oldest of these was taken from the church on the Ostiensis at Rome, and that it was on a door bearing the date 1070. The picture is upon a plate of brass on the door but is much older than the door. I have that picture here. [The speaker showed the picture.] Some of the pictures I showed you date many centuries earlier than this. Here is one [holding it up] which was taken from the dome of the Baptistery at Ravenna, which building was erected and decorated in 454. That is a little older than 1070! You will see that John is represented as administering the baptism by pouring, while Christ is standing in the water. Here is another [showing it] taken from a church in Ravenna which was erected in 401, and said by Mr. Taylor to be extremely ancient. Here is another still more ancient which is taken from the door of a church at Beneventum, one of the first cities in Italy, where the gospel was preached and Christianity introduced. The original was beheld by all who entered the church. Look at it, if you please. Taylor says it is extremely ancient also. Now I turn back again to the oldest representation of the Saviour's baptism that has yet been found, and it dates back to the early part of the second century. It was found in the "Chapel of the Baptistery in the catacomb of Pontianus, outside the Portese gate at Rome." It was exhumed by Ciampini, at the beginning of the present century, after a burial of centuries. The Baptistery in which it was found was used for the purpose of baptism in the days of the heathen persecutions of the church, and it consequently takes us back to the earliest ages of the church. Christ is represented as standing in the water, you see, while John is standing on the bank, pouring water on his head. "But how do you know," says one, "that these pictures or engravings are of such ancient date?" The antiquarian can tell you the very century in which a painting or engraving was made, from the character of the workmanship. The state of the art in the different ages is perfectly understood by those who have made it a study, and by this means the true date of all these engravings and paintings can be determined as accurately as the date of manuscripts in the ancient languages can, by the state of the language at the time the manuscript was written. These paintings and engravings form an important part of the history of the church, by illustrating the customs and manners of the early ages. And yet my opponent would have you believe that the universal practice of the early church was immersion! How under heaven did it happen that these immersionists always represented Christ as being baptized by pouring? When men picture a thing, they always picture it according to their idea of the thing. Why did not these ancient Christians, whom my friend tells always practiced immersion, represent Christ as being baptized by immersion? Simply from the fact that they understood that Christ was baptized not by dipping, but that he was baptized by pouring, as I showed you by

indubitable evidence from the fathers last night, harmonizing exactly with the representations of the Saviour's baptism.

But the gentleman told us that the soldier baptized in prison, as related by Eusebius, was only sealed and not baptized! I ask the gentleman, if in the ancient church baptism was not called "a seal," or "the seal in the Lord?" In the passage we both read from Hernias, baptism is called the "seal of the Son of God." This seal was the seal of baptism. Mr. B. knows that by the seal baptism is meant here, and that the person had no chance of being immersed in the prison. He knows it was the custom of the ancient church to baptize persons thus when there was no opportunity of immersing them as was sometimes the case with catechumens at the stake, and that numerous examples of this character can be found.

The gentleman asserted that I misrepresented Tertullian. Tertullian says: "We are immersed three times, fulfilling somewhat more than our Lord in the gospel commands." Mr. Braden says that Tertullian meant that the two extra dips were more than "our Lord in the gospel commands;" but what authority has he for this statement? I say Tertullian meant "the three extra dips," that he meant immersion was "fulfilling somewhat more than our Lord in the gospel commands." I challenge the gentleman to show a single case of immersion before the time of Tertullian, A. D. 200; and with the first mention of immersion we have the acknowledgment, it is "more than our Lord requires in the gospel!" Tertullian never heard of the single dip in baptism. All the immersion he knew anything about was trine immersion, or three dips and the candidate naked as Adam and Eve before the fall. Yet Tertullian was acquainted with sprinkling in baptism, for he calls sprinkling baptism.

The gentleman tells us the first account we have of sprinkling was two hundred years after the birth of Christ. The first account the gentleman can find of immersion is in the age of Tertullian, A. D. 200. Mr. Fanning, President of the Franklin Institute, Tenn., in his debate with Mr. Chapman, in Lebanon, Tenn., in 1850, admitted that "outside of the New Testament there was not a case of immersion to be found inside of the first two hundred years of the Christian era!" And A. Campbell, in his "Christian System," p. 220, states that the passages, which my friend has brought forward from Barnabas and Hermas, and which I have shown have no reference to immersion, are the only passages where immersion is spoken of in the writings of the apostolic fathers; and he finds no case of immersion until the days of Tertullian, when we have three dips, "fulfilling somewhat more than our Lord in the gospel requires." The truth is, there is no such thing as immersion to be found inside of the first two hundred years of the Christian era. The nearest he can come to immersion is the passage in the epistle of Barnabas (which is a spurious document, written in the second century, not by the companion of the apostle of the Gentiles, but by some converted Jew who wished to give currency to his writings. This fact Mr. Braden knows), where the person is said to "go down to the water (*katabainomen eis to hudoor*) full of sin and filth; but ascend (*ana bainomen*) with fruit and benefit in their hearts." But I proved by Prof. Stuart that *eis* with *katabainoo*



does not signify into, but simply to the place; so this passage fails him, while Barnabas, as I showed you, gives us, in another place, unmistakable allusion to sprinkling in baptism.

The gentleman tells us that where we first find sprinkling mentioned, we find all the mummeries of the Church of Rome. Is not this, too, where we first find immersion? Read Tertullian's account of baptism, and you will find all these Catholic mummeries connected with immersion. I have read a passage from Justin, who wrote seventy years before Tertullian, in which he calls baptism "the sprinkling with water." This passage from Justin, Mr. Braden has not noticed at all; he undertook to prove immersion by Justin, in the passage where he is describing baptism, and calls it "a washing with water," using the term *lavo*, which the gentleman knows does not mean to immerse, but to wash in any manner. I now call his attention to the passage from Justin, where he calls baptism "the sprinkling with water."

The gentleman told us last night that the Waldenses were immersionists. I read to you the statement of one of their own ministers, that they always baptized by sprinkling. How does he prove that they were immersionists? Why he says they were Anabaptists! What does anabaptist mean? It means "one who baptizes again." The Waldenses were no more immersionists than the Catholics; but when they received any one into their communion from the Catholic Church they baptized them again, not because they differed in the mode of administration, but because they held the Catholic Church to be the "Mystic Babylon," and because of her apostasy from the truth, they held she had no right to administer the sacraments of the church. This was the ground upon which they held Catholic baptisms invalid, and not because they reckoned nothing lawful baptism but immersion; and my friend Mr. B. knows it perfectly well. The word anabaptist, does not mean one who immerses, but one who baptizes again.

The gentleman tells us that sprinkling was unlawful, and not only that it was unlawful, but in the ancient church persons who were baptized by sprinkling when sick, were baptized again when they recovered.

*Mr. Braden*—The gentleman is mistaken. I was speaking of pouring in the case of Novatus.

*Mr. Hughey*—My understanding of the gentleman's remarks was that sprinkling and pouring were not considered lawful baptism, and that those who were baptized in this way when sick were immersed if they recovered. I am astonished that a man should make such an assertion with the facts of history before him!

Now, sir, I happen to have the epistle of Cyprian, to which Mr. Braden alluded in Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church, both in the Latin and the translation of King. After the passage which the gentleman read last night concerning the appeal of Magnus to Cyprian, in the same epistle Cyprian argues the validity of baptism by sprinkling, because such as had been baptized in this way when sick, were never baptized again if they recovered. He says:

"If any shall think that such have not obtained the grace of God, but are void and empty thereof, because they have been only

perfused with the saving laver, let not such then as have been so baptized deceive themselves; but if they recover their health, let them be baptized; but if they can not be baptized, as having been already sanctified with the ecclesiastical baptism, why then are they scandalized in their faith and in the mercy of God."—Lord King's Primitive Church, p. 222.

Here the fact that persons baptized by sprinkling when sick, were never rebaptized after their recovery, is plainly declared. This is here in the original, and the gentleman can read it if he desires. But the gentleman told us that Novatus was baptized again. I have the evidence to prove that he was not.

*Mr. Braden*—I said they refused to ordain him to the office of the priesthood.

*Mr. Hughey*—I can prove that this is also a mistake. You remember how the gentleman read: "If, indeed, it be proper to say that one like him did receive baptism," making the impression the manner of the baptism was the point of the objection. I will read you the paragraph from the epistle of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, which the gentleman quoted from, which is found in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, p. 266. He says:

"To him (Novatus), indeed, the author and instigator of his faith was Satan, who entered into and dwelt in him a long time. Who, aided by the exorcists, when attacked with an obstinate disease, and being supposed at the point of death, was baptized by aspersion in the bed on which he lay, if, indeed, it be proper to say that one like him did receive baptism. But neither when he recovered from disease, did he partake of other things, which the rules of the church prescribe as duty, nor was he sealed (in confirmation) by the bishop. But as he did not obtain this, how could he obtain the Holy Spirit?"

You see that the objection was not to the manner of the baptism, but to the character of the man. "If it be proper to say that one like him," not "one baptized like him."

*Mr. Braden* tells us they refused to ordain him to the priesthood; but they did ordain him to the priesthood. The point of objection was not the fact that he was sprinkled; but the suspicious character of sick-bed conversions, as I will prove to you by the twelfth canon of the Council of Neocesarea, held A. D. 314. That was the point of objection running through the entire passage. Novatian or Novatus was ordained, and afterward became the head of a sect. And though they objected on account of the suspiciousness of his faith, being baptized when he was sick, the point was not on the fact of his baptism "by aspersion," but the suspiciousness of sick-bed conversions. To prove this I will read you the canon referred to. It is found in Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 266:

"He that is baptized when he is sick ought not to be made a priest (for his coming to the faith is not voluntary, but from necessity), unless his diligence and faith do prove commendable, or the scarcity of men fit for the office do require it."

You will see from this that the only objection was the suspicious character of sick-bed conversions, for if his diligence and faith after

his recovery, proved his conversion genuine, the objection was obviated.

I come next to consider the practice of the Greek Church. Mr. Braden tells us still that the Greek Church practices immersion. His remarks make it necessary for me to turn again, and read to you the testimony of some witnesses, who are probably as competent to testify in regard to the practice of the Greek Church as any persons that can be found. I will read to you a description of the mode of baptism, as practiced by the Greek Church in the year 513, by Severus, Patriarch of Alexandria at that time. He says:

"The priest lets the person to be baptized down into the baptistery, looking to the east, and puts his right hand on his head, and with his left hand raises up the water thrice from the water in the font, behind, and at either of his sides, and says these words: 'N. is baptized in the name of the Father, amen; and of the Son. amen; and of the Holy Ghost, amen, for life eternal.'—Chapman on Baptism, p. 245.

You will see that the individual is in the baptistery, and is baptized by pouring, while he is in the baptistery.

Now I will turn to Seiss on Baptism, pp. 266, 267, and read to you the testimony of two more eye-witnesses in regard to the practice of the Greek Church: "The Rev. Pliny Fisk, missionary to Palestine some years ago, says: 'I went one morning to the Syrian church to witness a baptism. \* \* \* \* When ready for the baptism, the font was uncovered, and a small quantity, first of warm water, then of cold was poured into it. The child, in a state of perfect nudity, was then taken by the bishop, who held it in one hand, while with the other he anointed the body with oil. He then held the child in the font, its feet and legs being in the water, and with his right hand he took up water and poured it on the child, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'"—Memoirs of Fisk, p. 357.

The Russian wing of the Greek Church practices baptism in the same way:

"Dr. B. Kurtz, in his first tour through Europe, in 1825, says: 'We ourselves once witnessed the baptism of an infant in the great cathedral of St. Petersburg, by pouring.'"

And so Deylingius, as quoted in Booth's *Pedobaptism Examined*, says: "The Greeks at this day practice a kind of affusion."—*Ibid.*

Such is the practice of the Greek Church, and such was the practice in A. D. 513. Indeed, I regard this testimony, and the argument concerning the practice of the Greek Church as perfectly conclusive.

I will now proceed to a brief recapitulation of my argument. I started out to prove the proposition: "The scriptures teach that pouring or sprinkling water upon proper persons in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is scriptural baptism."

During this discussion I have labored under the difficulty of having to occupy both the affirmative and the negative. This has given me a great deal more labor, and consumed a great deal more time than would otherwise have been necessary; as it was absolutely necessary that I should remove the rubbish of error before I proceeded to build the superstructure of truth.

I started out with the statement that our Saviour and his apostles used the word *baptizo* in the sense in which it was used by the Jews, who spoke the Greek language in the time of their ministry.

I showed you that this is the rule by which we are to determine the meaning of words, by Dr. Carson and Dr. George Campbell; that present use is the sole arbiter of the meaning of language at the present time, and in determining the meaning of a word used in the time of our Saviour, we must find out what was the meaning of that word, as used by the Jews, for two or three hundred years before, and by the Christians for two or three hundred years after, the Christian era. I took this usage, and gave you a great many examples to show that *baptizo* did not have the specific meaning to dip, because the whole system of immersion rests upon this single position—that *baptizo* specifically and only signifies to dip or immerse. You might talk to an immersionist till doomsday about the mode of baptism, but until you prove to him that *baptizo* has not the specific meaning of to dip or immerse, it would all be a waste of time. They have been so accustomed to look upon these terms as synonymous, that it is absolutely necessary to remove this false impression from their minds, before you can make any impression upon them whatever. In carrying out my argument, I first took up the scripture's usage of *baptizo*, where the Christian ordinance of baptism is not spoken of.

My first example was the passages in Mark vii. 3, and Luke xi. 38, where washing before eating is spoken of. In Mark *nipto* is used, and in Luke *baptizo* is used, showing that these words are interchangeable. In the one instance the Pharisees "murmured that the disciples had not washed their hands (*nipsontai*) before eating." In the other they "marveled that he (Christ) had not first washed (*ebaptisthe*) before dinner." This washing before eating, here called baptism, was performed by simply washing the hands. This I proved by a quotation from Clement of Alexandria, who testifies that "this was the custom of the Jews, to be baptized often in this way (by washing their hands) upon their couches." That is before and after eating.

2. I showed you that the baptism of beds, or *klinoon* (Mark vii. 4), precludes the possibility of immersion. While it was possible to immerse cups and pots, to immerse the beds, as these beds were often made, was impossible. I proved that these *klinoon* were often a kind of elevation of the floor or platform around the sides of the room, and therefore they could not be immersed. Bear in mind these *klinoon* were the bedsteads, not the beds or mats upon the steads, and, while it was often impossible to immerse them, yet they were baptized! Here immersion is wholly out of the question.

3. I showed you that all the Jewish purifications were called by Paul (Heb. ix. 10) baptisms, and that most of these purifications, or baptisms, were simple sprinklings. If there was a general washing required, in connection with the sprinkling, as in some cases, it was not an immersion, and that not one single personal immersion was required by the law of Moses. I showed you also that the usage of the Septuagint and the Apochrypha was the same as in these examples. That when a man was "baptized from a dead body," or purified from a dead body, it was done by sprinkling, and probably a

general washing, also; but the sprinkling was the principal, the essential part of the baptism or purification. I showed you from these Jewish baptisms, or lustrations, that *baptizo* can not have the specific meaning of to dip. Here the argument was conclusive.

4. I took up the case of the baptism of the Israelites "by the cloud and by the sea," and I showed you they were not immersed in the sea. I showed you that they were not immersed by the cloud; but I showed you that they were baptized by the cloud, by the rain falling upon them, and confirming them unto Moses, which Paul calls a baptism unto Moses. These examples show the import of the term *baptizo* in scripture usage where the Christian ordinance is not spoken of.

5. I then took up the figurative meaning of the word *baptizo*, as used in the New Testament, and I showed that in every single instance where the mode of the Spirit's baptism is spoken of, it is represented as being "poured out," or "falling on," or "shed forth," etc., and never as an "immersion into." I further showed that water baptism should conform in mode to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, because water baptism is the type or symbol of the Spirit's baptism; for John says, "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," plainly showing that his baptism was typical of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. As the baptism of the Holy Ghost is always performed by pouring, the symbolical import of baptism absolutely requires that we are to understand that water baptism must be by pouring also. I showed here that if *baptizo* be a specific term, then its specific sense is to pour, and not to dip; that the only specific action here was pouring, and the baptism must be either the pouring out of the Spirit, or the effect of that outpouring. I showed that either horn of the dilemma here destroyed my opponent; for if *baptizo* expresses specific action, then that action is pouring, and my proposition is proved. But if the gentleman tells us the baptism was the effect of the pouring, then modality is not in it at all, and my proposition is proved also. My proposition is, that pouring or sprinkling is scriptural baptism; and I have proved that every baptism spoken of in the scriptures, the mode of which is specified, was performed either by pouring or sprinkling. If this does not prove my proposition, then it can not be proved that two and two make four. When I prove that all the baptisms spoken of in the scriptures, the mode of which is specified at all, were performed by pouring or sprinkling, I prove that pouring or sprinkling is scriptural baptism.

6. I presented the testimony of the early Christian fathers, and showed by numerous examples from patristic usage that they call sprinkling and pouring baptism. The various sprinklings of the Jewish law; the sprinklings of the heathen; the pouring water on the head of Christ by John; and the various instances where they speak of the Christian ordinance as performed by sprinkling or pouring, are all called baptism; and thus I showed you from the usage of the fathers—whether speaking of the Christian ordinance or not—that the term *baptizo* expresses acts of pouring and sprinkling, and therefore can not specifically signify to dip or immerse. Then I showed by a number of examples from the classics, that classical usage agrees with scripture and patristic usage.

7. I then brought forward the examples of baptism in the New Testament. I showed, first, the improbability of John's baptizing the people by immersion. John was a Jewish priest, and his baptism was in some sense a Jewish purification; and, since the world began, no Jewish priest ever immersed any man for the purpose of purifying him. If John had gone to immersing the people, he would have been introducing a new and unheard of custom among the Jews. When John's disciples and the Jews got into a dispute about purifying, they came to John, and went to talking about baptism, showing plainly that they understood that John's baptism had something in common with their purification. Secondly, I showed from the history of John's baptism that it was absolutely impossible for him to have immersed the vast multitudes which he baptized. John did baptize the great mass of the Jewish people. This can not be disputed; but this he could not have done by immersion in the short space of his ministry. Great multitudes flocked to hear the preaching of John, much after the manner of our modern camp meetings, only in vastly larger crowds, and it required a large amount of water to supply their natural wants. Hence he chose those stations for his ministry where the supply was abundant. Water enough for the purpose of immersion might have been found in many places, for this does not require much; but water for the supply of such vast multitudes could not easily be found in Palestine, only at such places as John fixed his stations. John did not baptize all the time in the river when at Jordan; but he went out of the river into a house on the bank, and baptized the people in the house, which no immersionist would ever have thought of doing. He also tells us himself, and it is always said of him in the scriptures, that he baptized with water, and that his baptism was typical of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Thus I showed that John's baptism was not performed by immersion.

8. I showed you that all the other examples of baptism in the New Testament scriptures were diametrically opposed to immersion. I proved that the jailer was baptized in the prison, and my friend can not get him out of it. Paul was put into the prison, and then by the jailer confined in the inner prison. It is stated that he was brought out, that is from the inner prison into the outer prison, and after the baptism was taken into the jailer's apartments. The prison was so situated that the jailer could see into the inner prison, and Paul could see out into the jailer's house, or apartments.

9. I next showed that Paul was baptized in the house where he was commanded to "stand up and be baptized." Thus when we come to the examples of baptism in the New Testament, we find clear and positive evidences against the practice of immersion, and conclusive evidences in favor of baptism by affusion. I do not wish to reiterate what I have already said in regard to the baptism, of the eunuch by Philip. The case is clear. They went to the water, both of them. This fact is not stated in any other case, and it would not have been stated here if it had been always the custom for both parties to go to the water.

10. My last argument was drawn from the fact that the validity of baptism by pouring or sprinkling was never called in question by the

church, and this I have proved beyond the possibility of cavil. How has my opponent answered all these arguments? Has he followed me step by step, and showed that my positions were not well taken, or that my arguments were not conclusive? You can answer for yourselves, ladies and gentlemen, what he has done. When I have brought forward argument after argument, instead of meeting the issue he has erected a man of straw and proceeded to beat him down with an air of triumph. When I have brought forward numerous examples from the usage of the word *baptizo*, to show that it is not a specific term, and can not be translated by a specific term without making nonsense, he has replied: "Will Mr. Hughey translate *baptizo* sprinkle or pour?" and has uttered such nonsense as "Can you sprinkle a man into the Jordan?" When I have shown you that while the Greek language has a word expressing the specific action of dipping, *baptizo* is not that word, and I proved this by the usages of the Greeks themselves. And while the Greek language is very accurate in the usage of terms, I showed that the accuracy of the Greek language was squarely against him every time. But when I have done this he has replied by saying: "I can translate *baptizo* by immerse wherever it occurs in the Greek language." But has he attempted to do it? I called on him to translate the passage in the New Testament where his own translators have rendered the word "endure" and "undergo," and he refused to do it. He says he can do it, but did he come forward and so translate it and let it go upon the record? When I called upon him to translate *baptizo* immerse in numerous other examples which I produced, he said he would if I would produce the original works from which the examples were taken. But he knows that neither he nor I can get the original documents. He has used extracts furnished by writers on this subject, and so have I. These original works can only be found in the largest college libraries, and he knows it. In this way he tried to stick his head in the sand again, like the ostrich, and suppose he would be safe. This has been the course I have honestly endeavored to pursue. I never have and never will, so long as God gives me power to speak, stoop to the arts of the demagogue, or the tricks of the pettifogger, when I am discussing questions of such vast and infinite moment. If I can not sustain my proposition by sound argument and an appeal to the word of God, I will let it go; for I have no interest in sustaining error, and truth requires no such defense. Whenever I stoop to such a course I will give you the liberty to say that I feel that I am beaten, and that I am doing this to cover up the disgrace of my defeat.

Now, I expect my opponent, when he arises again to speak, will pursue the same course which he been pursuing. He will give us a rehash of his old "square issue," ask me to translate "*baptizo* by sprinkle and pour," and tell us that he can translate it by immerse everywhere it occurs; and then wind up with a thundering exhortation, such as he has been in the habit of giving. I must say that I think my opponent is a much better exhorter than debater.

I have now, ladies and gentlemen, presented to you the arguments in favor of my proposition, fairly, logically, and, as I think, conclusively. I am satisfied that nothing which my opponent can bring

forward will change the result in the least, and yet he has labored hard throughout the entire discussion. I close with the remark, that when I have proved, as I have all along through this discussion, that every baptism of which we have any account in the scriptures, the mode of which has been specified at all, was by pouring or sprinkling, I have proved my proposition.

I now leave the subject for your consideration, hoping that God Almighty, in his mercy, will give every one of you a proper understanding of his truth, and that we may all be led in the way of eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—After noticing briefly what new matter my opponent has presented in his last speech, I shall give a general review of his entire course of argument and then give a resume of our own.

First, my opponent speaks of the action of baptism being sometimes expressed by *kataduo*, and claims that this was when it was an immersion, because the act of immersing was appropriately expressed in Greek by *kataduo*. If baptism itself meant immersion this word would not be used. Suppose we speak of dipping a man in immersion. Does it prove that the two words are essentially different? Our Tunker friends say they dip a man three times when they immerse him. Does that prove that the acts expressed by the words are different, or that immersion is any more generic in its meaning than dipping? No, both are alike specific, and express the same specific act.

*Duo*, *kataduo*, *duno*, *katadunoo*, *duptoo*, all express nearly the same idea, the same specific act. They are like the English words dip, plunge, submerge, immerse, overwhelm, in this respect. When applied to the ordinance they express the same act. What essential difference does it make, whether one dip, or plunge, or submerge, or immerse, or overwhelm a man in water, in the ordinance? We use dip and immerse both to express the action. So the Greeks sometimes used different words.

We wish here to remove some more mist raised in reference to words of specific action. My opponent finds such meanings as wash, cleanse, purify, bathe, given as meanings of *baptizo*. He claims that it can not express a specific act. I ask what word in Greek expresses the specific action of dipping or immersion? He replies, *duo*, *dunoo*, *kataduo*, *katadunoo*, and *duptoo*. Now we can find figurative meanings, secondary meanings, or results given as renderings of each of these, and we can, by his course, prove that this specific action can not be represented by any verb in the Greek language. Nay, we will take the English words, dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, and set each of them aside in the same way, and remove every word until we have not a word to express this specific physical act left in our language. Then, common-sense says let us take the primary meanings as the real meanings, especially when the secondary meanings are results reached by the act expressed by the primary, and given because they are accomplished by that specific action.



You may believe, if you will, that our Saviour was such a fool as to go down into a river to have a little water poured or sprinkled on his head; but I will not so impeach the common-sense of my Lord. He went down into the water, just as we do when we immerse, because he was immersed. John immersed him in the water, and straightway he came up out of the water. The gentleman claims *en hudati* may mean with water. *En*, means *in* unless we are compelled by the context to give some other meaning. My brother knows it occurs several times in the previous account, and he must render always *in*, till he reaches that expression, and then to suit his argument he renders it with.

*Mr. Hughey*—Is it not primarily used to represent the dative of instrument?

*Mr. Braden*—No sir, it primarily means *in*, and we so render it, unless the context compels us to give a different meaning. "With water," and "at water" are utterly unsanctioned by proper construction here. We might as well say "with those days," "with the wilderness" as "with water." So it should be "in the Holy Spirit and fire." So "he went up away from," is a perversion utterly unwarranted and made only to mystify and avoid a crushing argument.

Next, we have the case of Philip tortured till it means "they came to or at the water," and "went up away from the water." Now a more barefaced perversion never was made. *Kato* with *baino* does not merely bring them to the water, nor does *eis* leave them at the water's brink. *Elthon* with *epi* brings them to the water. Then *katabaino* with *eis* takes them down into the water, and *anabaino* with *apo* takes them up out of the water. Observe the climax, down into and up out of. It is clearly immersion. No wonder my brother endeavors to befog the plain language by perversion. It is strange that *eis* will take a Pedobaptist every where but into the water.

Allusion has been made again to the baptism of the children of Israel in the cloud and sea. Defeated in his attempt to have them sprinkled in the passage of the Red Sea, he now attempts to show that the baptism was commenced at the sea, and completed afterward at Sinai or some other place. It was a sprinkling he says. If they were sprinkled at all it was at Sinai, and there was the baptism, and the sea had nothing to do with it, and Paul talked nonsense when he mentioned the sea as a part *of* what they were baptized by. Verily, these Pedobaptists can make patch-work of the word of God. Take up a single act performed at the Red Sea, and stretch it out some sixty miles, and over three or four months. He denies that the waters were so they could not be dashed by the spray of the sea. He denies the word of God, which says they were congealed, and the people came over dry-shod or dry.

He has the assurance to go back again to repeat Rice's stale nonsense about *taufen* and *amad*. I read you several standard lexicons, which stand in German and Syriac as Webster and Worcester stand in English, declaring that both words meant dip or immerse. But this man that does not know a word of either language, presumes to challenge the decisions of these great standards. But *amad* is rendered wash.. Indeed! Is that sprinkle or pour? Do we ever wash persons by sprinkling or pouring water on them? My opponent has on a linen

coat, somewhat soiled like my own. He goes home to-day noon and gives it to his wife to be washed. Sister Hughey reasons. Husband says baptize is to wash, and washing can be done by sprinkling, for he says sprinkling is baptism. So she sprinkles a drop or two of water on the collar of the coat and hands it to him as washed! Would he be consistent with his position here to-day and accept it? No, he would say, "dip or plunge it in water, that is the way we wash things."

He reasserted just as confidently as though it were a new argument, and one that has some weight, that the soldier was sealed by baptism in the jail. We have repeatedly shown that there is not a scrap of argument to show that the sealing was baptism, but rather the eucharist was the confirmation or seal. And even if he could show that the soldier was baptized, how does he know that there was not, as was the case often with large houses and public buildings, a pool of water attached to the jail. It is all assumption.

Justin Martyr calls baptism a washing. Is it then a sprinkling? Do you wash by sprinkling or by immersion? Which? Verily these are weighty arguments.

The Waldenses were Anabaptists. So they proclaimed in their declaration to the French king. A great deal was said about this matter by Rice in his debate with Campbell. He attempted to impeach Jones by reading what he said was their declaration. It has since been clearly shown that Jones was right, and what Rice read was a confession of the followers of John Huss, persons who attempted to reform the Catholic Church, and retained some of its errors, sprinkling among the rest. The Waldenses declared themselves Anabaptists and said they retained the apostolic usage in so doing.

The gentleman attempts to avoid the case of Novatian by raising issues I never made. I said he was the first recorded case of sprinkling. The gentleman found none earlier. I said, also, Cornelius, the Bishop of Rome, denied that he was baptized, because he was sprinkled. These are undeniable facts.

His point about baptisteries is of no force. Baptism was performed by going into the baptistery or water. Why? Because people always go into the water to be immersed, but never to be sprinkled or poured. No, the water is brought to them. After a while, persons assuming, as people do now, that mode is of no consequence, and to gratify mothers when infant baptism was introduced, pouring and sprinkling were introduced. I have read a clear explanation of the matter from the standards in ecclesiastical history, which most accurately describe the whole matter.

I have read to you what several eminent historians have said about the Greek Church and their exclusive practice of immersion. Prof. Stuart is very clear and to the point. I will prefer what he says to the letters of one or two insignificant persons who saw only the practice of one or two churches corrupted by contact with sprinkling churches.

The potent picture-argument is next brought up. We have sufficiently ventilated that, by showing these pictures were none of them nearer than one thousand years to the time of Christ, for the door on which they were painted was dated A. D. 1070, and there is no telling

#### DEBATE ON THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

how much later the picture was painted, and that they were painted in the dark ages of the Catholic Church. Why does not he regale us with pictures of the Virgin Mary, purgatory, and angels of the same period? Candidly the whole thing is not worthy of a moment's sober thought.

My opponent still persists in his perversion of the burial mentioned in Rom. vi. 4 and Col. ii. 12. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of life." "Buried with him in baptism wherein also ye are risen with him."

This baptism is literal baptism. It buries us. Does sprinkling? Does pouring? No. Immersion does. It is baptism. That is all we need as an argument. It needs no such long obscure argument as my friend resorted to, to talk immersion out of the passage, and all sense with it. I take the plain meaning. Baptism buries us, pouring and sprinkling will not, therefore they are not baptism. Immersion will bury us, therefore immersion is baptism. It would be an insult to your common-sense to elaborate so plain a matter further.

My opponent thinks I dare not translate the passage concerning the baptism of sufferings by immerse. Now just to gratify him we will do so. "I have an immersion to be immersed with, and how am I Straitened till it be accomplished." How? Immersed in the sufferings and calamities of death. Try pouring or sprinkling. A mere sprinkle of sufferings! No, an overwhelming.

We will now take up the review of the gentleman's argument. Before doing so. we will make a remark. As baptism is a positive command of our Saviour, and one of the two great ordinances of his gospel, we would reasonably expect it to be very clear and plain. There should be no ambiguity about it. Also, as we have here a man of great research and ability and much experience, we would expect him to readily and easily find out what baptism is, and place it so plainly before us that "a wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein." We would expect him to go to the law and the testimony, and give a plain and tangible reason for his faith in his practice. With this thought in our minds, let us examine his course of argument.

The gentleman started with an attempt to show discrepancy in Baptist authors, a matter that had no bearing on the question, for how could that affect the validity of pouring or sprinkling? But he utterly failed in this, for they all agreed as to the act; the difference, if any, was in reference to the mere point of the length of the act, or its frequentative meaning. He next assumed that dye was its original meaning, thus placing the effect before the cause, for dyeing is the effect of dipping. He could not and did not find a single lexicon in his favor. He found sectarian arguers for sprinkling, who assert this assumption. We quote Stuart and Carson, who say *baptizo* never takes the meaning *dye*, which is a secondary meaning of *bapto*, its primitive, but retains only the original meaning, dip—a position they sustain by abundant authorities.

He here misrepresents Carson, representing him as saying all the lexicons are against him, in rendering *baptizo* dip, when Carson says

no such thing. He says they are against him in making it a verb of mode, an entirely different matter.

He quotes Porson on *bapto*, thus trying to confound *bapto* and *baptizo*. We show that *baptizo*, the word applied to the ordinance, is a word of much more limited meaning than *bapto*, and that it never takes the meanings of *bapto*, to which Porson refers. This we do by an appeal to Carson and Stuart, who prove it by a long list of examples. We show also that Porson says "*baptizo* clearly means dip, and not pour and sprinkle."

He next quotes one or two meanings given by Liddell and Scott, taken from Heysichius, Suidas and Gases. We show that Liddell and Scott have rejected these, and that Gases did not know enough of Greek to write a lexicon of the language, and the meaning "draw water" was merely a metonymy, by which the effect drawing water was put for the act dipping, and was hardly allowable any more than draw water would be a meaning of our word dip, because we dip the bucket to draw water.

He next asserts that *baptizo* is a verb of result, and not of action, but utterly fails to support his assertion by any authority or passage taken from classic usage. He does adduce one or two theological dictionaries, but we set them aside as sectarian and partisan, and also disprove their position.

He next gives *duoo*, *dunoo*, *duptoo*, *kataduo*, and *katadunoo*, as the Greek words to express dip. We show him that dip, and kindred words, occur nine cases out of ten as translations of *bapto* and *baptizo*, and that those other words have as primary meanings, to go down, to sink, to sink down, etc.

We challenge him to translate "I immerse thee" by "*dunoo*, *duoo*, *kataduo*, *katadunoo*, or *duptoo* se. After many challenges he at last translates it "*katadunoo* se," or, "I sink thee down into the name of the Father," etc. This evasion, when sore pressed, shows for itself.

He attempts to show that *baptizo* is not a verb of specific action, but one expressing a result that may be reached by several specific acts, by quoting such renderings as wash, cleanse, purify. We show that these are secondary meanings, and to reach them he has to skip over the primary and real meanings. We then give the rule given by Blackstone, Hedges, Webster, and all great canons of interpretation: "That a word must be taken in its primary and most common meaning, unless the context compels us to change it, and then it must conform as far as possible to its common meaning." He has never attempted to show any such necessity for taking secondary meanings of *baptizo*.

We show also that these secondary meanings are given because they are the results of the primary meaning or action he wishes to avoid, and given by metonymy because they are so produced; thus clearly proving that the specific act he is so anxious to avoid, is always implied in these secondary meanings.

We show also that by the same course of reasoning, by which he proves *baptizo* to be a verb of result, and not a verb of specific action, we can set aside *duoo*, *dunoo*, *duptoo*, *katadunoo*, and *kataduo* and every word in the Greek language, and not leave one to express this specific

act—dip. In like manner we can set aside dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, immerge, overwhelm, and have not a word in the English language to express this specific act. His argument, then, against the position that *baptizo* expresses specific action is an absurdity.

He still has not pour or sprinkle as meanings, nor as the actions by which the results or secondary meanings of *baptizo* are reached; for they are always invariably the results of the act of dipping.

He next takes instances in which these results may be figuratively reached by pouring and sprinkling, and by such a circuitous route does he reach pouring and sprinkling! We show its absurdity applying to the same word. Baptism is called a purification, because we baptize or dip things to purify them. We fumigate a room to purify it; hence fumigation is baptism. We purify by baptism, or baptism is a purification. We purify our system by taking pills; hence taking pills is baptism. Let us argue in the same way in regard to the Lord's Supper. Our Saviour said, "Eat the bread." Eating is consuming. We sometimes consume things by burning; therefore burning would be the Lord's Supper. Enough of such nonsense.

We again raised the objection that this taking possible acts that accomplish figuratively the secondary meanings of *baptizo* is too nonsensical and foolish to suppose that God would leave a very important positive command to be ascertained in so circuitous and unsatisfactory a manner.

He next expatiated on literal and figurative meanings, showing that words often lost the primary and retained the secondary or figurative meaning; no doubt hoping you infer that such was the case with *baptizo*. We challenged him to show that *baptizo* ever had secondary meanings that changed the act from what was expressed in the primary. He utterly failed; indeed never attempted this. Next to show, even were this the case, that pour or sprinkle could possibly be brought in among the most distant figurative meaning. He never attempted this. Next were both these positions true, that it had these meanings in the ordinance? He never attempted this, but dropped all talk about literal and tropical meanings.

We then concluded it had its proper meaning in the ordinance.

He next expatiated on sacred and classical meanings, showing that some words had in the scriptures a sacred meaning, different from the heathen or classical meaning. We showed that such words were those expressing moral qualities or attributes. We asked him to show that a word expressing physical action, as the word expressing the ordinance, could ever be changed. This he did not attempt. Next to show that *baptizo* had a sacred and classic sense. That these were different, or that the sacred meaning changed the act in the classic rendering. That it was used in a sacred sense in the ordinance. He attempted none of these. Hence we concluded that *baptizo* was used in its usual or classic sense in the command of our Saviour.

He then reaffirmed that *baptizo* was a word expressing result that could be reached by several acts, and not a verb of specific action; but produced no lexicon or classic quotation to sustain him in this position.

He then quotes passages, not to prove that pouring and sprink-

ling are baptism, but that immersion in a few cases may not be. He quotes iniquity baptizes me. We show that it means overwhelms, or immerses me. Also, the baptism of sufferings. We show that it means an overwhelming or immersion in sufferings. Also, the absurdity of iniquity or sufferings pouring or sprinkling any one. They would make nonsense of what immersion makes a bold and beautiful figure.

He next quotes the case of Naaman, asserting because the translators of the Hebrew scriptures into the Greek version, known as the Septuagint, rendered the prophet's command, "wash thyself" by *louo*, and then said "he baptized himself in the Jordan," that they regarded *louo* and *baptizo* as interchangeable. He also attempted to show that Naaman did not dip himself, for the act was for the cleansing of a leper, and that was done by sprinkling. He also affirmed, that because the bathings of the Jewish law were expressed by *rahaats*, wash, instead of *tubal*, immerse, they were not immersions.

We replied that the prophet commanded a result, washing, and that the translators say he dipped himself as the act by which it was reached; and do not assume that the words are interchangeable, any more than the words wash and dip are interchangeable, by which our translators render the Greek words into English. That the final act of the cleansing of a leper was bathing of the whole person, or an immersion in the water. That God never commanded water to be sprinkled on any one for a ceremonial or religious purpose. That Naaman's healing was a miraculous healing, not a ceremonial cleansing of a leper. That cleansing, the result, was the important thing in the Jewish law, hence it was expressed by *rahaats* to cleanse or wash, but that the context required them to bathe the whole person in water, as an immersion. This we showed by the law and Jewish authority.

He next quotes the baptism of the children of Israel in the cloud and sea to show that it was not an immersion. We reply that they were covered in the cloud and sea, or overwhelmed and baptized by the cloud and sea.

He then appeals to Psalms lxvii. and lxxvii. to show that they were sprinkled by rain. We show that the sea was congealed, hence they were not sprinkled by its spray; that the cloud was one of fire, and they are said to have gone through dry. Also, that the events mentioned by the Psalmist in speaking of the thunder and earth-quaking and the rain, were at Sinai.

He then attempts to hivy the baptism part at the Red Sea and part at Sinai. We reply that the sprinkling with rain—which claims to be the baptism—took place entirely at Sinai, and show the gross nonsense of a baptism that stretches over three months' time and sixty miles of journey.

He next quotes Judith's case as an instance of a baptism, that was a partial washing, not an immersion. We show that the circumstances of her leaving the camp in the dead of night, and going away down into the defile, or ravine, of Bethuliah, alone, being attended only by her maid, favored an immersion; for she could have washed her hands and face in the tent. Next that the law demanded an immersion. The Jewish rabbins said they did immerse scrupulously

the whole person. That the oldest Greek version said she baptized herself in the fountain or pool, and two of the oldest versions, the Latin and Syriac, say she immersed herself in the fountain.

He next quotes Sirach's expression of sprinkling from a dead body, and wants to know how we can immerse from a dead body. We reply as easily as we can pour or sprinkle from a dead body. We show that it means cleanse ourselves from the pollution of a dead body, as "sprinkling from an evil conscience" means being cleansed from the guilt of sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. From the law we learn that the last act of cleansing from the pollution of a dead body was an immersion, hence they did immerse themselves from the pollution of a dead body.

He next quotes Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 43. Claim<sup>3</sup> that *nipsontai* and *baptizo* are used interchangeably. That the cleansing was a sprinkling. Lastly that the beds could not be dipped.

We reply that *nipsontai* is used in reference to the hands, and *baptizo* in reference to the body or whole person. That it is in the middle voice, and means baptize themselves. That the law requires an immersion of the whole person. That the Jews did thus wash themselves. That sprinklings were never called washings. That the bed or table was usually a small article, easily dipped. That the Jews declared they did dip them, and large articles a part at a time. That the law positively required them to be put into water and rinsed. Here then was no sprinkling or pouring, but an immersion.

He next brought up the baptism of the Holy Spirit, admitting that it was the spirit of man that was baptized with or in the Holy Spirit. We showed that the powers of the individual were baptized in the power of the Spirit; they were overwhelmed by the power of the Spirit of God. Hence, it was an overwhelming. That was not a pouring nor a sprinkling, for the pouring out the Spirit could not be the baptism, but the overwhelming the spirit of man by the Spirit of God.

In no case has Mr. Hughey attempted to show directly that pouring and sprinkling are baptism, but only that *baptizo* expresses a result that may be reached by pouring and sprinkling.

We show that all these results, in every instance, have been reached by immersion. He admits that immersion is baptism, but he utterly fails to show that pour or sprinkle are meanings of *baptizo*, or that pouring or sprinkling is baptism. Hence, he has failed to sustain his position, and left immersion as the only action of baptism.

We have urged that our Saviour used a well-known Greek word which had a clear and well-defined meaning. Mr. Hughey, while unable to deny this, has utterly failed to tell us what that clearly-defined meaning was, but has endeavored to make it as indefinite and obscure as he could.

We have argued that he commanded a physical action to be done, for baptism is not a mental internal act. Not denying this, Mr. Hughey has failed to tell what action our Saviour commanded. He performs an act to obey the command. He immerses men. Is not that the act, or did our Saviour leave three commands. He must

have done so to express that such distinct acts, as pour, sprinkle, or immerse

We have urged that all positive ordinances require some specific act, and can be obeyed by but one act, for that act is the ordinance. That no positive command can be obeyed by three entirely different acts. Mr. Hughey utterly failed to meet this. Hence it is proved, and as he admits immersion to be an act of obedience to the positive ordinance, it is the only act.

We next ask Mr. Hughey if the Greek language has not verbs which express the specific action expressed in English by the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, and immerge? He admits this. Is not *baptizo* a principal one? He dare not deny it. Then can it mean also pour and sprinkle? Can he name any verb which represents three entirely distinct acts, like pour, sprinkle, and immerse?

We ask him if it has not verbs for pour and sprinkle? He admits it has. Is *baptizo* one? He can not claim that such is the case; but insists that *rantizo* and *cheo* are the verbs for pour and sprinkle. We ask him to translate pour and sprinkle into Greek. He dare not use *baptizo*, but must use *raino*, or *rantizo* and *cheo*.

We ask him to translate "I pour thee" into Greek. He dare not say "*baptizo se*," but "*cheo se*." We ask him to translate "I sprinkle thee" into Greek. He dare not say "*baptizo se*" but "*raino se*;" hence, conversely, "*baptizo se*," can not mean "I pour thee," or "I sprinkle thee," or pouring and sprinkling are not baptism.

He can and must translate "I immerse thee," by "*baptizo se*" if he follows the analogy and usage of the Greek language.

Mr. Hughey claimed that *baptizo* was a verb of result, and not of specific action, but utterly failed to sustain his position. We then showed that in the three hundred and eighty-three times in which the word had occurred in the Greek literature that has been examined in reference to this question, that it is applied to the ordinance eighty times in the New Testament and is only transferred into English. In over two hundred and eighty of the remaining instances it is rendered dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, and immerge. In the remaining few instances it is rendered by wash, or some such word, and the action was undeniably an immersion, and the word could be so rendered and should be.

Hence we urged on him that the word was one that peculiarly expressed the specific action expressed in English by dip, plunge, immerge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, and its few secondary meanings are always accomplished by this specific act, and can be rendered by words which express it. He fails to set this aside.

We next call his attention to this great fact, subversive of his whole position, that if the entire extant Greek were to be translated into English, we would have the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, immerge, overwhelm, many hundred times. They would occur in over nine cases out of ten as translations of *baptizo* and *bapto*. Hence *baptizo* and *bapto* are pre-eminently the words, which, in Greek, expressed the specific action which is expressed in English by three nearly synonymous words.



We would have pour and sprinkle many hundred times also, but never once as a translation of *bapto* or *baptizo*. Hence they never mean pour or sprinkle, and our Saviour, when he used *baptizo*, used a word which expressed the specific action dip or immerse, and excluded the actions pour or sprinkle.

As a rebutting argument Mr. Hughey assumes that if *baptizo* means any thing, it means go to the bottom and stay there. Wants to know how we get the person out. Also claims if I do not admit this I deny specific action. I reply that we do not accept any such meaning, for no authority or classic quotation will sustain it. We get our immersed persons out just as he does. The force that takes them out is not in the word, but in the arms of the administrator. Common sense answers all such quibbles, or rather would treat them as too absurd to be met. But Mr. Hughey here very clearly admits that *baptizo* expresses an act that places one under water.

He then appeals to the divers washings or baptisms mentioned in Hebrews, claiming that they mean the sprinklings as well as the bathings of the law. We deny it, because a sprinkling in no case can be a wishing. It refers to the washings of the person or bathing of the whole person, or divers immersions.

He then quotes the fathers, not to show that pouring and sprinkling are baptism, or that they called them such, or described baptism as a pouring or sprinkling, but to show that they used the word *baptizo* in places where it may mean something else than immerse.

We offer to translate every passage by immerse if the original is given. He attempts to evade the force of this by thrusting out to me the passages already translated, without a word of the original, and asks me to translate the sentences from the English translation.

He quotes the passages contrasting baptism with heathen and Jewish sprinklings, and assumes that because both are spoken of as purifications, that the action is the same in each—as they were sprinklings the Christian purification or baptism must be also. We show the fallacy of any such forced analogy, by showing in the same way that action in inaugurating our President, according to such reasoning, must be crowning. We and the British people both call the induction of our chief ruler into office an inauguration. We both inaugurate. They crown their Sovereign, hence we must crown our President.

We then quote the fathers when they describe the ordinance of baptism and tell us what they do, beginning with Barnabas, the companion of Paul, and they all say they immerse, that baptism is an immersion—say they go down into the water—imitate the burial of our Saviour—are born of the water, thus both directly and figuratively describing baptism as an immersion in every case.

Mr. Hughey finally appeals to the classics. He brings up the case of the sword plunged into the neck of Echiclus, and endeavors, not to show that it was poured or sprinkled, but that it could not be immersed. We show it was plunged into his neck, and *baptizo* has just that meaning in the passage.

Next he quotes Rice's famous blister-plaster. We show that it was not a blister-plaster, but a pessary, and must be dipped in oil before insertion. He next quotes the tow baptized with oil. We show that

common-sense would saturate the tow by dipping it in the oil. Next the mass of iron baptized with or in water, assuming (to make his point) that the mass was too large to be dipped in water. We show that it could be handled, for a man drew it out of the fire, and common-sense knows a blacksmith plunges or dips iron to cool it.

Next we had the pouring of sea water on wine, called baptizing Bacchus or wine in the sea. We show that this does not mean pour or sprinkle, but mix, for the pouring was done to the sea water, not to the wine—that the wine was covered or overwhelmed by the sea water. Lastly, that the use of *baptizo* here is rejected by Greek critics, who place in *aliduein* or *alibduein*. Finally, were it correct, he at last has a place where *baptizo* means mix, one case in several hundreds, and on this he predicates pouring and sprinkling.

He next brings up Origen's expression, "be baptized as to your souls from anger," or have your souls baptized from anger, and wants to know how we are baptized from anger or immersed from anger. We reply, we are cleansed from the guilt and sin of anger by immersion, according to Origen, just as we are sprinkled from our evil conscience by the blood of Christ, by sprinkling.

He then appeals to the overwhelming of the wood and altar on Mount Carmel, recorded in 1 Kings xxix., which Origen calls a baptism. We show that twelve barrels, or several hundred gallons of water were poured on the wood, till it was overwhelmed or covered with water, and this overwhelming, and not the pouring, is called a baptism, and that overwhelming or covering was what added to the greatness of the miracle, when the fire from heaven licked up the sacrifice, the wood and the water.

He next appeals to the case of the general dipping his hand in blood, and grossly perverts it, quoting it that he baptized the shield in blood, and wants to know if he could dip the shield? We, from the original, show that it was his hand and not the shield, for he took away the shield and dipped his hand in blood for the purpose of writing on the trophy he erected.

He next quoted a passage from Plutarch, grossly perverting it also, and making his point against immersion by means of his perversion. He represented the soldiers as baptizing themselves from wine casks, and asks how they could dip themselves from wine casks. We showed from the original that they dipped with cups from the wine casks and drank to each other. He next read from one of the fathers of a soldier being sealed in jail, and where there was a washing and the Lord's Supper spoken of. We showed that the washing was not necessarily a baptism, any more than it would be in a similar expression in English. That he had not shown that were it baptism, the soldier could not be immersed. That not baptism, but the eucharist, was regarded a seal, hence there was no baptism in the account.

Evidently beaten in his appeal to the classics, for every passage he brought forward was a clear case of dipping or immersion, he next appealed to the Scriptures, not to show that pouring and sprinkling are baptism, but to find petty difficulties in the way of immersion. He don't see how three thousand could be immersed. We show that they could be immersed as fast as poured or sprinkled. That the

twelve apostles could immerse them in four hours, at the rate of one per minute; or the eighty apostles and disciples in forty minutes. Next, "John baptized all Judea in Jordan." The objection is not against immersion, but against their being baptized at all, and falsifies the word of God. The language is highly figurative, a strong hyperbole. No water at Pentecost! We show the utter absurdity of supposing millions could be assembled where there was not water enough to immerse three thousand. We show also that there were eight large pools open to all Jerusalem, covering in the aggregate fifteen or twenty acres of ground, and that once a year a great multitude, perhaps as many as were at Pentecost, rushed *en masse* into one of these pools, Bethesda. He then perverted the case of the jailer, asserting he was baptized in his house. We showed this to be false, for after he was baptized he brought them into the house. He also perverted the account of the baptism at the house of Cornelius, representing Peter as saying, "Why can not water be brought that these may be baptized?" We show that the companions of the apostles say they were led to the water, and not the water brought to them.

He next perverted the account of Saul of Tarsus, representing Ananias as saying, "Stand up and be baptized." We quoted Paul when he said he was buried in baptism, or immersed. Next John was represented as baptizing in Bethabara, a house, and of course did not immerse. We showed from Judges vii. that Bethabara was a city on the Jordan, at the lower ford, as its name indicated, house of the ford, and that John was baptizing in Jordan, at or in Bethabara.

He next attempted to pervert the prepositions construed with *baptizo*. John was baptizing at the Jordan. Why not preach at those days, preach at the wilderness, baptize at the Holy Spirit and fire? Such nonsense does he make of the word. Christ came up from the water? No, for he was in the water. He went up out of it.

Philip and the eunuch went down to or at a certain water. We showed that the words *elthon* and *epi* brought them to the water, and they went down into the water and came up out of the water. We showed that in every case he rejected the almost invariable meaning of the words, and assumed far-fetched meanings entirely unwarranted by the context. If these words do not place Christ and the eunuch in the water, there are no words in the Greek language that can do it.

He then produced his great picture-book argument. We showed that they were painted amid the darkness of the Romish Church, at least one thousand years after Christ, and probably much later, and were merely the opinions of Romish painters, probably little acquainted with the Bible or history.

He next appealed to early writers. We showed that he assumed baptism to be meant, when there was no such idea in the passage. Assumed that it could not be immersion, when he was not able to show that it could not easily be performed.

We showed also that he came no nearer the time of Christ and his apostles than nearly two hundred years, or more than double the time we have been a people, and what mighty changes have taken place in that time! That celibacy, purgatory, worship of saints, began at the same time with sprinkling, a kindred abomination of the Man of Sin.

We showed also that the fathers all immersed. That they regarded pouring and sprinkling as changes of the ordinance. Denied sprinkling to be baptism, (lave the first recorded case of sprinkling, and first mention of pouring, and showed both were denied to be apostolic baptism.

We showed when and where and how sprinkling and pouring were gradually introduced, and were resisted for hundreds of years as innovations.

We now ask attention to the following defects in Mr. Hughey's argument: He does not commence, as he should, by showing that pour and sprinkle are meanings of the word *baptizo*, the word our Saviour used in the command, but he skips over all its primary and real meanings, and attempts to show that in a few instances, out of four hundred, that it may mean something else besides immerse. He then attempts to determine the ordinance from these few figurative meanings, instead of the hundreds of primary renderings.

He places dyeing, washing, and cleansing, the effect, before dipping, the cause of these effects, thus violating every rule of language, which places the act or cause as the real and primary meaning, and the effect as the secondary meaning, because produced by that action or cause.

He then attempts to show that these few secondary meanings or results may be accomplished also figuratively by pouring and sprinkling, and though he knows they are almost invariably produced by immersion, he assumes that pouring and sprinkling are therefore baptism.

He next asserts that because *baptizo*, as he says, means wash, it can be used interchangeably with it, therefore pouring and sprinkling are baptism. A most illogical assumption, for washing is always done by immersion.

He then asserts *baptizo* is a verb of result and not of specific action, but utterly fails to sustain his assertion by a single lexicon, classical quotation, or any authority.

His argument against its being a verb of specific action, because it has a few figurative meanings, which however are given because invariably accomplished by one specific act, would set aside every verb in the Greek and English languages, and leave us not a word in either to express any specific action.

His attempts to beg the question with figurative and sacred meanings, and utterly failing to show that *baptizo* ever had any figurative or sacred meaning which changed its common and classical meaning, and especially to show that pour or sprinkle were among these meanings.

His quotations from the fathers, assuming baptism to be spoken of, where it was never mentioned, and that contrasted things are interchangeable.

His shallow picture-argument. What must be the condition of a man who will clutch at such straws as that?

His utter failure to find pouring and sprinkling, nearer than about two hundred years after Christ, and amid the abominations of the Man of Sin, and then under protest and condemnation, as a change of

the ordinance, foisted in by false doctrines of the importance of baptism, and administered only in necessity.

His attempts to evade plain scriptural arguments, virtually falsifying the Scriptures by quibbles about the want of water, the want of time, etc.

His gross perversions and distortions of the Scripture language, in torturing the prepositions and other plain Greek words, to evade the force of the argument in favor of immersion, and his false version of the jailer's baptism.

His utter failure to meet our argument on the nature of positive ordinances, and also on verbs of special physical action. .

His utter failure to meet our argument that *bapto* and *baptizo* are pre-eminently the words, which, in Greek, mean immerse.

His utter failure to meet our argument on the convertibility of the words *baptizo* and immerse.

His sophistry on the figurative references to baptism, spending nearly a whole speech to argue immersion out of a passage, arguing all sense out of it to do so, evidently being lather willing to make nonsense of God's word, than to admit immersion.

His roundabout far-fetched way of reaching his conclusion, and when he has reached it, it is not the proposition.

His utter failure to sustain his position by classical authority, such as lexicons, learned men, and classical quotations, or by history.

His utter failure to give you one passage of Scripture that you can repeat, and rest his position on it.

Such are some of the many failures and errors in the gentleman's argument. Want of time compels me to omit many that I might specify.

We will now review our argument, and we may have to repeat in our review, to make it complete, some things that we have already advanced. We used them in our review of Mr. Hughey's arguments to show their force in refuting his position. We now repeat them to show their force in sustaining mine.

We began by reminding you of the fact that Christ, when giving the commission or organic law of his church, commanded three distinct things to be done. There is no dispute about the first and last, but we see men performing three entirely different and distinct actions, as acts of obedience to the second. I accept only one. Pie accepts this and two more, and as he is to establish the validity of two I deny, he is properly on the affirmative.

As it is asked why we are so tenacious about the act performed, we reply that Christ gave it as one of the two ordinances he enjoined on his people, when he gave the organic law of his kingdom, and it can be performed only once. Hence, an act that was thought by the great Lawgiver of sufficient importance to be placed in the organic law of his kingdom, as one of the two great ordinances he gave his subjects, and stands as the crowning act of man's assuming the most important relation he ever assumes, that of a son and heir of God, and joint heir with Christ, and can be performed but once for all time and eternity, must be of paramount importance in design and

action, and we can not be too tenacious of the very act commanded. All governments are very tenacious in requiring the performance of just what they command in such ordinances.

Baptism is a positive ordinance or command. Positive commands enjoin some specific act, not before meritorious, for some end, usually ceremonial or disciplinary. The merit is not in the act, abstractly considered, but in the act as performed in obedience to proper authority.

As they enjoin a specific act, they can be obeyed only in that act. This action is essential to obedience to the command, for the act performed in the way commanded, is the command or ordinance.

Hare we lay down this great truth: No positive command can be obeyed by three entirely distinct and different physical acts.

Since positive ordinances are designed by God to secure obedience—as tests of obedience—to exhibit our loyalty to him, to distinguish his loyal subjects from those who are not, to cultivate a proper spirit of veneration and submission to him, and keep alive our zeal and devotion to his government; God has been very tenacious in exacting obedience to his positive commands, requiring the very things he commanded, for without this obedience, without this act, these great ends would not be accomplished. Every government, society, and organization has its positive ordinances, and regards them as of vital importance, and could not exist without them, and exact obedience to them.

We enforced this thought by referring to the cases of Cain and Abel, Lot's wife, Moses at the rock of Horeb, Korah, Dathan and Abiram, Nadab and Abihu, Phineas and Hophni, Saul's disobedience in the war with Amalek, the men of Bethshemesh, Uzziah, and the condemnation of the Israelites for their sacrifice of lean and fatted calves. God wants obedience—wants what he commanded, especially when he has now but two positive commands, and this one at the entrance into his kingdom, can be obeyed but once, and he will require the act he commanded, for that alone is obedience.

A drop is not as good as an ocean, if God commanded the ocean instead of the drop. Nor will the sophistry about the mode being indifferent if the heart be right do, for if the heart be right it will inquire for, and do just what God commanded.

The query is, what was the specific act God commanded in this command? God used human language to convey his commands to men, and he used words in them of a common and ordinarily accepted meaning. This is always especially true of his positive commands. He does not enjoin a new act in this command, but he takes a well-known act, requiring it to be done in a certain manner, and when thus performed, it constitutes an ordinance in his church. He gives no new meaning to the word expressing the act to be performed that changes the act.

The act, and the way it is performed, constitutes the ordinance, and not a new act.

In recording the three things commanded in the commission the Holy Spirit uses three common and well-known Greek words; words that had then a clearly-defined and well-accepted meaning, and uses

them in that meaning. As there is no dispute about the first and last we will inquire what does the second mean? The Holy Spirit used *baptizo*, a well-known and very common Greek word, with a clearly-defined and well-accepted meaning, and he uses it in that meaning.

We have already set aside all mystification about literal and figurative meanings, and about sacred and classical meanings, and no attempt has even been made to show that *baptizo* has a sacred or figurative meaning that changes its classical or literal meaning. It is merely mentioned to mystify and throw dust.

We confine the inquiry to *baptizo* and reject all allusion to *bapto*, because *baptizo* is the word used alone in the ordinance, and does not take one class of the meanings of *bapto*; and these meanings we reject are the very ones our opponents use to mystify the subject. This we sustain by an appeal to Stuart and Carson, who sustain it by many pages of quotations.

Then the question is, "What does the Greek word *baptizo* mean? As the language is no longer spoken, we appeal to lexicons, classical usage, learned men, history, and other authorities. We affirm that *baptizo* is a verb which, in Greek, represents one clearly-defined, specific physical act, or has, as secondary meanings, results that are accomplished by that act, and it is always implied in the results when they are used as secondary meanings of *baptizo*. That our Saviour made this act, performed in a certain way, an ordinance in his church, but did not change the action expressed by the word, or the meaning of the word, and that this act alone is obedience to the ordinance, for the act is the ordinance.

To sustain this we appeal—

1. To lexicons. These are compiled by learned men, who have made the language a life-study. They compare all passages where the word occurs—appeal to history—to translations made into other languages—to the context, and from all these determine the meaning of the word. We have quoted thirty-three standard lexicons, compiled by learned men, speaking as scholars and impartial men, and they say *baptizo* means dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, immerge, as results reached by the specific act expressed by these words. A large number, and the best of them, and all who have spoken of the point, say that it has these meanings, because these results are all accomplished by this one specific action. Many of the best say it can have no other meaning but this specific act and such results. Hence, as not one gives any meaning that conflicts with this specific act, and all give meanings that are this specific act, or necessarily imply it, we claim that we prove by the lexicons it is a word which invariably expresses or implies this specific act. A large number of the best testify that pouring and sprinkling are utterly out of the question.

2. We appealed to seventeen authors of lexicons of other languages, who had translated *baptizo*, and to encyclopedists, and they all gave the same testimony.

3. We appealed to fifty-eight eminent scholars, divines, commentators, theologians and historians, who were deeply versed in the Greek language, and literature, and the Scriptures, and they all gave the same testimony.

4. We appealed to nearly seventy learned men, historians, scholars, divines, commentators, and encyclopedists, for the usage of the apostolic church, and they said it was invariably immersion.

These lexicographers, historians, scholars, divines, commentators and encyclopedists were members of churches who poured and sprinkled; hence their prejudices, when they began the investigation, were against exclusive immersion, but as scholars and honest men, and as writers of books which were to fix their reputation, they testify uniformly and unitedly for immersion. They extend throughout all ages of the church, in all churches, and through all learned nations.

5. We verify these decisions by an appeal to classic usage. In 3C3 times that the word occurs in the Greek I have before me, it is in the New Testament transferred 80 times. In the remaining 283 times it is translated directly by immerse as an equivalent word 280 times. In the two or three times it is translated wash, it implies immersion, and should be so translated. In the 80 times it is transferred it can and should be translated immerse. Hence classic usage triumphantly sustains the lexicons, and our position.

6. We next appealed to over thirty fathers and early writers, some of whom were fellow-laborers of Paul and the apostles, some of whom had doubtless seen them baptize, and been baptized by them, and they all give baptism as immersion, and give that alone.

7. We next give the history of sprinkling and pouring, as given by the fathers, and learned men, historians, divines, commentators, and encyclopedists, and over seventy of these men, extending through all ages of the church, and through all civilized nations, and through all prominent pouring and sprinkling churches, and they all say that these acts were introduced by false ideas of baptism, and were regarded as changes and perversions of the ordinance, and were resisted by the churches for thirteen hundred years as innovations.

8. We next appeal to the usage of the Greek, Old Latin, Anglican, Ethiopic and Waldensian churches. These all testify in favor of immersion, and have practiced it alone, they say, from the days of the apostles, from whom they have received it.

9. We next appeal to our argument based on the nature of positive ordinances. They enjoin one specific act, and all admit immersion to be a specific act of baptism, and as there can be but one specific act which is obedience to the command, that specific act is immersion alone.

10. We next appeal to the law concerning verbs expressing physical action, which no one can deny. No verb can represent two, much less three, entirely different specific physical acts. All obey the command baptize by a physical act. All admit immersion to be a physical act that will obey the command, hence the command can be obeyed by no other, and immersion alone is the act which obeys the command.

11. We next appeal to this great fact—were all extant Greek literature translated into English, the words dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, overwhelm, immerge, would occur several hundred times. In more than nine cases out of ten they would occur as translations of *bapto* and *baptizo*. Hence these words pre-eminently represent in Greek the specific action expressed in English by the words dip,



plunge, immerse, etc.; and our Saviour, in using the most restricted word *baptizo*, did, in the plainest manner that human language would permit, command that specific act.

12. We next appeal to the fact that "I pour or sprinkle thee" can not be translated by "*baptizo se*," hence it can not be baptism; but "I immerse thee," can be so translated, and must be if we follow the analogy of the language; hence immersion is baptism, and pouring and sprinkling are not, or immersion alone is baptism.

13. We next appeal to the great truth that no lexicographer, scholar, or commentator, nor has my opponent, dared to give pour or sprinkle as renderings of *baptizo*, or even dared to translate a sentence in which it occurs by pour and sprinkle. Hence it can not mean pour or sprinkle, as pouring and sprinkling are not baptism, and as these three acts are the only ones claimed to be baptism, this leaves immersion alone as baptism.

14. We next appeal to the great fact that were the entire Greek literature translated into the English we should have pour and sprinkle many hundred times, but never once as a translation of *baptizo*, hence it never meant pour and sprinkle in Greek, and pouring and sprinkling are not baptism; and this leaves immersion alone as baptism.

15. We next appeal to the exact nature of the Greek language, which is fully carried out in the Scriptures. In the Septuagint and New Testament when translated, dip occurs thirty-two times, and twenty-eight times as a translation of *baptizo* and *bapto*, and in every case the whole person or thing is dipped. When translated wash it (*baptizo*) means an immersion of the whole person. Pour and sprinkle occur over one hundred times each, and not once as translations of *bapto* or *baptizo*. Which act, then, did our Saviour mean when he said baptize? He meant dip, the only action that it expresses in the Bible, when used aside from the ordinance. As our Saviour used it in its plain meaning, it means in the ordinance the same it does elsewhere, as it always means dip or immerse.

16. We appeal next to the translators of the Bible into other languages. All made in the days of the early church translate it immerse. All who translate instead of transferring it, translate it immerse. Not one renders it pour or sprinkle. Hence it means immerse.

17. We next appeal to the law of substitution. A meaning of a word should make good sense when substituted for it. Pour and sprinkle will make nonsense when substituted for baptize. Immerse will make sense, and is demanded by the context, hence baptism is immersion alone.

18. Next we appeal to the prepositions construed with *baptizo*. They make fools of Christ and his apostles, if they were sprinkled or poured, or practiced them. They are just what immersion requires; hence immersion alone is baptism.

19. We next appeal to the figurative uses of baptism. A sprinkling or pouring of suffering—sprinkling or pouring in the Holy Spirit, and a burial in sprinkling and pouring? Sheer nonsense! An immersion in sufferings—an immersion of the faculties of the person in

the power of the Holy Spirit, and a burial in immersion are in accordance with fact and sense. Hence immersion alone is baptism.

20. We next appeal to the places where baptism was performed. They exactly accord with immersion, but make fools of John, Jesus and his disciples if they sprinkled or poured. Hence immersion alone is baptism.

21. We appeal to this great fact. God never commanded water alone to be poured or sprinkled on any person for any purpose, moral or religious. Hence they are not baptism, and immersion alone is baptism.

22. We next appeal to the absurdity of the objections to immersion. So contemptible and so weak are they, that we will not notice them. If they are all that can be urged against it, then it is as clear as sunlight that immersion is baptism, and immersion alone.

23. We next appeal to the fact that in the cases of Groves', the first American edition of Donnegan's Greek lexicon, and also the first edition of Liddell and Scott, attempts were made to foist in meanings that would favor pouring and sprinkling. These sprinkling and pouring authors had to throw them out as untenable, and leave dip, and words that are in accordance with it. Hence immersion alone is baptism.

21. We appeal next to the instincts of mankind. All accept immersion, and were an annunciation to-day made from heaven, in the ear of every man and woman that God would accept but one act, and that none could be saved but those who had performed that one act, and leave it to human judgment to decide what is that act, there would be a dipping in every stream in Christendom; and no one would trouble about where water could be found and how so many could be immersed, nor about its decency or the coldness of the water. This shows where common-sense lies. It seems to me as though God in his word has spoken almost as plainly, and men ought to heed it, and not pervert and give the lie to his word, as they virtually do.

25. Lastly, we appeal to the results of impartial investigation. When men who have been sprinkled or poured, who were reared in churches which sprinkle and pour, with all their prejudices and prepossessions, are, as honest men and scholars, compelled to testify so unanimously and uniformly in favor of immersion, and against pouring and sprinkling, can pouring and sprinkling be baptism? Can baptism be anything but immersion—immersion alone?

We have summoned our witnesses from every age, from every civilized nation, from all churches, from among those who in practice are against us, and we have from the hundreds of authors, lexicographers, divines, historians, commentators and encyclopedists but one uniform declaration; and against their own practice in a majority of cases. How can you dispute such an array of testimony? We have found the Bible, the early companions of the apostles, and the decisions of these men, to be that immersion alone is the one apostolic, scriptural baptism, left by the Son of God to his church. Will you accept it as such?

In conclusion let us enforce what we have said by this illustration: Suppose you were about to purchase a lot of land, and three pieces

were offered you. When you inquire concerning the title, you are told that many believe the title to the first to be good, but many of the best lawyers pronounce it good for nothing; the same is true of the second, but no one disputes the validity of the title to the third. Which would you, as men of sense, purchase? The one concerning which there was no dispute.

Three practices or acts of baptism are before the world. The most learned and best men of all ages have disputed the scriptural origin of pouring and sprinkling; but all agree that immersion is valid. As wise men choose that which the common-sense of all men in all ages approve as correct.

My opponent has frequently compared me to David, because I was unwilling to wear the armor of my Saul, Bro. Campbell. I refused it because "God had not chosen it." I choose my own shepherd's sling, and with a few pebbles selected from the clear stream of God's truth, have I met this Goliath, whose spear is as a weaver's beam, its head six hundred shekels' weight—this champion who has defied so long the soldiers of God's primitive truth—the hero of a score of victories (if we believe his boasting); and as of old the boaster lies prostrate before the simple pebble he so much despised in the hands of the diminutive David. If the disparity in ability is so great as he has so vauntingly claimed, with such a result who can doubt on which side God's word is found?



# DESIGN OF BAPTISM.



# DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

---

## PROPOSITION FOR DISCUSSION.

*Christian Baptism is in Order to the Remission of the Past Sins of the Penitent Believer.* BRADEN affirms.

## MR. BRADEN'S OPENING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The proposition just read in your hearing, and which I am to affirm, is a very plain one, and it seems to me to be as plainly taught by God's word. All men admit that man needs reformation and salvation from the practice, guilt and punishment of sin. All believers of the Bible believe that it reveals God's great scheme for man's redemption, and all such believers believe also God must devise and reveal the plan. As God is infinite in power, wisdom, and mercy, we would naturally expect that the way would be so plain, that every responsible being could comprehend it, and that all men would agree concerning this plan. The Bible declares that "a wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein."

But when we examine the teaching of our religious leaders, we are confounded by the babel of contradictory voices that arise. The Universalist tells us all will be unconditionally saved, the Calvinist that God has chosen a few without regard to merits, and passed the rest as persons doomed to wrath, the Methodist, that we are so depraved as to be incapable of a good volition, and unless the Spirit of God, by immediate operation on our hearts, removes this inability, we can never turn to God; and so we might enumerate several conflicting theories. Thus, this most important of all questions, has been so darkened by words without knowledge, that no one knows what is meant by many of the phrases of modern theology. "Getting religion," "change of heart," "new birth," "conversion," "regeneration," are terms used to express, no one knows what, for we are told that this process is as intangible as the blowing of the wind.

Now we assume that the Bible is a perfect revelation of the answer to this all important question. "What shall I do to be saved?" We believe that the Bible was given in human language, that men might understand it, and we appeal to it, believing we can understand it. Believing that Jesus came to save men from their sins, we look to him for an answer. If I require more than my opponent in answering this question, let the words of the Son of God decide which is correct. If all that I believe to be necessary for the remission of sins, be not found in his language, let the untaught terms be cast out.

When our Saviour gave the great commission to his apostles, he gave the organic law of his kingdom. In it were contained the germs of all the great truths his disciples afterward announced to the world. The disciples were to "go forth and make disciples of all the nations, to baptize them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them." Concerning the design of the first and last one, we have no dispute, but to the second, we give entirely different designs.

Christ certainly had some design in giving all of his command. All of God's commands have a design, and that design can not be accomplished without the obedience to the command. Hence, to me, none of God's commands are non-essentials. We, do not believe the infinite God of the universe ever gave commands that were non-essentials. God's commands may be divided into moral, physical, and positive. All his positive commands have not only one clearly-defined specific action, but they have also but one well-defined object. As this object can not be inferred, as in the case of moral commands, it must be clearly stated in connection with the command.

As God has an object in all his commands, they are to be obeyed by all who are addressed in them. Man secures God's approval by a heartfelt obedience of his commands, and incurs his displeasure by his disobedience. Man has no right or warrant in the word of God, to set God's laws to one side as non-essentials, nor to change the order of his arrangements, or the design for which his commands were given.

To remove some prejudice, we will mention some circumstances that modify man's responsibility. As man is finite in knowledge and ability, he is not responsible for not obeying a law of which he is ignorant. This extends even to those who have been incorrectly taught. Care should be taken here, however, to guard against an abuse of this, for it will not cover or screen self-imposed ignorance.

Men are not guilty for not obeying a law which they can not obey. God never requires impossibilities. This principle extends to moral, as well as positive law. All are required to believe the gospel, and we are told that "without faith it is impossible to please God." Yet the heathen never believed what Paul tells us that "they who have not the law, are judged without the law, being a law unto themselves, their consciences excusing and accusing one another." God, we are told, in times of ignorance winked at sin. Christ tells us he allowed certain things among the Jews on account of the hardness of their hearts. Jesus tells the Jews that if he had not wrought his miracles, they would have been without sin. The deaf mute never believes until he is taught and reads the gospel. God denounced the false teachers in his ancient people, and excused to a great extent at least their dupes. Hence we conclude, as mercy and justice dictate, that human responsibility is modified by human knowledge and ability.

Man is not required to obey a law till it is given. God's Jewish law of ceremonies was binding on no one till given. God has had moral and positive conditions of pardon in all dispensations. Un-



der the patriarchal dispensation, we read of prayer and sacrifice alone. Under the Jewish, a more elaborate law. Under the Christian, a simple law, an all-pervading rule of internal conduct suited to man's more advanced condition. His moral conditions of pardon have always been the same, only more fully developed as man advanced. He has changed his positive conditions of pardon, and can change them when his purposes can be better subserved by something else.

We will now apply these principles to the case before us. Should we find that baptism is for the remission of sins, we would regard it as a condition only when man knows it to be such, and can obey it. We would modify it just as one would the law demanding faith. God does not require impossibilities. The law requiring baptism in the name of 'Jesus was first proclaimed to the world at Jerusalem and on the day of Pentecost. Before that time it was required of no one. John's baptism was merely preparatory, and not in the name of Jesus. Even after Pentecost, men like Cornelius and Apollos were accepted of God if they wrought righteousness according to the light they had. But when Peter or Priscilla taught them the way of the Lord more perfectly, they had other things to do to be saved.

By a common-sense application of these principles, we exclude from the purview of this question all the Old Testament saints, the thief on the cross, and those who repent and can not be baptized; also it relieves us from all concern concerning our good old fathers and mothers. If they lived up to the light they had, they are in the hands of him who doeth all things well. We are now to inquire what is the law of the Lord, and what is our whole duty? Thus modified, we propose to affirm that: "Since the day of Pentecost, in all cases where proper instruction has been given in the gospel plan of pardon, baptism is one of the conditions of the remission of the past sins of a penitent believer, when obedience to that command is possible."

We say one of the conditions, but not the only one, and a condition efficacious only in the case of the penitent believer. We propose to prove this affirmation by an appeal to the law of pardon as announced and discussed, in various places in the New Testament, by Christ and his apostles. We will lay down the following canon of interpretation, by which we shall be guided in all our investigations, in discussing this proposition. (Bottom 1/4 of page from hard copy cut out).

Let us take the law of naturalization as an illustration. The alien must come to this country, live here three years, demean himself as a law-abiding citizen. He then goes before the proper court and there declares his intention to become a subject of the United States. He must live here two years longer, demean himself as a law-abiding citizen, and then go before a proper tribunal and renounce his allegiance to all foreign potentates and powers, and take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States. He is then a citizen.

These conditions of citizenship are mentioned in several sections, each section giving generally but one step. Now citizenship can not depend on less than is mentioned in each section, but it does depend on more and other conditions mentioned in other sections, and to learn all the conditions, we study the whole law, and combine all the conditions. Citizenship depends on all these conditions, taken in their proper order. The foreigner can not reject one as a non-essential, nor can he say, "I will do it after I become a citizen," for he can not become a citizen without it.

In like manner we must examine the law of pardon, the law informing us how we become citizens of Christ's kingdom, and though but one condition may be mentioned in a place, we are not to conclude that it is the only condition, nor because other conditions are mentioned in other places, that the scriptures clash, for they nowhere declare that any one of these is the only condition of pardon. On the contrary we are to examine the whole discussion of pardon by Christ and his apostles, and take all the conditions that they mention, as the logical train of thought demands, and combine all of them, for all have their legitimate office in procuring for man this great result—pardon; and they must have their proper order. We can not omit one, for God has no non-essentials, nor can we change God's order and place a condition of pardon after pardon as an act of Christian obedience, for we can not obtain pardon without complying with God's terms, and we can not change his law. Pardon is an act performed by God, and we can not change his law, or compel pardon as we please.

Having thus prepared the way for our investigations, we now take up the law of pardon, and inquire if baptism is one of the conditions of the remission of sins. Let me here say that the conversion of the sinner is a progressive work. It is not accomplished by any one sin-  
(Bottom 1/4 of page from hard copy cut out).

tear them asunder, and place pardon where God has not placed it; for we have no power to do so. We place baptism last, not because we regard it as the most important, but because God's law places it there. We regard it as the last condition, the crowning act of man's restoration to God's favor, which he performs himself.

To remove prejudice that has arisen from theological perversions of the scriptures, and to introduce our first argument, we will examine the account of man's fall as given in Genesis. The scriptures say man has wandered away from God, and has become a rebel and alien to God's government. Then we will trace the history of his departure and learn how he wandered away from God and his favor, premising that he must retrace his steps to return to God. Let us then examine the account of his departure. We turn to the second chapter of Genesis and we read:

"And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the earth, and he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward, in Eden, and there he put man whom he had made. And out of the ground the Lord God made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food—the tree of life in the midst of the garden—and also the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

"And the Lord God took man and put him in the garden to dress it and keep it. And the Lord God commanded man saying: Of every tree of the garden, thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die "

From this account, we learn that man was created pure and surrounded by pure influences, but he was subject to law as all rational responsible beings must be; for God designed him to be voluntarily and rationally happy. He designed that man should, with a knowledge of the alternatives, choose good and be happy.

Man's physical nature was subject to the law of labor, development and nourishment. A violation of this law would have been followed by a proper punishment.

His moral nature was subject to moral law, or law which prescribed his duty to himself, his fellow-man, and his God. The reasons for this law are found in the nature of things, and it is obligatory on all rational beings, in all times and places, and is unchangeable; while the nature of things remains unchanged. Man might have violated this law and have been punished.

His will was subjected to positive law. A positive law is one which enjoins or forbids an act, not before meritorious or wrong abstractly considered. The merit is in the obedience, or the submission of the will of the subject to rightful authority. This law is never obligatory till it is explicitly given and can be repealed by the power ordaining it. It always has a clearly-defined object, which is stated by the power ordaining it, for the reason can not always be deduced from the command, as is the case in moral law.

Physical law tests man's prudence, moral law his conscience, and positive, law his will, or his submission to the power ordaining it.

Obedience to physical law secures health; to moral law righteousness; and to positive law, a humble and obedient disposition.

All these laws are necessary to man's full development and perfection, for his whole nature must be subject to God's government. But as positive law is often misunderstood and objected to, we will examine it further. Often, especially with children, the reasons for moral law can not be comprehended, and obedience to it must be positive obedience. Such was the case with our first parents, in their early date of childish simplicity and lack of knowledge. Obedience to positive law cultivates that spirit of implicit obedience needed in such cases. Parents recognize the force of this, when they say that one of the first lessons a child should learn is obedience. God designed to teach man this lesson, in his first positive law.

Positive ordinances serve also to distinguish all who are loyal, submissive subjects of the government, from rebels, aliens and others who are not. They assert the authority and dignity of the government; and secure zeal and attachment, and keep alive the sense of the relation existing between the government and the governed. All associations and governments have them, regard them as of vital importance, and in fact could not exist without them. Were an association to be attempted to be formed to oppose all positive law, it would have to commence with positive laws and ordinances. AH Masons know how much of the existence of their order depends on a strict observance of their positive ordinances and ceremonies. So well is this understood, that obedience to them is regarded as a better test of obedience, than obedience to any other law.

Let me illustrate: Suppose when I left my home, I had called my two oldest little boys to me and said to them, "I want you to let my papers and drawers where I keep them, entirely alone, while I am gone," giving no reason for the command. Shortly after I leave, Frank wants a scrap of paper for some purpose, and proposes to go to my drawers and get it. Bian remonstrates urging my order. Frank retorts, "I can see no harm that can be done by taking an old scrap of paper from the drawer." "But," says Bian, "father said, keep out of them, and that is reason enough." While they are thus disputing, their mother comes in and they appeal to her, and she replies, "Your father has some important papers all arranged just as he wants them. You must not disturb a single one." The boys go away, but who submitted his will to the will of his father? Bian obeyed because his father commanded it, Frank was submissive only to his own sense of the necessity of not disturbing the papers.

In like manner governments are jealous of any tampering with their positive ordinances, for they are peculiarly the symbol of the authority and dignity of the government. When the immortal order went forth, "If any man trample on the American flag, shoot him on the spot," why did every patriotic heart say "amen?" Says the violator of the order: "Why it is only a rag with a few stripes and spots called stars on it. What harm is there in trampling on it?" The government says, "It is the symbol of the authority of the government to which you owe allegiance. None but a

traitor's heart would prompt such an act, and as a traitor you must die. You have trampled on the symbol of the authority of your government, and insulted its majesty, and are doomed." Every loyal heart would shout "amen!"

Man needed a spirit of obedience, loyalty to God's government, humility, reverence for God's authority and law—he needed to make an acknowledgment of God's authority and of his own submission to his authority, and to be distinguished as a loyal subject of the government of God. All this was accomplished by the command "Thou shalt not eat of the fruit of the tree in the midst of the garden," so long as he obeyed it. We think no reader and believer of the Bible will object to what we have said on positive law.

Let us now read the account of the fall:

"Now the serpent was more subtle than any other beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said to the woman, Yea hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree in the garden; and the woman said, We may eat of every tree in the garden; but of the tree in the midst of the garden, God hath said, You shall not eat of it, neither shall you touch it, lest you die; and the serpent said to the woman, You shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day thou eatest thereof, you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.

"And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit and did eat, and gave to her husband with her, and he did eat; and the eyes of both were opened, and they were ashamed.. And they, walking in the garden in the cool of the day, heard the voice of God, and ran and hid themselves; and Adam said, I was afraid."

We have from this account that the tempter appealed to woman's pride and will, saying, "Yes, God has arbitrarily said, 'You shall not eat of the fruit of that tree,' and for no reason whatever. Don't you see you are under an arbitrary unreasonable control?" Woman, stung and irritated, says, "He lets us eat of every tree in the garden but one, and he says we must not eat of that, for if we do we shall die, and that is reason enough."

The tempter then allays her fears by a lie, and excites her curiosity, ambition, and love of knowledge, and rouses her will and pride by representing the law as unjust, and a jealous, selfish restriction, for God's selfish advantage, and to her injury. Her senses are aroused by the fruit; her curiosity, love of knowledge, ambition, pride, and dislike of control were excited, and she disobeyed and fell.

Let us now analyze the successive steps, and learn when she became guilty in the sight of God.

1. There was a preacher of falsehood and disobedience—falsehood and disobedience were preached and heard; but she had not become guilty—she had not fallen.

2. Next she disbelieved God in believing the tempter; but she had not yet fallen. Suppose she had said to him: "What you say is reasonable. Indeed I believe it; but God has said, 'You shall not eat of it;' and I will obey him." Would she have fallen? Certainly not. It would have been an error of the judgment, but not a sin of

the heart. Should one of this audience to-day before leaving home say to his little son that he must not go into a certain field, because he would be gored by a cross animal you had in it; and after he left a neighboring boy were to come along, and ask the boy to go into the field with him, and his son were to refuse, saying that his father forbade it; and it were to be asked by the tempter, "Well what does he make such an order as that for?" The boy replies, "He says I will be killed by that cross animal." "O, pshaw!" says the other, "he went over there himself. I know what it's for. He knows you will get some of them peaches in the field. Come, let us go over and get some." "No," replies the boy, "father said stay out of the field. What you say is true, no doubt, but as he said stay out I will do it." Would the parent regard the child as guilty of disobedience? It was an error of the judgment to believe the tempter's story, but not a sin of the heart. In like manner woman had not become guilty when she believed the tempter. She was not condemned for faith in the tempter, for "faith alone." We use these simple illustrations because the entire account is simple and childlike. Modern speculation has destroyed the whole history by its tremendous assumptions about "original sin," and "Adam's federal headship," and all such dogmas that are not hinted in the simple, life-like Bible account.

3. She desired the reward of disobedience, and became dissatisfied with the reward of obedience; but she had not yet fallen, or become guilty. Suppose she had said to the tempter: "Sir, I feel a strong desire to eat such pleasant fruit, and to become as God, knowing good and evil. I don't see why I am restricted in this way, but God has said, 'You shall not eat of it,' and I will not." Would she have fallen? Certainly not.

4. She next arrayed the last part of her nature, not already in rebellion against God, in opposition to his law. She resolved to disobey, and as the act and volition were, in her case, simultaneous nearly, the Bible makes them so, and says, "She ate and her eyes were opened, and she was ashamed" or guilty, as she fell, and not till then.

Hearing perverted her ideas—faith in the tempter or belief in him, her judgment or beliefs—desire, her heart or motives—disobedience, her will, and arrayed her whole nature in opposition to the government of God, and she became guilty, and not till then.

She disobeyed a positive law of God, and became guilty in consequence of her disobedience of positive law. The sin was not in the act abstractly considered, for had there been no command, there would have been no sin; but in the consideration that it was a willful violation of a known command of God. She did not sin, however, was not guilty, was not separated from God, was not punished, till she had violated this positive law. Her disobedience of this positive law was before and in order to her guilt, and her punishment. It was not the only act of her fall, nor the most important act, but the last and crowning act, because the nature of things placed it there. No one will dispute this who believes the Bible, for the Bible says, "In the day, or when thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Also, "When they had eaten, their eyes were open, and they were ashamed," or were

guilty. Also, "Death," or separation from God, "entered by sin, and sin is a transgression of the law."

Now how does man return or retrace his steps? Christ came to reconcile or bring man back to God. He lays down the law under which this is to be done in his last great commission to his disciples.

Matthew.—"Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

Mark.—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be condemned."

Luke.—He said, "Thus it became necessary for Christ to suffer, and rise again on the third day, according to the scriptures, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in all nations in his name, beginning at Jerusalem."

From these versions of the commission we learn that man's return to God is a progressive work, accomplished by a succession of steps or acts.

1. The gospel must be preached, and man must hear it. He is not yet pardoned.

2. He must believe the gospel, or have faith. He has not yet returned; he is not yet pardoned; he is not yet relieved from the guilt of sin, just as the woman had not incurred the guilt of sin, when she believed the tempter. I know that this plain common-sense analysis of the departure and return, makes sad havoc of many dogmas about the "new birth," "getting religion," "change of heart," etc., that men have preached; but we can not help it. We are following God's word. Let that be true, though every man be a liar. You all assented to the statement that the woman was not condemned for "faith alone." Now be consistent and believe the Bible, which does not save man by "faith alone."

3. Man must repent—he must cease to love sin—loathe it and its results, and desire peace, purity, and acceptance with God. He is not yet pardoned, just as the woman was not yet guilty when she desired the results of disobedience.

4. Since man has been living in rebellion against God, he must now confess Christ before men, as did the eunuch to Philip. But he is not yet saved, for were he to stop here his return would not be complete. His entire nature would not yet be tested, and brought in subjection to God's law.

5. He must next obey the positive command of God, or submit his will to the will of God in his positive ordinance—baptism.

Then his whole nature is tested, or brought in subjection to God's will, for he submits his will to the will of God in obeying his positive command in baptism. The merit is not in the act alone, but in the obedience to God's command, but this obedience can never exist without baptism. Baptism, then, occupies precisely the same relation in time and sequence, in man's return to God, that the disobedience of the positive command, "Thou shalt not eat of it," did in his departure.

It has the same merit in his pardon, that disobedience of a posi-

tive command had demerit in his departure. Any argument that militates against baptism being for the remission of sins, also militates against eating the forbidden fruit, being in order to the incurring the guilt of sin. As man was not punished, or separated from God, till he disobeyed a positive law, so he is not restored to divine favor, or pardoned, till he has obeyed a positive law.

Thus every part of man's departure from God has its counterpart in the gospel plan for man's restoration or returning, and we must reason on the counterpart, as we do on the original fact, and assign to it the same place and efficacy. We say—no baptism, no pardon, just as we say—no disobedience, no punishment. We say that each step is necessary in both cases, and without it all subsequent steps would never be taken.

We say, no preacher of disobedience, no belief of falsehood; no belief of falsehood, no desire for the results of disobedience; no desire, no disobedience; no disobedience, no guilt, no punishment. In like manner—no preaching, no faith; no faith, no repentance; no repentance, no obedience; no obedience, or baptism, no pardon.

Thus indissolubly does God's word join these steps together. Let my opponent beware how he reasons on baptism for the remission of sins, for the arguments he wields against it will be clubs in the hands of the skeptic, who will beat out his brains, when he attempts to reason on the first transgression. If baptism be not for the remission of sins, then man never sinned, and needs no Saviour.

This concludes our first argument for the position we take. Our position is in exact accordance with the account of man's fall, and the scheme for his return laid down in Christ's commission to his apostles. We might stop here satisfied.

Our second argument is that this scheme is in exact accordance with man's mental and moral constitution and God's government, as revealed in the scriptures. Common-sense and the Bible tell us hearing produces faith, faith produces emotion or desire, emotion produces volition or an act of will, volition produces conduct, and conduct produces guilt or merit, as our conduct is good or bad.

Hearing falsehood in the fall produced a belief of the lie, or faith in the tempter and his story, faith produced desire, desire produced volition, volition produced disobedience of a positive command, disobedience or sin produced death or moral separation from God.

In the return—hearing the gospel produces faith, faith produces repentance, repentance produces volition to obey God, volition leads to obedience of God's positive command—baptism, obedience secures God's approval or our pardon.

Our third argument is based on this thought: Man's entire nature was arrayed in rebellion to God, before he was punished or became guilty. His whole nature must be brought in subjection to God before he will be accepted or pardoned. This must be plain to all. When is this done? Let us see. In the fall, hearing perverted his ideas, belief his judgment, desire his emotional nature or heart, disobedience his will, or arrayed it against the will of God—then he became guilty, for his whole nature was in opposition to God's government.



In the return—hearing corrects his ideas, faith his judgment or mind, repentance his emotional nature or heart, obedience to a positive command, or baptism, connects his will or brings it in submission to God's will. His entire nature is changed or in subjection to God's law, and not till then. He is accepted or pardoned then, and not till then.

Let me here illustrate this by restating it: Hearing changes the ideas, faith the judgment or mind, repentance the heart, baptism the will, and pardon the state. Pardon is not in baptism, but just on the other side of baptism. When a couple of persons by acquaintance become attached to each other, there arises the desire for union in marriage. When this desire arises they proceed to satisfy the demands of our civil law, and God's requirements, by a ceremony of marriage. Acquaintance produced love, love produced desire to give themselves to each other in marriage. Still they are not married. They resolve to fulfill this desire. Still they are not married. They take their places before the minister, and when he has completed half the ceremony they are not married. Not till the words, "I pronounce you husband and wife" are uttered, does the woman take the man's name, and not till then is she entitled to his estate. It is not in the ceremony, but just on the other side, that she becomes vested with a wife's rights. So in baptism, we are not pardoned, but pardon is just on the other side. Our state is then changed, or we are pardoned, and are children of God.

Our fourth argument is that when John the Harbinger was preparing the way for the coming of Christ, baptism was for the remission of sins, and in this he prepared the way for the great law of pardon in Christ.

Mark i. 4.—"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

Luke iii. 3.—"John came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

Matthew iii. 5, 6.—"Then went out to John all Jerusalem and Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

This baptism was one which could only be administered to penitent believers of John's preaching. To all such it was for the remission of sins, for Matthew assures us he required confession before baptism. Then followed baptism for the remission of their sins.

Our fifth argument is that Jesus, in his annunciation beforehand of what should be the law of his church or kingdom, made baptism necessary to entrance into his kingdom. When a man is pardoned he is a subject of Christ, or in his kingdom, and not till then. Hence, to obtain pardon, or to be changed in state from an alien to a subject of Christ's kingdom, one must be baptized.

John iii. 3.—"Jesus said except a man be born again he can not enter the kingdom of God." 5.—"Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he can not enter the kingdom of God."

Our passing from an unconverted to a converted state, our entrance into Christ's kingdom, is called, or compared to a birth. Our state before conversion, when in sin, is compared to the helpless confinement

and darkness of the infant before birth. Our entrance into Christ's kingdom is called a birth, because we are ushered into the light and liberty of God's children. The figure is continued by Peter when he speaks of new converts as new-born babes. This entrance into Christ's kingdom, then, is the new birth, or regeneration, so much talked of by the theological world, and which is, like the blowing of the wind, perfectly unintelligible. This birth is of two things, water and Spirit. When we understand what birth of Spirit is, and what birth of water is, we have the birth complete. To the word and the testimony.

Jesus says in the eighth verse, as rendered by our version: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and you hear the sound thereof; but you can not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth."

Now this rendering is perfect nonsense. Does the wind choose where it blows? Why do the translators render *pneuma* here by wind, when in every other place they give it "spirit?" Why does *amenos* represent wind in all other places, or some such word? In every other place in this chapter *pneuma* is rendered spirit, and we believe it should be here. We render the passage remembering that Christ is explaining the new birth, and not mystifying it. Thus:

"The Spirit breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice; but you can not tell whence he comes nor whither he goes: so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit."

The Spirit breathes, How? In inspiration of his chosen instruments of revelation as in the inspired word, and you hear his voice or this word. In this way, or by hearing his words, and believing them, are you begotten by the Spirit. This makes sense.

But we are sustained in this by numerous quotations:

1 John v. 1.—"He that believes that Jesus is the Christ has been begotten of God."

James i. 18.—"Of his own will he begat us with the word of truth."

1 Peter i. 23.—"Being begotten not with corruptible seed, but with incorruptible, by the word of God which lives and abides forever."

1 Corinthians iv. 15.—"I have begotten you in Christ Jesus, through the gospel."

Hence belief of the gospel, or faith, is called the birth of the Spirit, or being begotten of the Spirit.

How are we born of the water?

Titus 3.—Having "saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

Here baptism is called the washing of regeneration, or our birth of water.

Mark xvi. 16.—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Here, faith, one part of the birth of the Spirit, is mentioned. Baptism is the other part, or our birth of water.

In this figure, for the language is highly figurative, we are said to be begotten by the Spirit in faith, or born of the water in baptism. But why are we said to be born of the water and the Spirit? Why is baptism placed first? Because we are always born of the one who bare us, before we are born of the one who begot us. In Mark, how-

ever, being begotten of the Spirit is placed before baptism, as it should be. Hence our Saviour, in announcing, in anticipation, what should be the law of his kingdom, declares that we must be born of the water and Spirit, or have faith and be baptized, before we are ushered into the kingdom of heaven, or Christ's church. Or, he makes baptism a condition of our pardon.

Our sixth argument is based on Matthew's version of the commission:

Matthew xxviii. 19.—"Go make disciples of all the nations—baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

The last duty, "teaching to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," applies to Christ's subjects, or pardoned persons, and includes all that applies to them. This teaching was for them alone, and included all they were to be taught. Hence all that preceded, as making believers and baptizing, was the work of making subjects of them, or preceded their being subjects. A man becomes a subject of Christ when he is pardoned, hence baptism preceded pardon, and with believing, or becoming followers of Christ in belief, was in order to their pardon, or becoming subjects.

My seventh argument is based on Mark's version of the commission:

Mark xvi. 16—"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

Here salvation is spoken of as depending on belief and baptism. It can not mean eternal salvation, for that depends upon perseverance to the end in doing all things whatsoever Christ commanded us. It means salvation from sin, and its guilt; as when it was said Jesus should save his people from their sins. Hence it is here used for pardon, or a removal of the guilt of sin. The condemnation of those who believed not, was not the eternal condemnation. It was the resting under the guilt of the sin of the impenitent unbeliever. Then baptism is here declared to be for our salvation from the guilt of sin, or the remission of sin, in the most positive manner. I do not know how language could be made stronger.

We have now examined all the declarations of Christ and his apostles, before the formal announcement of the law on the day that his kingdom was set up in Jerusalem.

We have found in the last passage quoted that Christ declares that he that believes and is baptized shall be saved from the dominion, practice, and guilt of sin, and thus we have it at present. We will take it just as God has spoken it, and thus it will stand forever, and by this law will you be judged in the last day. God will not ask you how you twisted the law to suit your dogmas, nor how you pieced and scraped it, but "how you obeyed it as I gave it to you?" If you change it from the form he has given, you follow your own will, and not the will of God, and at your peril.

Then let me adjure you to take the whole word of God as the rule of life. Take all the conditions of pardon. They are all essential, for God never commanded a non-essential. The Lord of heaven and earth does not so trifle with the eternal welfare of his children. You

can all understand a plain "thus saith the Lord." The statement, "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved from his sins," is as plain as the command "Thou shalt not steal." God has said, "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved from his sins." Do you believe him? Did the Son of God mean what he said? If not, what did he mean?

Then examine the whole law of pardon without prejudice, without being on the alert to see how it will affect "my dogma," and see if you can come to any other conclusion than that baptism is one of the conditions of the remission of the past sins of the penitent believer.

It is often said Christ does not say, "He that believes not and is not baptized shall be condemned." "He omits baptism here." Yes, and so would common-sense. Suppose I say of a certain man, "If he eats and digests his food he will recover, but if he does not eat he will die." Do I thereby intimate that digestion is not a condition of his life? Certainly not. I do not mention it in the last clause, because it is needless. If he never eats he will not digest his food of course. So if a man never believes he will not be baptized. We will now close by reiterating in your ears the plain declaration of the Son of God, "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved from the guilt and dominion of sin."—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The proposition before us at this time is one of vast and infinite moment. It is the consideration of what doth God require in order that sins may be pardoned, and man be brought into favor with God. It is not a question about how we shall perform some ordinance of Christ's church; about something that a man may perform after he is a Christian; but it is how the sinner shall become a Christian. What are the conditions which God requires in order that the penitent believer may obtain remission of sins, and become justified before God. I am glad that my opponent, in his opening speech, has been so explicit. It has released me of the trouble of presenting to you from the standard works of his own church their real sentiments on this vital question, as I have sometimes been compelled to do in discussing this proposition with the gentleman's brethren.

He takes the ground that "baptism is for the remission of sins," in the sense of a condition—a condition precedent to the remission of sins—a condition without which remission of sins can not be enjoyed by those to whom the gospel is preached. That a man may believe, that he may repent, that he may confess his sins before God, but without submission to this positive institution, he is still a sinner; he is still unpardoned, and that without it he must perish everlastingly. I am glad, I say, that my friend has been so explicit, and I hope he will not hereafter abandon the position he has taken. It was with the utmost difficulty that I could get Mr. Sweeney to take this position. Indeed, he said, "If the gentleman will admit that baptism is for the

remission of sins in any sense, I am willing to stop the discussion right here."

The difference between us seemed so slight that Mr. Johnston, the President-Moderator, arose and tried to reconcile us saying we were agreed. But the question here is so clearly stated by my friend that I think you will be able to see the difference between us without the least trouble.

Well, now, what are the consequences that follow from the position the gentleman has taken? The logical, legitimate, and necessary consequences that follow from this position are, that you, and I, and every other unimmersed person in Christendom are destitute of spiritual life, alien from God, and are still unpardoned sinners, and must all perish everlastingly. That all the unimmersed persons of Christendom are without the life of God in their souls. They can not have it, for they can not have the spirit of Christ unless they are in Christ, and they can not get into Christ until they are put there by baptism. This is the gentleman's position, and he will not deny it. There can be no such thing as belonging to Christ without baptism; but we are all aliens from God, and strangers to the covenant of promise. Now, if he will stand to this position it is all that I ask him to do. It is more than Alexander Campbell has done. It is more than any of the gentleman's brethren, with whom I have yet had discussion, would do. There is no such thing here, ladies and gentlemen, as compromise. There is no such thing as laying down the weapons of our warfare and striking hands as brethren. There is no such thing as meeting upon the ground of a common Christianity. No, sir. If the gentleman is a Christian, I am not. If I am a Christian, he is not. And yet he calls me "brother," and has been doing it all through this discussion. I have not called the gentleman "brother," and will now tell you why. According to his doctrine I have no right to do it. If he is an honest man he will never call me brother again. I profess to be an honest man, and I will not brother the gentleman or his brethren. They consider me an enemy of Christ, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and I have no right to step up and say "brother" to such men, and I do not ask them to say "brother" to me. And why? Simply because I want them to understand that this calling me "brother," and slipping up and "striking me under the fifth rib," is a species of hypocrisy that I can not endure. No, sir. What is in my heart stands right out in my eye, and comes from the end of my tongue. I took this position in my debate with Mr. Spear, at Bridgeport, and Mr. Treat, one of his brethren came to me and said: "It was worth coming two hundred miles to hear you take that position; it is a position we have been trying to get your brethren to take in Indiana, but we can not get them to do it." I replied, "You can always get me to take it; I am an honest man, and that is the true issue." He said: "I know it is correct, sir, and I am glad you have taken it." But during the recess for dinner, Mr. S. and his friends found that they had taken the wrong case, and during the remainder of the discussion on that proposition, he tried in vain to get out of the position he and his brother had so boldly taken in the morning. But I pressed it upon him, and compelled him to stand to the ground he had taken. These

are the legitimate—the necessary consequences of the gentleman's position, and there is no getting from them. I will not charge them upon Mr. Braden "unless he expressly avows them." But I will charge them upon his doctrine, however, and wait and see whether he will avow them or not.

Now you can fully understand the issue between us, and see the importance the controversy has assumed. It is not a question of small moment we are debating now. "The law of pardon" is a question of great and infinite moment to us. It is of greatest importance to us to know the manner in which we are to be brought into the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and obtain remission of sins. If the position that my opponent has laid down is true, there is not an unimmersed person in the world who is not an unpardoned sinner; no one is pardoned, and admitted into Christ, we are told, without first going down into the water and being immersed. This is the only way pardon comes to the penitent sinner.

I will now take up the gentleman's arguments in their order, and we shall see whether they can be sustained by the word of God. He tells us that baptism is one of the conditions of pardon—not the only condition—it is at the end of a string of conditions. It is the last one "the converting act," as Mr. Campbell calls it. It is the act in which the soul turns to God. It is the act in which remission of sins is obtained, and without which remission of sins can not be obtained. A man may hear, he may believe, he may repent, he may confess, but he is still unpardoned until he submits to the test act. He submits his will to the will of God in the outward act of Christian baptism. Then he comes to Christ, then he obtains pardon, and not until then. We are told that this is the plan of restoration to the divine favor, and that it corresponds with the steps taken in the fall. That first it was necessary that there should be somebody to preach; then it was necessary that there should be somebody to hear; then it was necessary that there should be somebody to believe, and that after the believing it was necessary that there should be an act of will. Not only must there be a determination of the will, but an intention of the heart to commit the act, but there must be a commission of the act—that there is no sin in the mere determination of the will, but there must be an overt act.

In the first place, this is a contradiction of the plain teachings of Jesus, who says that "if a man loveth a woman to lust after her he has already committed adultery with her in his heart." In this case an individual who has determined to transgress the law becomes an actual transgressor. My friend's position is in flat contradiction to the teachings of our adorable Master. A man may be just as guilty before God of murder, if he has the murderous principles in his heart, as if he had shed the blood of his fellow-man, according to the word of God. The essential principle of sin is in the determination of the heart, and not simply in the outward act. Here the gentleman's position is flatly opposed to the word of God.

There are various steps to be taken in consummating sin, I admit; but sin may be consummated without an overt act. So also man's return to God can be consummated without an overt act. We begin to diverge from each other when we come to consider the various steps to

be taken in the sinner's return to God; and we shall see which of us is sustained by the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, as we progress with the discussion of this proposition.

I am not arguing against the importance—the necessity of baptism. I do not say that it is not necessary for a Christian man to be baptized, I am not here for the purpose of setting aside the necessity of baptism; but I am here for the purpose of placing Christian baptism in its proper place in the economy of the gospel, where the Lord Jesus Christ himself has placed it. I admit that it is an important Christian sacrament. But then my friend says that it is one of the essential conditions of pardon, and I deny it. This is the point of difference between us. It sustains no such relation to the divine economy as being a condition of pardon.

My opponent says that sin is consummated by a succession of steps, and that the sinner's return to God is accomplished by a succession of steps. He finds an exact antithesis between the fall and the sinner's return to God. 1. There is preaching. 2. Hearing. 3. Believing the gospel, that is, assenting to the doctrines and facts of the gospel as true. 4. There is repentance. 5. There is baptism, which is the consummating act, and 6. Salvation, or the remission of sins. This is the gentleman's plan, which he says corresponds with the various steps of the fall. 1. There was the preaching of Satan. 2. There was the hearing of the falsehood. 3. There was the believing of the falsehood. 4. There was the arraying of the will against the will of God, in the destination to do the act. 5. There was the act of disobedience, and 6. This act was necessary to the consummation of guilt.

The position here assumed is in direct opposition to the whole teachings of the word of God. Baptism is an outward symbol of the remission of sin, and not the condition of remission.

Again, sin can be consummated without the overt act, and my friend will not deny it, for he would come in direct conflict with the Lord Jesus Christ, and here is seen the viciousness of his whole system; and I will show you that instead of baptism being the consummating act, in the sinner's return to God, faith in Christ, in the sense of trust, is that consummating act. Faith in Christ, in the vicarious sufferings of Christ—is the test act—the condition upon which the sinner comes out of a state of sin into a state of justification.

The various steps of the sinner's return to God are these: 1. Hearing the word of God. 2. Believing, in the sense of assenting to the doctrines and facts of the gospel as true. 3. Repentance, including confession and forsaking of sin. 4. Faith, in the sense of trust or confidence, by which the soul is affianced to God and by which it is united to Christ, and then comes salvation.

Here is the gospel plan; here is the "law of pardon" laid down in the word of God, and I stand here pledged to prove it by, "Thus saith the Lord." You understand now my position perfectly, and also the position of my opponent.

So far as the illustrations from the marriage relations, and from the induction of an individual into citizenship in the United States is con-

cerned, the comparisons are not good—they relate to temporal things, and can not properly point out the relation of spiritual things. The change of the sinner's relation to God, in the pardon of sin and renewal of his nature, is not analogous to the process of naturalization or marriage, and hence such figures fail to convey a correct idea of conversion. This was the pernicious principle of Alexander Campbell. He understood conversion to be a change of state—a passing out of one condition or state into another; while the Bible everywhere represents it not simply as a change of state, but as a change of heart, and, consequently, these illustrations are not such as would fitly and aptly represent the sinner's return to God, and his being united to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The gentleman lays down a canon to be observed in the interpretation of the scriptures, and I will accept it, for it is correct, and I *do* not wish to quibble about a matter when there is no ground of controversy. The canon is this: "When anything is promised upon the performance of certain conditions, all the conditions must be complied with, before the thing promised can be obtained; and although in some places some of the conditions may not be specified, where the thing promised is spoken of, all the conditions must be understood, though not expressed." This I admit is true. But what are the conditions upon which remission of sins is promised to the penitent? My opponent says baptism is one of them; I say it is not.

The question then resolves itself into this: "Is baptism one of these conditions in order to the remission of sins?" My friend says that it is, while I say that it is not. It is necessary, indeed, that all the conditions, upon which pardon is offered, should be performed. A man must not only hear, but believe, in the sense of assenting to truth. In this sense every man believes who is not an infidel; every individual who does not reject the testimony of God. He must also repent, and confess his sins, and with all his heart he must trust in the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for pardon and for eternal life.

The second argument the gentleman advanced is drawn from the mental constitution of man. He tells us his position is in exact accordance with our mental constitution. Eight here I take square issue with him, for anything that is diametrically opposed to the word of God, stands directly opposed to the mental constitution of man. If the gentleman's position is true it must of necessity preclude the possibility of the salvation of scores who have heard the gospel of Christ, or who may hear it, and who can not comply with its conditions, and therefore can not be saved. The mental constitution of man is such that a mental change may take place without any external or physical act, consequently, the mental constitution of man requires that his return to God should be a mental—a spiritual act, not a physical one. He tells us that it is in accordance with the mental constitution of man that there should be some external or physical act by which the individual returns to God, and is brought into the Christian state, or into the family of Christ. How will this rule work in regard to individuals who are placed beyond the possibility of performing that physical act, when the word of the gospel is first preached unto them? But, says my friend,



"God does not require impossibilities!" "Do you suppose the infinitely-wise God would lay down a condition of pardon which must be changed continually?" I want to know if baptism is a condition of pardon, and there are cases where the condition can not be performed, if there must not be a change of the conditions? Do you suppose the infinitely-wise God, in arranging the plan of human redemption, would adopt a condition of the remission of sins, which it would be necessary for him to be continually changing to suit the conditions and necessities of men?

Alexander Campbell tells us that "salvation is as wide as water flows," and by implication no wider, for he says: "Wherever water, faith, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are, there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus" (Christian System, p. 215); and where all these are found, and water can not be found, there can be no salvation!

This is not only diametrically opposed to God's law, but it is also diametrically opposed to the mental constitution of man; and the illustrations the gentleman brings from the marriage relation, and the naturalization of a foreigner, as we have seen, are not analogous to the case before us, and therefore fail to sustain his position.

The gentleman's third argument was founded on the assumption that his position is in accordance with man's new birth, as explained in John iii. 3, 5. He tells us that the Christian is "begotten of the spirit, impregnated by the word, and born of water." He agrees with Mr. Campbell, who tells us that "God is the father, and the water is the mother," of the Christian; and that "every child is born of its father when it is born of its mother." If "God is our father, and the water is our mother," I would like to know which we ought to love most. Children generally love their mother best; and I think there must be a great deal of this human nature in the gentleman's church. I think they, like most children, love their mother best, for we hear them talk infinitely more about the water, than they do about God. [Laughter.] But this whole argument, if argument it may be called, is solemn trifling—it is worse than this—it is blasphemy in the sight of God to talk in such a manner of spiritual regeneration. I confess I have very little patience with such gross perversions of the word of God.

I remark, in the next place, that the illustration used by Christ in John iii. 5, to explain the nature of the new birth to Nicodemus is a natural one; and one which Nicodemus ought to have understood at once. My opponent will not deny that water was the standing symbol of the Spirit under the Jewish dispensation. He dare not deny it. He will not deny that water under the gospel is the standing symbol of the Spirit. If he does I will prove that it is. Throughout every dispensation of God's church, water has been the standing symbol of the Spirit, and, consequently, purification or cleansing by water is, and has ever been, the symbol of spiritual purification or cleansing. Nicodemus was a teacher in Israel, and it was his business to understand and teach the law. But when the Saviour presented to him the doctrine of spiritual regeneration, he did not understand it. He thought the Saviour was speaking of a literal birth. In order to explain to him the nature of that birth of which he was speaking, Jesus then took

up the type or symbol of spiritual cleansing, and said: "Except a man be born of water, even the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The conjunction *kai* often signifies even, and so rendering it in this passage, makes the passage harmonize exactly with the general teaching of the scriptures, which everywhere teach that water is the symbol of the Spirit. This passage may be paraphrased thus:

"Do you not know, Nicodemus, that throughout the whole scriptures water is used as the symbol of the Spirit, and that the cleansing with water is the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing. I am speaking of being born again in a spiritual sense—of being cleansed from sin."

As this was the type of cleansing, Jesus used this illustration, not to convey the idea of a literal birth of water, but he is speaking about the necessity of a spiritual change, set forth by the types and symbols of the law.

In John i. 12 and iii. 3, 8, and 1 John v. 1, 18, the word used in the original, which is translated in the passages in the gospel "born," and in the epistle "begotten," is the same word. When an individual is said to be "begotten" he is also "born" or "generated" of God, and he partakes of the nature of God by this "generation." The idea of making a distinction between "begotten of God" and "born of God" never occurred to any one until it emanated from the watery brain of Alexander Campbell. The truth is a man is said to be "born" or "begotten" of God because he partakes of the nature of God. It is by this birth that this great spiritual change is consummated; it is the beginning of a new life; not simply the entering into a new state. This great spiritual change is represented in the scriptures under a variety of figures and forms of expression; sometimes as being "begotten" or "generated" of God, sometimes as being "born," and always as showing the divine paternity of the redeemed and saved soul.

The Spirit operates upon the mind and heart, and brings the individual to accept the truths of God's word, and to believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and then he is "born of God," or "regenerated" by the power of the Holy Ghost.

But the gentleman tells us that the same thing is presented in Mark xvi. 16. Here my opponent tells us that being saved signifies "remission of sins." Now, I admit that salvation is sometimes used in the New Testament to signify remission of sins and regeneration, but not always. Sometimes it signifies the blessed state of the soul in heaven, and sometimes it is used to express the final salvation of the soul and body after the resurrection of the dead. . Now, I ask how are we to determine its sense in any given passage? By its connection, the only true rule of interpreting the meaning of words.

What stands in antithesis to salvation in Mark xvi. 16? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." My friend tells us that damnation is the antithesis to salvation, and, consequently, if the salvation spoken of is the remission of sins in this life, then the damnation spoken of must, standing in antithesis to the salvation, refer to the condemnation the

sinner is under in this life also, and not to the future at all. This is Universalism. The very fact that damnation is here the antithesis of salvation, proves incontrovertibly that the salvation here is not remission of sins, but final salvation in the immortal state, and as baptism is the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing and moral purity, and the visible entrance into the household of faith, it becomes the synonym of Christian duty. "He that believes and is baptized"—that is, he that believes and afterward obeys God's commandments in all things "shall be saved." This, then, is the import of the passage in Mark xvi. 16. The salvation stands in direct antithesis to the damnation, and requires, from the very nature of the case, that whatever state the salvation refers to, the damnation must refer to also. It is not "he that believes not is damned," it is "he that believeth not shall be damned." It is not "he that believeth and is baptized is saved," but "shall be saved." The "salvation" and the "damnation" are both in the future. I am surprised every time I hear one of the gentleman's brethren bring forward this passage of scripture as one of the passages upon which depends the proof that baptism is for the remission of sins. I stand squarely against this position.

The gentleman tells us that the Christian life begins when the person is baptized into Christ, and not before. There is no spiritual life, according to his doctrine, until the person is buried into Christ by immersion! When he, or any of his brethren, comes up to you, and calls you "brother," say to him: "I am not your brother, sir; I can not be your brother, according to your doctrines; I have never been buried into Christ by immersion, and, consequently, I have no spiritual life. Do not come around me with feigned words, to make me believe that I am a good Christian, while by your doctrine you send me to hell."

The gentleman's fourth argument, he tells us, is drawn from the fact that the scriptures expressly teach that baptism is for the remission of sins, in the sense of a condition precedent to the remission of sins. Now, what are the scriptural proofs presented in proof of this position?

I will now take up the passage upon which Mr. B. and his friends rely to prove their proposition. I will read to you a list of all the passages claimed by Mr. Campbell to sustain this position, for Mr. B. follows Mr. Campbell pretty closely here, and I prefer to follow the master instead of the disciple.

Mr. Campbell gives but six passages "that plainly import any connection between baptism and remission of sins." They are the following:

1. "John did baptize . . . and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."—Mark i. 4.
2. "The people of Judea and Jerusalem were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing their sins."—Mark i. 5.
3. "And he came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."—Luke iii. 3.
4. "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins."—Acts ii. 38.

5. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, invoking the name of the Lord."—Acts xxii. 16.

6. "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism."—Eph. iv. 5.—Campbell on Baptism, pp. 251, 252.

Three of these passages refer to John's baptism, and I will take up these first and follow the gentleman's argument.

In the first place I ask, is it here declared that John baptized the people "for the remission of their sins?" Look at the passage, and see if it is so stated. Did John baptize the people "for the remission of their sins?" No, sir; these passages do not say so. What do they say? They say he preached something "for the remission of sins." He preached the baptism of what? Of remission; is that it? No. He preached the baptism of repentance, did he not? He "preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Now, I want to put the question to the gentleman: Did John preach the remission of sins by baptism? Was John's baptism designed to wash away the sins of those who received it at his hands? If so, why did Christ himself call John's baptism the "baptism of repentance?" John's baptism has got the wrong name according to my friend. It ought to have been called the "baptism of remission," but it is called the "baptism of repentance."

I remark in the next place, that if John's baptism was for the remission of sins, there are two baptisms in the New Testament, according to my opponent, for the remission of sins. Christian baptism is for the remission of sins, and he tells us that John's baptism, and the "Christian institution," are two separate and distinct things. Which of these baptisms is the true baptism of remission? Does God require the same person to be baptized twice for the remission of sins? My opponent will not baptize a person twice for the remission of sins. O, no, this is contrary to his creed. He spoke awhile ago about the mummeries of the Roman Catholic Church. But does he not agree with the Roman Catholic Church on the doctrine of the remission of sins? Both churches baptize for the remission of sins committed before baptism, and both require confession and prayer for the remission of sins committed after baptism. Here the Catholics and my opponent agree exactly on the doctrine of remission.

But did not the apostles baptize the very same persons whom John baptized? If you will turn to Acts xix. 1-7, you will find that certain persons who had been baptized by John, received Christian baptism. I ask why were these persons baptized again? Why did Christ and his apostles baptize all those who came to their preaching, if John's baptism was for the remission of sins? I want a straightforward answer to all these questions, or an acknowledgment that John's baptism was the baptism of repentance and not for the remission of sins. John preached something for the remission of sins. What was it that he preached? John's whole doctrine is called his baptism, because his baptism was one prominent feature of his work. But John preached something "for the remission of sins." What was it that he preached? My friend says baptism is an action. How could John preach an action? He could preach a doctrine; but an action he could not preach. John "gave the knowledge of the remission of

sins" through faith in Jesus Christ; this is precisely what he did. I repeat it, John "gave the knowledge of the remission of sins" to Israel through faith in Jesus Christ. John did not remit their sins in, or by baptism, but he preached to them how they were to obtain remission through him that was to come.

"And it was prophesied of him by his fathers, Luke i. 77, that he should "give the knowledge of salvation unto his people by," or rather through "the remission of their sins." But how did he do this?

Paul says: "John baptized the people with the baptism of repentance, saying unto them that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, in Christ Jesus."—Acts xix. 4.

Can there be any such thing as the remission of sins except through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? My friend, even, will not say that there can. John then gave the knowledge of salvation through faith in Christ, and his baptism was to those who received it, the sign of repentance, and also the declaration they looked to him who was to come, for remission of sins, through faith in his name.

I intend to follow the gentleman through his argument, for this proposition does not require me to take both the affirmative and negative, as did the former.

I wish you to bear in mind, that in these passages concerning John's baptism, it is always called the "baptism of repentance," and never the "baptism of remission." It was not a condition precedent to remission of sins; and yet the very same preposition (*eis*) is used in reference to John's baptism that is used in Acts ii. 38.

John says: "I, indeed, baptize you with water (*eis metanoian*) into repentance."

Again, it is said: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance (*eis aphesin amartoon*) into remission of sins."

You remember that I told you that *eis*, when used in connection with *katabainoo*, did not signify action into a place, but only to it. My friend, however, told you that the primary meaning of *eis* was into, and that being its primary meaning, we could not depart from it only in cases where there was a manifest necessity for it. I agree with this general principle, that the ordinary meaning of a word must be adhered to, unless there be a sufficient reason for a departure from that meaning.

And now we take up the meaning of the preposition *eis*, and inquire whether it must be understood in its ordinary meaning in these passages of scripture. John did baptize, and preach the baptism of repentance *eis* the remission of sins. I wish to know if this baptism was in order to the remission of sins? The arguments which I have already presented preclude the possibility of understanding it as expressing a condition of the remission of sins, or in order to the remission of sins. Well, then, I ask, what does the preposition *eis* here mean? How are we to understand it? John did baptize the people and "preach the baptism of repentance into the remission of sins," telling them "that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ." Are we to understand the preposition here

in its ordinary sense? We must so understand it, unless some sufficient reason can be assigned for giving it a different meaning? What does it mean to say, "he preached the baptism of repentance (*eis*) into the remission of sins?" In illustration of the meaning of (*eis*) here, we will turn to the example quoted a moment ago: "I, indeed baptize you with water, (*eis*) into repentance." Does *eis* here mean in order to repentance? Would any man assume such a position as this? To be baptized (*eis*) into repentance, then signifies to be baptized into a profession of repentance. Then to "preach the baptism or repentance (*eis*) into remission of sins," is to preach the doctrine that remission of sins comes through faith in Christ. John's baptism was for the remission of sins in the sense of a declaration of the fact that remission of sins came through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

The fourth passage Mr. Campbell brings forward, in support of his proposition, is Acts ii. 38: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins." This is the strong passage upon which the gentleman and all his friends rely to support their system; and yet, the whole argument here rests again upon the meaning of the preposition *eis*. Mr. C. and all his followers understand the preposition *eis* here to mean "in order to;" and upon this the whole system rests. Suppose now we translate the preposition *eis*, "into," which is its ordinary meaning, and is so translated by Mr. Campbell himself, and see how the passage will read: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, into the remission of sins." Perhaps you will ask, "What have you gained by this?" We shall soon see what we have gained. What does to "be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, into remission of sins," mean? An examination of a few passages of scripture where the same form of expression is used, will soon settle the meaning of this passage. The first passage I shall call your attention to is Matt. iii. 11: "I indeed baptize you with water *eis metanoian* into repentance." Now, every one knows that *eis* does not mean in order to, in this passage. It means a profession of repentance. To be baptized into repentance, then, is to be baptized into a profession of repentance.

The next passage I shall call attention to, is the "great commission," Matt. xxviii. 19: "Go disciple all nations, baptizing them *eis* (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." What is meant by being "baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?" It means that in baptism we make a solemn profession of faith in, and obedience to, the ever-blessed Trinity, and it can signify nothing else.

The third passage I shall bring forward in illustration of my position is 1st Cor. x. 2: "And were all baptized *eis* (into) Moses," etc. According to my friend's teachings it would be, "and were all dipped into Moses." [Laughter.] What is meant here by being baptized into Moses? The only meaning that can be attached to it is, "they were baptized into a profession of faith, in the teachings of Moses, and of obedience to him as their lawgiver." To be baptized into Moses, or into any one else, is to take upon one's self a profession of faith in, or obedience to that person. In the same sense a person is "baptized the name of Jesus Christ, into remission of sins." It is to be bap-

DEBATE ON THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

tized into the profession of the faith, that remission of sins comes only in the name of Christ—only on account of his merit, his atoning sacrifice for sin. The name of Christ here, standing for his sacrificial death.

The fourth passage I shall present in illustration of my position is 1st Cor. i. 13-15: "Or were ye baptized *eis* (into) the name of Paul? \* \* \* \* Lest any should say that I had baptized *eis* (into) mine own name." Now, I ask, what is it to be "baptized into the name of Paul?" The apostle is here reproving the party spirit that had crept into the church at Corinth, and he was showing them that they were not under the obligation of obedience to any one but Christ. Why? Because they had not been baptized into the profession of faith in, or obedience to Paul, or to any other minister, but only to Christ.

Now, take all the light that is thrown upon this passage, by the passages we have just referred to, and I ask if to be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ *eis* (into) remission of sins," means to be baptized in order to, or as a condition of remission of sins?

To be "baptized *eis* (into) repentance," to be "baptized *eis* (into) the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," to be "baptized *eis* (into) Moses," to be "baptized *eis* (into) the name of Paul," and to be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ *eis* (into) the remission of sins," are all expressions of the same import, and the meaning is plain in all these passages. When we come to examine the import of *eis*, and compare the passages where such forms of expression are found, we find that there is not a particle of foundation in this passage of scripture for the doctrine that baptism is "in order to the remission of sins." This passage of scripture when properly understood, by the plain and obvious meaning of its terms, and its collation with other passages of scripture, teaches that remission of sins comes only through faith in the name of Jesus, while baptism is the public profession of this faith to the world, and because the outward symbol of remission of sins, and that spiritual cleansing, which only comes through faith in the blood of the slain Lamb of God.

I will not now go beyond the point where my opponent has gone, but will let the argument rest here for the present. But I want you to bear in mind, the position I have here proved, that to be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ *eis* (into) the remission of sins," does not signify to be baptized in order to the remission of sins, any more than to be "baptized *eis* (into) repentance" means to be baptized "in order to repentance;" or to be baptized *eis* (into) the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," means to be baptized "in order to" the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or to be "baptized *eis* (into) Moses," means to be baptized "in order to" Moses, or to be "baptized *eis* (into) the name of Paul," means to be baptized "in order to" the name of Paul. So to be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ *eis* (into) the remission of sins," is not to be baptized "in order to" the remission of sins; but it is a profession of the faith that remission of sins comes only in the name of Jesus Christ. This one single argument takes away the only passage of scripture on which my opponent can possibly rely, as we shall see during this discussion, and is of itself

sufficient to forever settle the question whether baptism is a condition of the remission of sins or not. I ask you to follow us closely during the discussion of this proposition, for it is one of infinite moment to us all, and as we hear and understand, so will our account be in the great judgment day, and so will be our destiny to all eternity.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My opponent has referred to one matter several times, that can hardly be regarded as in order. He has several times spoken of his debate with Mr. Sweeney, and of Mr. Sweeney's positions, and of his victories over that gentleman. I would remind the gentleman, as he has already been told by several persons, that we are not so much concerned about what he thinks he did in Du Quoin several years ago, as we are about what he can do here. His friends here would rather have him, at least, make a tolerable effort toward sustaining his position here, than to hear of a thousand victories elsewhere. Unless he does better than he has done so far, they will not even believe his stories about what he has done elsewhere.

I am told that Mr. Hughey wanted Mr. Sweeney to affirm that "baptism was regeneration." He positively refused, but did affirm that "baptism was for the remission of the past sins of the penitent believer." He gave as the conditions of pardon, hearing the gospel, faith, repentance, confession of Christ, baptism, and then pardon. He appealed to the great commission Christ gave to his apostles, and most triumphantly sustained his position. So triumphantly did he sustain it, that Mr. Hughey rose under great embarrassment, and began by saying that Mr. Sweeney had not taken the position he anticipated, and that the proposition was not what he wanted—he expected Mr. Sweeney to affirm that baptism was regeneration. So complete was his discomfiture that Mr. Cole, a Baptist preacher, one of the moderators, arose and said: "Mr. Hughey, since the proposition is not what you wanted, and as he proved his position from the commission, you had better drop this proposition and go on to the next." Such is a full statement of the matter as given me by one who was present, and who is here this morning.

Now, let me ask you if my opponent grappled with the work I laid out before him. I affirmed most unequivocally that baptism is one of the conditions of the remission of the past sins of the penitent believer. I adduced seven clear positive arguments to sustain it. He replies by running back to the patriarchs and wanders down through the unbaptized world, down to himself, and the unbaptized of the present day, and asks "what will become of them if the position be true?" Instead of showing that my arguments did not sustain my position, instead of showing that my position is not in accordance with God's law, he virtually impeaches the justice of that law by his declamation about consequences. Consequences have nothing to do with the discussion of this proposition. If I can show that the word of God affirms and most positively teaches my position, I have established it by the standard we both accept, and I care not a straw for consequences.



My opponent wants to know if he is an unpardoned sinner. He must read his Bible more carefully and decide for himself. It is not for me to say. I am not a judge of another's servant. "To his own master he stands or falls." He wants to know what becomes of all unimmersed persons. We are not debating that proposition. The question is "Does the law of God make baptism one of the conditions of pardon?" We appeal to the scriptures, and as my opponent is concerned about the consequences, let him go there to settle that question. He seems, however, to be more disposed to deny God's word, because its teachings are repugnant to his prejudice and his estimate of his Standing as a servant of God.

Christ met certain persons who spurned the idea that they were not the salt of the earth and righteous above all other men. They rejected his teachings on account of the consequences, for did they not make sinners of them the seed of Abraham, and who tithed mint, anise and cummin? Christ never changed his law on account of its consequences to the self-righteous of his day, nor will he modify his law to suit my friend's conduct. Let him make his conduct accord with God's law. I did say in the beginning that a man's knowledge modified his responsibility, and that this extended even to them who had been wrongly taught. Some have had the law presented to them in so perverted a manner that they never knew the truth.

But my opponent says he can not plead ignorance. Well, he knows best! So much the worse for him! He must settle the question by testing his cause by the plain and positive teachings of God's word. Whether he is one who is misled, or whether he is one of that class so fearfully denounced by our Saviour, who had taken away the key to the temple of knowledge, and who would neither enter its sacred portals themselves, nor permit others to enter, he must decide, and not I. It is between his conscience and his God.

He is not my brother, he says. He don't want me to call him brother. Well, he shall be gratified. I shall never whine about any such privilege. I care nothing about it. I can stand it as long as he can, for the loss is too small to be calculated. But it is a fact, however, that after those insulting remarks, he went right out of doors last night and called several members of my church, brethren.

*Mr. Hughey.*—I did not know them.

*Mr. Braden.*—Well, you should be careful in the future how you dispense such an inestimable favor, since it is such, to be called brother by you. Now we will examine his attempts to evade the force; of the positions we took and established yesterday. He attempts to meet the force of our unanswerable argument on the fall and restoration of man by mystifying the point where man became guilty.

He says sin is in the determination of the heart. Suppose we admit it. How does that effect or change our position? When there is this determination, will not the act follow? Does not this determination of the heart move the person forward to the completion of the act, and remain in and exist throughout the act? Does not the Bible regard the determination as forming part of the act, and simultaneous with it? It certainly never mentions the determination while it does mention the act.

My friend places the sin in the intent of the heart, and here alone.

This makes the act sinful, but the sin is the act. We read in 1st John iii. 4: "Sin is a transgression of the law." They broke the law when they ate the fruit. God said to Adam, ".When thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." He did not attempt any of the fine-spun metaphysical distinctions of modern dogmatic theology, and say, "When you determine to eat of it you shall surely die." No he knew that the determination would be in the act and simultaneous with it, and he spoke of and treated them as one.

We are told also, "When they ate their eyes were opened and they were ashamed" as they were guilty. All the statements of the Bible agree with our position, that man became guilty when he had violated a positive law, and not till then. The passages we quote are speaking directly of this transaction, and they make a plain unequivocal statement as to when man became guilty. Revelation states it as a fact that he became guilty when he violated a positive law, and we accept the plain positive statements of the scriptures rather than my opponent's metaphysical distinction made to set aside positive statements of fact.

My opponent places baptism in the return, when disobedience was in the fall. That is all we ask. Then he admits that baptism is as much in order to remission, as transgression of the command, "thou shalt not eat of it" was in order to incurring the guilt. If all will accept that and act accordingly we will have but little dispute about the proposition, for I think all would regard baptism to be a condition of remission. We read, "When thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." So we say, "When you are baptized you shall surely live." We give the same place in time and sequence to one that we do to the other. All right, says my opponent. Indeed he Could not say otherwise. Here we might leave the question.

But my friend must now save his speculative theory about "regeneration" or "getting religion." He asserts that disbelief was the consummating act. This makes woman a sinner before she even desired to disobey or had determined to disobey. He here contradicts himself, and he most positively contradicts these most plain and emphatic declarations of scripture, that the transgression—the eating—was the consummating act that made woman guilty.

He destroys all analogy between the fall and return. He makes the fall to consist, in hearing the falsehood, and disbelieving God by believing the falsehood of the tempter. The steps of the return are hearing, faith in the sense of believing God's word, repentance, confession, and faith in sense of reliance on God. Now we object to this, that it destroys all analogy which the gentleman admits to exist between the departure and return. It separates faith into two parts and places one part before, and the other after repentance, a most absurd notion. The gentleman had better take the plain statement of God's word that man fell by hearing, disbelief, desire of sin, and transgression of a positive law, and he must return by hearing, believing, repentance, and obedience to a positive law.

But we can admit his position that faith in the sense of reliance on God is the consummating act of man's return, and still prove baptism to be a condition of pardon. Now we can never be pardoned till we have this faith, says our opponent. When can we have this faith?

1 John iii. 18, "My little children let us love neither in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth."

When do we love in our deeds and in truth?

1 John v. 2, "Hereby do we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments."

When have we faith in the sense of reliance or confidence in God?

1 John iii. 19, "Hereby do we know that we are of the truth, add shall persuade our hearts before him. For if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts and knows all things. Beloved, if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God, and whatsoever we ask of him, we receive, because we keep his commandments."

Again we are told that, "He that comes to God must not only believe that he is, but he must also believe that he is a rewarder of such as diligently seek him."

Now when the sinner attempts to return to God, when can he have this reliance on God? John says when he has examined his heart, and finds he has from the heart done all God commanded. And it is to give this assurance that God instituted baptism. The sinner having obeyed this, and submitted his will to the will of God in this positive ordinance, knows that he has done what God required, and that God's eternal truth is pledged to accept him, and he has confidence to ask of God and will receive pardon, because he has kept his commandment. Hence every attempt of the gentleman to evade the conclusion that baptism is a condition of pardon only involves him deeper and deeper in difficulty.

He next says Mr. Campbell says immersion is a change of state. We understood conversion to include all man does to return to God. Pardon, the last part of it, an act of God, changes his state. He next speaks of my talking of mere belief. We are often told that we require mere historical faith, and that nine men out of ten can make the confession we require and say they believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Now such a representation most grossly misrepresents us. We do not require mere intellectual assent. We require a man to most solemnly declare before God, that he believes with his whole heart. Did you ever see a man who believed with his whole heart that was not a Christian? You know you never did. Then let us have no more misrepresentation about mere belief.

Mr. Hughey wants to know if baptism was a condition of pardon among the Jews and patriarchs. Certainly not, for the law was not then given. Has God changed the conditions of pardon? He has changed the positive conditions of pardon. The patriarchs were pardoned by prayer and sacrifice. Sacrifice was the positive condition. The Jews had this and other conditions. Now these are done away, and we have baptism. God has modified his moral conditions for he requires far more of us than he did of the patriarchs. We enjoy the full light of God's revelation, and God's moral conditions of pardon are greater now than in the time of the patriarchs.

If men are saved in ignorance or mobility without baptism, does God change his conditions of pardon? Not at all, he modifies man's responsibility, according to his knowledge and ability. He modifies man's responsibility in this way in reference to every condition. The

heathen never hear, hence they are judged without the law. Faith is a condition. Deaf mutes never have faith. They can not have and it is not required of them. But this does not destroy the consistence of God's plan. God never stultifies himself, when he thus modifies man's responsibility.

My friend next urges that according to my position all baptized persons belong to the church. All penitent believers who have been baptized, have been baptized into Christ, and form a part of his body, the church. The proposition requires faith and repentance before baptism.

But, says Mr. Hughey, the gentleman makes the Spirit our father, and baptism our mother in our new birth, and as we all love our mother most, this accounts for these people thinking more of baptism than of the operation of the Spirit. They love the mother more than God. There is a rule of rhetoric my brother should learn, "Never press a figure too far. Never make it go on all fours." We never said baptism was our mother. We never said the Spirit literally begat us according to the ordinary process of procreation. We avoided all such gross literalizing the highly figurative language of our Saviour. But we are willing to have our love for God compared with that of our opponent's. Those love the Father most, who keep his commandments. We are told that obedience is better than sacrifice. We believe that we must not only offer the sacrifice of the words of our lips, but that we must obey his commands "If ye love me, keep my commandments," says Christ, and we prefer to demonstrate our love in that way, rather than by noisy shouts and protestations, that men may hear us. My opponent would fain have you believe that he is very spiritual. He spoke of my being very literal, and my lack of spiritual discernment. We are to conclude that he and those who believe his dogmas are alone spiritual. Let us hope he will abundantly enlighten us on these matters.

We come now to his attempt to set aside our argument that baptism is said to be for the remission of sins. He gives us a long disquisition on *eis*. He is great on *eis*. He admits it means "into" primarily, and can be so translated in a majority of cases. Its second prominent idea is "in order to." This he attempts to avoid by retaining the original rendering into. That will not help him. "Baptism into remission of sins." What does it mean? It means being baptized into a state of pardon or into the state of remission of sins. Baptized into Moses. What does it mean? It certainly means being baptized into a state or condition which places you under the leadership of Moses, or the authority of Moses. Baptize into Christ means baptized into a state in which you are under the authority of Christ. Baptized into the name of Paul, or into Paul, means baptized into a state where you are under the authority of Paul, have Paul's name called on you, or a state where you wear the name of Paul. Baptized into remission of sins, means then baptized into that state or condition where your sins are remitted, or into the state you are in when your sins are remitted. Hence we are baptized into that state, or can not be in that state till we are baptized, or baptism is in order to our entering this state, or in order to the remission of our sins. Rendering the word into will not

help the gentleman a particle. Baptism still remains in order to the remission of sins.

What does baptized into repentance mean? It means baptized into a state of repentance or reformation. It should be reformation. There are two Greek words that are translated into English by the verb repent. They are: *Metamelomai*, to feel sorrow for sin, or remorse; and *metanaeoo* to sincerely repent, or to reform. In these cases repentance means reformation, hence *metanoia* was used, and John baptized them into a life of reformation.

We will now examine his attempts to evade our argument on John iii. 3, and Mark xvi. 16. He does not take the language as we would ordinarily understand it. He attempts to evade the argument by giving it a rendering that only years of attempts to evade the truth and pervert God's word could possibly reach. Millions would read the passage and never think of such an idea. No one would think of it, except one who had an untenable dogma to bolster. But my opponent is spiritual and this perversion can be discerned spiritually only. I used to know an old woman who had in her possession a stone that had the remarkable property of enabling her to see things past, and things to come, things afar off as well as those present, when she looked through it. My friend seems to have a stone of like character, and when he looks through it, he sees the scriptures in a new and spiritual sense. He is like the man who was blind, he "sees men as trees walking."

Jesus says "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter the kingdom of God." Here are two things spoken of—two entirely different things—the water and the Spirit—and we are said to be born of both—of the water and of the Spirit.

Jesus explains the birth or being begotten of the Spirit, as believing the word of truth. Many other scriptures most positively teach the same thing. Jesus says belief and baptism are necessary to our salvation from sin, or our new birth. Paul says we are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit, or by believing the gospel and baptism. Hence birth of the Spirit, or being begotten of the Spirit, is faith, and birth of water is baptism, for we are in the water and emerge from it. So says common-sense in all ages. The apostolic fathers always called baptism a birth of the water. So say commentators, divines and learned men of ages. So says John Wesley.

But, alas, how ignorant Jesus, Paul, the apostolic fathers, commentators, Wesley, and all learned men have all been! My friend puts on his spiritual discerning-stone, and he reads, "Born of the water, even the Spirit." He interprets it that water and Spirit are the same, and when a man believes, he is born of the water! I feel I ought to apologize for noticing such twaddle. He says water is used all the way through the scriptures as a symbol of the Spirit. Now, that is a broad assertion, and needs proof. I most emphatically deny it. I deny here that water in this passage is a type of the Spirit. When one is born of the water there is no water at all meant! It means belief, or birth of the Spirit! Can any one, in the name of reason, believe such nonsense? The water and the Spirit are identical, and it means water, even Spirit! If water and Spirit are identical how

can water be the type of the Spirit? Are the type and the thing typified the same? It means water even" the Spirit one moment, making them the same, and again water is a type, and the Spirit the anti-type, and of course different things. In this way does this man jumble and make nonsense of the words of the Son of God.

I know *kai* sometimes joins words that are in opposition, and are titles of the same person or thing—as "Our God and Father," or it might read "Our God even the Father." But no one will be such a sodden fool as to Believe it has the same use here, or that water and Spirit are one, or that the water and the Spirit are titles of the same person, and that when we believe, or are born of the Spirit, we are born of the water.

But water is a type of the Spirit. Then it is not the Spirit. But that will not help him, for we are said to be born of both. We are born of two different things, the type and the antitype, water and the Spirit, before we are pardoned, or enter Christ's kingdom. If they were the same would the Son of God be guilty of such needless, absurd tautology, as to use both terms. Mr. Hughey addressed you yesterday. A picture of Mr. Hughey is a representation, a symbol of Mr. Hughey, hence when you heard Mr. Hughey, you listened to the picture even Mr. Hughey; you heard the representation of Mr. Hughey even Mr. Hughey! Away with such nonsense. Don't insult our common-sense by attempting to foist such balderdash on the Son of God, as born of the water even the Spirit.

The gentleman takes up his spiritual discerning-stone, and he looks at *M* irk xvi. 16, and he sees wonderful things that have never before entered into the imagination of man. He sees that baptism in Mark is the same as the "all things" which Christ commanded in Matthew, and that baptism means simply all Christian duties! How did he find it out? All Christian duties is certainly not a meaning of baptism That is making more of baptism than even a "Campbellite" ever dreamed of. If Christ meant all Christian duties, why did he not say so? He certainly knew that baptism did not mean that. Could he not say what he meant? Alphonso; King of Castile, used to say had he been present at the creation he could have saved God Almighty from a great many blunders. My opponent seems to think that had he been present, he could have saved the Spirit of God from a great many blunders. He could have told the Son of God what he meant, by the aid of his spiritual discerning-stone, and told him how to say it. But baptism is a specific act, and can not be used to express the generic, or the "all things" that Christ commanded. The generic may be limited to the specific, and be used for it, but the specific can not be expanded to the generic, and made to include all that is in the generic, hence it can not be used for it. We showed, also, that Matthew placed baptism before pardon, and made it an act necessary to enter Christ's kingdom, and that the "all things" were after one entered the kingdom, hence they did not include baptism; much less could baptism include them.

Let us compare the accounts: Matthew says, "Make disciples of all the nations." Mark says, "He that believeth." These are one act. Then, "Baptizing them into the name of the Father," etc.,

says Matthew; "and is baptized," says Mark. These are the same act. "Shall be saved" from sin, or pardoned, says Mark. Matthew, without stating this, gives what shall be done with the pardoned. Mark leaves this out. This attempted evasion will not do.

But *katakrisis* means eternal condemnation, hence the salvation must be eternal, as baptism secures our eternal salvation. Worse and worse. The salvation is the same as the apostles always promised when preaching, a salvation from sin, from the practice and guilt of sin. Our eternal salvation Paul assures us is to be wrought out with fear and trembling. *Katakrinoo* does not mean to damn or condemn eternally. The same word is used in John v. 10, when the adulterous woman was brought to Jesus, and he asked: "Does any man condemn thee?" and said, "Neither do I condemn thee." Does it mean eternal damnation when it is said, in Matt. xxvii., "When Judas saw that Jesus was condemned?" Does it mean that our Lord was eternally damned?

"He that believeth not shall be condemned." In John iii. we are told he that believeth not is condemned already. Does it mean eternally damned? No, it means that he is condemned, or rests under the guilt of sin. So it does in Mark xvi. In like manner the salvation is a salvation from the guilt and condemnation of sin, or pardon, and baptism is a condition of this salvation or pardon.

We will now restate our position in regard to when man became guilty, and show that it accords with God's word, and show, also, how my opponent's position denies and falsifies it. My opponent is highly pleased with the state of the discussion. So am I, and our joy is mutual, and I hope it will be full.

He agrees with me that man's departure from God was a progressive work, and was accomplished by a series of acts or steps, and not by a single act, or by a single one of these successive acts. That man's return must be a progressive work, accomplished by a series of acts, and not by one, or by a single one of these successive acts. That we must examine all the law of pardon, collate all the conditions and unite them, and that pardon depends on all of them, and not on a single one.

He makes the steps of the departure hearing and disbelief. The steps of the return are hearing, belief of the gospel, repentance and faith, in the sense of confidence in God. Then the guilt of sin is removed and baptism follows as an act of Christian obedience.

I claim that the steps of the departure were hearing, disbelief, desire for sin, and sin, or disobedience of God's positive command, "Thou shalt not eat of it." That the steps of the return are hearing, belief of the gospel, or faith, repentance, and obedience to God's positive ordinance of baptism.

The issue between us is here. Mr. Hughey places moral death, or man's separation from God, before the overt act of transgression, or disobedience of God's positive command; and the removal of the guilt, or pardon, or man's restoration to divine favor, before baptism, or the overt act of obedience, or submitting the will to the will of God, in obeying his positive law.

I place moral death, or man's separation from God, after the con-

summation of his volition to disobey God's positive command, or the overt act of disobedience. I place also man's restoration to divine favor, or new life, or pardon, after the consummation of his volition to obey God's positive command, or the overt act of obedience in baptism.

The issue is not one of theory, but one of fact, and can be settled by an appeal to God's word. What saith the word?

The scriptures say that by sin moral death, or separation from God, entered the world, and that sin is a transgression of the law, or that man was not separated from God till he had broken the law.

"Not so," cries my opponent to the Spirit of Eternal Truth, "not so, or what will become of my pet theory of getting religion? What will become of me and my friends, if this principle is carried out in God's government. Not so, death, or separation from God, entered before the transgression."

Jehovah announced in the garden of Eden, "When thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or be separated from me, the source of all spiritual life.

"Not so, O Jehovah!" cries my opponent, "or what will become of my pet theory of the new birth? What will become of me and my friends if this is the law of the government? Not so, before she ate of it she surely died, and before we obey we shall surely live, whether we obey thy law or not."

The scriptures, in describing this very event, say: "When they had eaten their eyes were opened, and they were ashamed," or became guilty before God.

"Not so," repeats my opponent, "or what will become of my pet dogma about a change of heart by faith alone? What will become of me and my unbaptized friends, for we do not like thy law, and we are not going to obey it, and we are going to have our guilt removed before we obey. Not so, before they ate they were guilty."

Then the scriptures most clearly and positively declare that death entered by a transgression of the law—that when they should eat they should die—that when they ate they became guilty.

My opponent says that death entered before the transgression of the law—that before they should eat they should die—and that before they ate they became guilty.

A more flat contradiction can not be conceived. The dispute is not with me, but between him and his God—between his daring assumption, and the plainest statements of God's word, and there we leave it.

We will now try our position:

The scriptures say that by transgression of a positive law moral death, or separation from God, entered the world. So say we, and that by obedience to a positive law we begin a new life, or return to God.

God said, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or when you violate my positive law, you shall be separated from me, the source of life. So say we, and when we obey a positive law we shall live, or begin a new life of union with God and restoration to his favor.



The scriptures say, "When they had eaten," or violated a positive law. "they became guilty." So say we, and we say also that when we obey a positive law, or are baptized, we have our guilt removed, or we are pardoned. Thus we speak as the oracles of God speak on these matters.

Now, let me urge you to take the plain common-sense understanding of man's fall and restoration; the plain common-sense rendering of "Baptism for the remission of sins;" the plain common-sense rendering of "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of heaven;" also of "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and decide as men who are listening to God's word, is not baptism for the remission of sins?—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. HUGHEY'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—If I have a "spiritual discerning-stone," through which I view things, it is quite apparent that my opponent looks at everything through the water, and this prevents his seeing things clearly, for water you know refracts the rays of light that pass through it, and it shows you only a distorted image of the things seen. So my friend looks through the water, and it gives everything a distorted shape and a false coloring. [Laughter]

Before I enter upon the review of the gentleman's speech, I wish to ask him what test, in the form of a positive command, was it through which the patriarchs, and Old Testament saints, consummated their return to God or obtained the remission of sins? What was the overt act by which Abraham was justified, and brought into the family of God? Will he tell us if there were some overt act, by which the sinner's return to God was consummated, before the coming of Christ, what that overt act was?

In regard to the discussion between Mr. J. S. Sweeney and myself, I have said nothing here about gaining a victory over him. This much, however, is certain: When Mr. Sweeney and I had received propositions from H. S. Bosworth, of Cincinnati, and had both agreed that it was the best we could do, and when nothing remained but to close the contract, and I was urging him to close the contract, and send it to me, and I would sign it (he was then living in Cincinnati) and send it back to him, when one of his brethren in De Soto, Ill., who was abundantly able, had publicly, through the *Herald of Truth*, pledged himself to furnish Mr. Sweeney's part of the money, and five members of our church in Duquoin, Ill., where the discussion was held, and who represented not less than 875,000 capital, had pledged themselves to furnish my part of the money to pay for publication, and I had notified Mr. Sweeney of this fact, he suddenly dropped the correspondence for some eight months, and I could not get a word out of him. When he was compelled to speak out, his excuse to his friends was that the report was not fit for publication, and that I had not come forward with my part of the money, both of which were false. The report was made by Rev. E. H. Waring, of Iowa, who has twice reported the proceedings of our General Conference, and is one of the

best reporters in the West. Yet Mr. Sweeney published his debate with Rev. Mr. Logan, of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as a regularly reported debate, while I have in my possession now, a letter from Elder John R. Howard, of the Campbellite Church, stating that he reported the Sweeney and Logan debate, and that he is no reporter at all! but that he took notes in long-hand, and from his notes he wrote out all of Mr. Logan's speeches, and part of Mr. Sweeney's, and the rest Mr. Sweeney wrote out himself! Yet the report of our debate was not fit to publish! Mr. Sweeney also acknowledged to the reporter in Duquoin, when he had written out his first speech and showed it to him, that it was a much better report than that of the Logan debate, and would need far less correcting. Whether Mr. Sweeney thought himself victorious or not this fully proves.

The gentleman has stated what is positively false in regard to the question between Mr. Sweeney and I. Mr. Sweeney refused to take the position that every unimmersed person must be damned. He was not so brave as my opponent; he would not take the consequences, nor would he do it until I got him a little irritated, and then he said, "If a man will not obey the commands of God he would be damned, and he ought to be." This was the nearest I could get him to the position, while he repudiated the consequences which [ showed must follow this position—that all unimmersed persons would certainly be damned. Mr. Sweeney started on this proposition: "If Mr. Hughey will admit that baptism is for the remission of sins in any sense, I don't care what, I will close the argument." I replied, "I will admit that baptism is for the remission of sins in a symbolical sense." It was then that Mr. Johnston, the President-Moderator, arose and attempted to reconcile us, thinking that we were agreed. I did not say the proposition was not what I wanted. It was Mr. Sweeney who stated, on the proposition concerning the Methodist Discipline, that it was not what he wanted, and I arose and proposed to change it, so as to make just what he wanted; but he said that he could not change it, for he had made his arrangements to debate it in that form, and he must go through with it. These are the facts in the case—I know whereof I affirm. Whether Mr. Sweeney was victorious, or whether I was victorious, I am not here to say. I want this, particularly, to go upon the record, for I intend to fully ventilate this whole matter concerning the Sweeney debate.

The gentleman tells us that he does not care for the consequences that follow from his position. I want him to stand square up to the consequences here, and not do as Mr. Campbell has done. Mr. Campbell, when the question was asked him by a conscientious sister whether there could be any baptism among the sects, replied as follows:

*Mr. Braden*—I rise to a question of order. Mr. Hughey is debating with me, and not with Mr. Campbell.

*Mr. Hughey*—I will yield the point if it is decided out of order.

*The Moderator*—(Hon. Mr. Kuykendall)—The passage can be read if it has a direct bearing on the question in debate.

*Mr. Braden*—All that has been said by Mr. Campbell does not affect the issue between my opponent and myself. It is my business to

bring forward arguments, and it is Mr. Hughey's business to reply to them. The opinions of Mr. Campbell are in no way connected with the work before us. This controversy between my opponent and myself is not to be decided by our hurling Campbell and Rice at each other's heads. We have a clear issue, and let us stick to it

*Mr. Hughey*—I want to read the passage for the purpose of showing, as I have already stated, that Mr. Campbell would not assume the consequences of his doctrine, and that he admits that if his doctrine be true, the "gates of hell have prevailed against the church!"

*Mr. Braden*—I object again. I am not to be held responsible for the views of Mr. Campbell. Some person in the church asked Mr. Campbell to show the consequences of a certain position, and Mr. Campbell acknowledged the consequences. Whether he assumed them or not is another question.

[The reading was finally allowed, but the remarks of the Moderator were in so low a tone that the reporter could not hear distinctly. The grounds of the decision were, that the affirmant could not be held responsible for the views of Mr Campbell, yet the quotation might be admitted as having a bearing upon the general question.]

*Mr. Hughey*—I will now read the passage from Mr. Campbell, which appeared in the *Millennial Harbinger*. New Series, vol. i. pp. 411, 412.; Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 517. Mr. Campbell here says:

"In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews. Turks, pagans; and therefore, no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against his church! This can not be, and, therefore, there are Christians among the sects."

" But who is a Christian? I answer every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things, according to his measure of knowledge of his will!"

\* \* \* \* \*

"I can not, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy, without their own knowledge and consent, as aliens from Christ, and the well-grounded hope of heaven!"

\* \* \* \* \*

"Should I find a Pedobaptist more intelligent in the Christian scriptures, more spiritual-minded and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian—a Pharisee among Christians!"

This is what Mr Campbell says. He is not like my opponent; he will not assume the consequences, for he knows that the consequences will kill his position whether he avows them or not. He knows that these are the fair and legitimate consequences that follow from his position, and that they will ruin his position unless he can succeed in removing them. The gates of hell have prevailed against the church of Christ, if none are saved but those who are immersed; consequently there must be Christians among the sects! Here Mr. Campbell fully acknowledges that these consequences necessarily follow the position of my opponent, and he declares that there are, therefore, Christians who have never been immersed! Mr. Campbell tells us that persons may be children of God, and have the love of Christ in their hearts, and yet may never have been immersed! Mr. C. has here shown the consequences of the gentleman's position, and I don't wonder that he wants nothing to do with these consequences. The consequences are disastrous to the gentleman's position; and it is by these necessary consequences that I prove his position false, Alexander Campbell, himself, being judge. Ignorance may have a great deal to do with the guilt or innocence of a man, when the man could have no knowledge of the law. But when a law is published, and every man has it, or may have it, there is not a lawyer upon the face of the earth who does not know that the plea of ignorance is of no avail. If the law is published in plain language, it is presumed that every one knows what it is, and the plea of ignorance can not shelter those who violate it. So the plea of ignorance can not cover the case of those to whom the law of the Lord is revealed, and, according to the gentleman's position, every unimmersed person in Christendom must be damned, because they have the law, and yet disobey it!

The gentleman told us that the guilt of transgression was not acquired until the overt act of transgression was consummated. I showed to you from the scriptures, that sin consists in the determination of the heart—that this is the essential principle of sin. How did my opponent answer this? He told us that the sin is the consummating act of transgression—the open violation of the law. Did you not see the fallacy of the gentleman's argument? According to his argument, there can be no sin, no guilt, without an overt act of transgression. According to his argument there can be no such thing as mental sin against God! He says there must be the overt act of sin or transgression in order to acquire guilt. Does the law of God take cognizance of men's thoughts, or simply their lives? My friend's argument would convey the idea that it only takes cognizance of their lives, and has nothing at all to do with their hearts. But what saith the scriptures? The law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts of the heart, it enters within the soul, it regulates the thoughts, and the affections, and the gentleman dare not deny it. What kind of an act constitutes a transgression of the law? When the determination of purpose is fixed in the heart, whether the overt act is committed or not, sin is consummated in the sight of God. The separation between the soul and God takes place when the determination to transgress is fixed in the heart.

The argument of my opponent implies that our first parents could not have fallen at all if they had not violated the positive law, which was given as a test of their obedience, by an overt act. If this is not the legitimate conclusion from his premises, I do not see how any conclusion can follow from any premises. His position is that their sin was consummated, and guilt contracted by the overt act of eating the forbidden fruit; and that this overt act was necessary to the consummation of the sin, and the contracting of the guilt; so the conclusion necessarily follows, that sin could not have entered into the world except through the violation of that one positive law! Could not our first parents have fallen by the violation of moral law, as well as by the violation of this positive law? If so, it was possible for sin to enter into the world without the violation of positive law at all; and consequently it is not necessary, in order to the sinner's return to God, that his return should be consummated by obedience to a positive law.

My friend claims that sin could not have entered into the world in any other way than by the violation of positive law. This whole premise I prove thus to be false; consequently all the conclusions drawn from the premise I prove to be false, also.

The issue here is clear and distinct. It is simply this: Does sin consist simply in the overt act, or in the determination of the heart, while the overt act is but the expression or manifestation of that which already exists in the heart? When the purpose or determination of the heart is in rebellion against God, it will produce not one only, but many acts of transgression, and when the purpose of the heart is fixed to obey God, it will not produce one act of obedience only, but obedience to every divine command will be the result. The determination, or purpose of heart, is the principle of obedience or disobedience. This, I presume, my opponent will not deny. This one principle sets aside his whole theory

This being the case, the nature of the divine law requires that the consummating act of man's return to God should be an internal, or spiritual act; consequently this consummating act is that faith, trust or reliance of the soul upon the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the sinner obtains remission of sins, and is brought into communion with God. The simple question between us is: Is the external act of Christian baptism the consummating act of the sinner's return to God, or is faith, in the sense of trust, confidence, reliance, that consummating act?

My opponent, upon this question, stands in direct opposition to the positive declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord says:

"Whoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

But my opponent says there can be no adultery without the overt act! If this is not his position, I am not able to understand it, nor am I able to draw conclusions from the plainest premises. He is not merely in opposition to me on this point, but he is in opposition to the word of God.

I am glad the gentleman repudiates the position he took that water is the mother of the Christian! Saul's armor does not fit our little

David. The Saul of his Israel is Alexander Campbell, and he tries to follow Mr. Campbell exactly. But Lie had better get his shepherd's bag and sling, for Saul's armor does not fit him. But this is a subject that is not agreeable to him.

My friend tells us we should not make a figure go on all fours. I thought he made the figure of the spiritual birth in John iii. 5, walk on an hours at a wonderful rate yesterday afternoon, when he told us God was the Christian's lather, and water was the mother, etc. I am glad he has got back to his right mind at last. [Laughter.]

But I must turn to John iii 5, for a moment. This passage will come up next week, in the discussion of the subject of regeneration; but I must reply to the gentleman's argument now, or he will say that I have refused to meet it. In this passage the change connected with the remission of sins, is spoken of under the figure of a birth. The gentleman tells us, because the word *kai* (and) is used here, "born of water and the Spirit," water can not be here understood as the symbol of the Spirit.

The conjunction *kai* does not always mean and, but often signifies even; indeed this is one of its principal significations as the gentleman knows, and giving it this sense here, the whole passage is plain. But this objection is groundless, even admitting that *kai* here properly means and, for the gentleman knows that one rule of interpretation, which must never be lost sight of, is: "That which is true only of the antitype, is often affirmed of the type, and *vice versa*." There is not a biblical scholar in the world, but knows that this rule must be observed in interpreting the scriptures. Water is the symbol or type of the (Spirit throughout the scriptures, and the gentleman will not deny it.

Through the whole of the Mosaic dispensation, throughout every dispensation of the church, water is the type or symbol of the Spirit.

David says: "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow."

What does David mean by this? He explains his meaning in the following verse. He says:

"Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me."

Ezekiel says: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." That is, as is immediately added: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you."—Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26.

Isaiah says: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground;" that is, as is immediately added: "I will pour out my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thy offspring."—Isa. xlv. 3.

In John vii. 37-39, we read: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive:

for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

Cleansing with water, was a type or symbol of spiritual cleansing throughout the Jewish dispensation; and I ask again, what type or symbol would be most likely to be used by Christ to illustrate this spiritual cleansing, here brought to view under the figure of a birth? Most certainly the cleansing or birth of water would have been used to represent this spiritual cleansing or spiritual birth, for with this figure, Nicodemus was perfectly familiar.

But I wish to ask the gentleman another question. Is it a supposable case, that God would take that which was the type or symbol of spiritual cleansing under the shadowy dispensation of the past, and make it the real, the spiritual cleansing under the glorious dispensation of the Spirit? Would God take that which was the type under the law, and make it antitype of itself under the gospel? The thing is not at all supposable. We can not conceive that Infinite Wisdom could do such a thing. If a man can believe that which was the type or symbol of spiritual cleansing itself under the law, could become that cleansing itself under the gospel, there must be a good deal of water about his brain. He must be looking through water that gives things a distorted coloring. The thing is an absurdity, and can not be; and here again I prove the gentleman's position false.

In regard to the salvation spoken of in Mark xvi. 16, I said that there the salvation stands in antithesis to the damnation. Both of them are in the future. He that believeth and is baptized "is not" but "shall be saved;" he that believeth not "shall be damned," not "is damned." But the scripture says, "He that believeth not is condemned already." The word *krino* is here used to express the present condemnation that rests upon the sinners while in unbelief; but in Mark, *katakrino*, is used to express the future condemnation, or damnation of the unbeliever.

Baptism standing as the symbol of the Christian profession, it becomes the synonym of obedience. But my friend tells us that he shows his love to God by keeping his commandments, and he quoted several passages of scripture to "prove that this is the only way we can show our love to God. But none of the passages quoted speak of obedience in a specific sense, or as limiting that obedience to any one commandment; but they speak of obedience in a general sense, of keeping all of God's commandments. But why bring up these passages of scripture, when the gentleman knows that there is not a man in Christendom, who pretends to believe the word of God, who does not admit that the Christian must keep, not one only, but all of God's commandments; and in this way alone he can show his love to God. But what has this to do with the pardon of sin, -or with the conditions of pardon? All these passages of scripture which speak of us showing our love to God by keeping his commandments, refer not to any specific act of obedience; but to that general obedience which God requires of us as the fruit of living faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

I wish to say a few words more in regard to the preposition *eis*. Here is one argument which I want the gentleman to meet. Was

John's baptism the baptism of remission, or the baptism of repentance? The gentleman tells us that John baptized the people into reformation! The word *metanoia* (repentance) does not signify reformation. It signifies a change of mind or purpose, not a change of life, as the gentleman knows, or may ascertain by examining the use of the word in the New Testament To be baptized into repentance, then signifies to be baptized into the profession of repentance, or a profession that the mind and purpose is changed; and not literally into reformation, for this could not be done. A person might be baptized into a profession of reformation, but not into the reformation itself. To be baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is to be baptized into the profession of faith in, and obedience to, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

To be "baptized into Moses," signifies—and the gentleman admits it—a profession of faith in Moses as a divinely appointed teacher, and of obedience to him as a lawgiver. To be baptized, then, "in the name of Jesus Christ, into remission of sins," is to be baptized into the profession of the faith, that remission of sins comes only in or through the name of Jesus Christ. The name of Jesus, here as elsewhere, stands for his work, his meritorious death, his sacrificial offering, and remission of sins can only be obtained through faith in that atoning sacrifice, and baptism is an expression of that faith, and not the condition upon which remission of sins is obtained. That this is the meaning of this passage is demonstrably proved by Peter himself, who emphatically declares that baptism is the symbol of spiritual cleansing, and not that cleansing itself In 1 Peter iii. 21, we read: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here Peter tells us baptism saves us in some sense. We inquire, then, in what sense does it save us? Peter says it "does not save us by putting away the filth of the flesh;" but that it does save us in the sense of being "the answer of a good conscience toward God, through faith in a risen Saviour." Baptism does not make the conscience good, it does not give us a good conscience; but in answer to a good conscience obtained through faith in a risen Saviour. What does "putting away the filth of the flesh" mean? Every one knows that it can mean nothing else but the cleansing, or the putting away of man's unrenewed nature. The word filth here signifies moral pollution; while the word that is translated "putting away," can not signify a washing at all. There is no such idea as wash in it. I know our opponent tells us that this passage signifies that baptism does not wash away the impurities of the body. But the word does not mean wash in any sense. It means simply "a putting away" or "putting off," and nothing else.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—We will first notice the point raised by my friend in reference to John's baptism. He objects now to its being a baptism for the remission of sins.



He at first admitted it was a baptism *eis* remission, or a baptism into remission of sins; but he has learned that into will not save him from baptism in order to remission. Now he falls back on the assumption that the repentance was for remission, while the baptism was not. That will not help him, for John says he baptized them (*eis*) into repentance or reformation, and if the reformation was for the remission of sins, then since they had to be baptized into this state of reformation, baptism was still a condition of remission of sins. We are told that they were baptized confessing their sins, and that when the Pharisees came, John exclaimed, "Who hath warned you to flee the wrath to come." How did they expect to avoid this wrath, or be pardoned? By repentance, confession and baptism. John's baptism was for the remission of sins.

He next wants to know why John's disciples were rebaptized if John's baptism was for remission of sins. I will read the account and learn from that:

"And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, he said to them: 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed.' And they said to him: 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' "

He baptized them in the name of Christ and laid his hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. It was that they might receive the Holy Spirit that he rebaptized them in the name of Christ, who sent the Holy Spirit into the world.

To avoid the reply that I made to his query how a man could be baptized into repentance or reformation, as I rendered *metanoia*, he denied that *metanoia* meant reformation of life. Greenfield says: "A change of life, a reformation of life," and he refers to this very expression, "I baptize you, indeed, unto or into repentance."

There are one or two little quibbles I will here notice lest he should weary your patience with a repetition of trifles. "How were the patriarchs pardoned? What were the positive conditions of pardon then?" We have already answered that once, if not twice. We are told that Job used to offer sacrifice and prayer for his children. Then sacrifice was the positive condition of pardon. The Jews sacrificed and obeyed the Jewish law. It does not matter whether their sins were really forgiven, or only rolled forward till the time of Christ. Sacrifice and observance of the law were the conditions on which they were pardoned, or their sins were rolled forward till the time of the great expiation

I find it necessary to refer to the Sweeney matter again. It has now become simply a question of veracity between my opponent and others who were at the debate. I would however remind my opponent that since he is about the only one who can appreciate the great victory he won there, that he had better let his past laurels, which are so small that nobody but himself can see them, rest, and attend to the business before him, or when he is through with this debate, people will be as unable to see a victory here, as they have been in the Sweeney debate.

But he parades the statement of Bro. Sweeney that "if a man

knows the law and does not obey it he should be condemned," as though it was a palpable absurdity. He has been repeating that statement ever since the debate, and making great eyes and faces over it. What does he mean? Will he deny it? I will most positively affirm it, and he will not dare to negative it. Then let us have an end of that folly.

I beg leave to inform my opponent that he is not debating with Mr. Campbell, and that his readings and references to him are really out of order. It will, judging from present indications, be as much as this Goliath of sectarianism can do, to withstand the pebbles from the sling of the David he has before him. It will be remembered that his great prototype, like himself, was very much chagrined that so small a man was sent out against him; and it will be remembered what the sequel was also—Goliath was slain.

My friend is still troubled about the consequences of my position. Well, he ought to be. I hope it will trouble him till he accepts the plain positive declaration of the word of God, and acta in accordance therewith. He wants to know what becomes of the good men and women of Pedobaptist churches. I stated in the opening of the debate on this question, that human responsibility was modified by human knowledge. Men that have been misled by false teaching, are often excused in the Bible. Whether men can to-day be saved through ignorance, I do not pretend to say. That is not the question. The question is, "What is God's law?" Let those who are afraid of consequences settle their state by the word of God. The Jews wanted to know of John and Jesus if the consequences of their teaching would not be to condemn them, the children of Abraham; but I never learned that either changed his teaching to avoid the Jewish argument on consequences.

It is urged that I have not interpreted the scriptures correctly, that I have erred in placing the guilt or sin where the Bible does not place it, that I have said man can not sin without the overt act of transgression. I have taken no such position. I said that in the first transgression or fall the sin was not completed till the overt act, and that man was not punished till after the overt act. In like manner, I reasoned, he is not pardoned, is not released from liability to punishment, till after the overt act of submitting his will to the will of God in baptism. I was not discussing a theory of moral philosophy, but was stating a fact, and one we can easily prove by an appeal to the declarations of the Bible. My friend's attempted evasion by quoting the general statement of our Saviour that sin is in the sinful desire of the heart is open to two fatal objections:

1. He attempts to set aside the positive statements of a fact given in unequivocal language by the Bible, by a general principle, instead of limiting his application of the principle by well-known and undeniable facts.

2. He merely arrays scripture against scripture and the issue remains unchanged. He made or attempted to make the word of God contradict itself.

There are three positive declarations of fact we have read, and he never attempts to notice them, but attempts to evade the issue by be-

fogging it by a wrong application of a general principle. The Bible says that death or moral separation from God entered the world by sin, and that sin is a violation of the law. Then man was not morally dead or separated from God till he had broken the positive command, "Thou shalt not eat of it." The Bible also says, "When you eat you shall die," or be separated from God. It also declares when they had eaten they were ashamed or guilty before God. Here are three most explicit statements of facts, and we object to our opponent's resorting to the infidel trick of trying to array scripture against scripture. No one will modify a general principle to agree with undisputed facts.

Again, we object that he reasons on the first sin of sinless beings, as he should on the conduct of depraved beings. Our parents had no experimental knowledge of sin till they had eaten the fruit. But it will be urged we are discussing the pardon of sinful beings, and such reasoning would be just in that case.

Suppose that a man may be regarded by God as one worthy of pardon as soon as he resolves to obey, and is going forward to obey as earnestly as his ability will permit, how does the sinner know that God thus regards him? "O, by a miraculous impact of the Spirit of God," says my opponent. John says, that if we, in our hearts, know that we have kept his commandments, our hearts assure us, and we have confidence to approach into his presence, and we know that he will give us all we ask him, because we have obeyed his commandments. In this way does the Spirit of God, by his words, bear witness with our spirits, when we try our hearts and conduct by the word, that we are the children of God. Then to meet this want of the human heart has God instituted baptism as the crowning act of our return. The sinner knows he has believed, repented, confessed Christ, and obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered to the saints, as the commandment of God, and he relies on God's veracity, his eternal word, that he is then made free from sin and death. So plain and common-sense like is the gospel plan of pardon.

We can admit all our opponent urges about mental sins, sins of the heart, and still it does not affect the fact, the plain statements of the Bible. Neither did I say that man could only have sinned by violating positive law. You will remember that I distinctly said that man was subject to physical, moral and positive law, and could have sinned by violating either, but the question in this debate is, what law did he violate? The Bible says a positive law. When did he receive punishment? The Bible says when he had violated a positive law. We referred to this account of his transgression to show that God has arranged man's return in such a manner as to require him to retrace his steps, and that pardoning man after he obeyed a positive law, was precisely analogous to condemning after he had violated a positive law. We have taken the plain statements of the Bible. We object to the position of our opponent and all of his school, that they make what the Bible makes a plain fact, a conglomeration of speculative dogmas, and bewilder men in a metaphysical fog.

I confess I am in a quandary whether to pass by the persistent repetition of the stale nonsense about "water even the Spirit," and the "water is a type and the Spirit is the antitype," with the contempt it

deserves or to show its utter absurdity, and thus punish my opponent as he deserves for such nonsense. Suppose, now, that I admit what my friend has so vociferously stated that sometimes the same thing is predicated of the symbol as of the thing symbolized; does that prove that they are identical, and that when one is born of one, he can be said to be born of both. The same things are sometimes predicated of Jewish sacrifices, the type as of Christ the antitype; therefore, according to my friend's philosophy, when we are baptized in the name of Christ, we are also in the name of Jewish sacrifices.

We have denied that water is a type of the Spirit. My opponent reiterates it without a word of proof. We have shown the absurdity of supposing the type and the antitype should be joined together as Christ here joins water and Spirit. We have shown the nonsense of assuming that they are one, thus making Christ talk nonsense in using both terms. We have shown that even if one were type, and the other the antitype, they must then be different things, and we are born of both. Birth of water, or baptism, still comes up, like Banquo's ghost, to trouble our opponent. He can not figure it out of the passage. Still our opponent will get up, and vociferously repeat this stale, exploded stuff about type and antitype. Like Beecher's dog Noble, he will bark into the empty space, hoping to make you think there is something there because he barks so loud over the vacuum.

We have again a repetition of the exploded assumption that the solution spoken of in Mark is future. The act of obedience was future, but when performed the salvation from sin followed immediately. If men refused the gospel, the condemnation then followed. Paul repeatedly addresses men as already saved, says "Christ has saved us." Peter exhorted men to save themselves from an untoward generation. What salvation are they speaking of? A salvation from sin, of course, for Paul exhorts the same persons to work out their salvation; and Peter speaks of an eternal or everlasting salvation, in contrast with this present salvation.

The believing, obeying, salvation or condemnation are all in the present world, and at the beginning or rejection of a Christian life. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved from the punishment, practice, and guilt of sin" in this world, and if he does all things which Christ commanded, he shall be saved with an everlasting salvation in the world to come.

But is not the command, "observe all things whatsoever I command you," specific? Well, now, what next? A command to do all things—a specific command, or a command to do a specific act. The generic always includes the specific, but the specific can not include the generic, as the gentleman assumed when he assumed that baptism was equivalent to the all things in Matthew. Besides, we have shown that baptism was an act required of one in order to become a subject of Christ's kingdom, while the all things were required of his subjects; hence the all things did not include baptism, much less did baptism include the all things.

We are now ready to look up Acts ii. 38. In our first speech we said that Christ enjoined three acts, faith, repentance and baptism; and each act had an end or object, or was for some end. Will my op-

ponent tell us what baptism is for? We hope you will watch closely and see whether he answers this plain question or not. We can learn what we are commanded to do an act for in two ways:

1. From what the law states will follow the act as a result. The act then must be for, or in order to that result. It is in this way we have been determining what baptism is for.

2. The law may explicitly declare what it is for.

It is to this second method that we appeal now. All Bible students know that our Lord said the keys of his kingdom, or church, were given to Peter, as he was to unlock the kingdom, or in other words preach the first gospel sermon to both Jews and Gentiles, and thus open the kingdom to both. On the day of Pentecost the apostles were endued with power from on high. Peter preached the first gospel sermon. Men heard, and were pierced in their hearts, and cried, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Do for what end? Pardon or remission of sins. Peter gives, for the first time, the gospel law of pardon. Then "the law went out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." What was it? Listen! It answers the whole question—settles this dispute between myself and my opponent: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Here we have the law given. Baptism is commanded, and its object is stated in connection with the command, "remission of sins." I have here my affirmative in the plain language of the scriptures. Infinite wisdom could not make it clearer or stronger. I challenge my friend to choose or arrange words that could express the declaration that baptism is a condition of remission more clearly or more positively. My opponent then negatives the positive declaration of God's word. Peter, or the Spirit of God speaking through him, announced as the great law of Christ's kingdom, that "baptism is for the remission of sins." My opponent negatives this, denies God's word, and flatly contradicts the Holy Spirit. I feel that I ought to leave the matter here. I can make it no plainer. The Spirit of God could not express the truth any clearer than this. If you will not believe God, you will not believe me.

But we will proceed to examine some of the subterfuges by which men attempt to falsify God's word and evade the truth:

1. We are told men are to repent for the remission of sins, but are not to be baptized for the remission of sins. A more palpable perversion of plain language was never attempted. The two words are inseparably connected by the copulative conjunction, *and*; therefore what modifies one, modifies the other, also. While the sentence might be so arranged as to have "for the remission of sins" modify, "be baptized" alone, it can not be made to modify "repent" alone, while "be baptized" stands between them. A basis like "repent," and its modifier "for the remission of sins," are never separated by an unmodified part of the compound basis. Take the sentence, "I shall go or send some one." "Some one" modifies "shall send," hence it is placed next to it. We can not say "I shall send or go some one." In like manner had the Holy Spirit meant "Repent for remission of sins, and be baptized," he would have said so. But he said "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Here the compound pre-

dicare is modified, both words alike, by the phrase "for the remission of sins." We are to repent "for the remission of sins," and be baptized "for the remission of sins."

2. We are told that "for" means "because of," and they were to be baptized "because of" the remission of sins. To this subterfuge we object.

1. For "the remission of sins" is connected with "repent" in just the same sense it is connected with "be baptized," and if they are to be baptized because of the remission of sins, they were also to repent because they had their sins remitted, or we have three thousand unrepentant pardoned persons!

2. *Eis* means, primarily, "into," and, secondly, "in order to," and never "because of." Into remission, or into a state of remission, or in order to remission, expresses exactly what we affirm; hence the primitive and real idea of *eis* forbids our rendering it "because of."

3. The expression used here, both in English and Greek, is word for word, and letter for letter, the same as occurs in Matthew xxvi. 28: "This is my blood of the New Testament shed for the remission of sins." The language is the same, and the idea and meaning are the same. If we are to be baptized because of the remission of sins; Christ's blood was shed because of the remission of sins, or because our sins had been remitted. But it was shed in order to remission, and we are to be baptized in order to remission. There is no evading this conclusion.

Let me here notice a miserable piece of trickery practiced by the author of a semi-religious novel, published by the Baptists of Kentucky. We are told in that book, that *eis* is the Greek word translated by "for" before "cleansing" in Mark i. 44, where the leper was directed to offer an offering "for his cleansing." *Eh* in Greek and "for" in English both mean "because of;" for the leper was already healed. A more dishonest trick was never attempted. The word rendered here "for" or "because of" is *peri*, which means "concerning," or "because of." *Eis* does occur in the context, and in the very sense of "in order to." The offering was to be "*eis marturian*," or "for a testimony," or in order to a testimony unto them. What shall we say of such perversion of the original as this?

But we will drop the phrase "for the remission of sins," out of the passage, and prove right out of the mouth of every man present that baptism is for the remission. These convicted sinners cried out, "What shall we do?" Do for what purpose? For the remission of our sins. Can any one deny that such was the end for which they wished to do something? Did the Holy Spirit answer them? He did. What did he tell them to do? Repent and be baptized. Baptism for the remission of sins again.

We will now go a step further and admit for the sake of our opponents, that "for" means "because of." That will not help the matter. We can do things "because of" something past, or something future. Remission was not past because the Holy Spirit told them to repent, and an unrepentant pardoned person is nonsense. Hence remission was still future when they performed these acts. They were to repent and be baptized, "because of" a future

remission, or in order to obtain it. I defy the ingenuity of man to change that passage so as to destroy its meaning that baptism is in order to remission without destroying all sense, and making the Spirit of God talk nonsense.

Let us now take my opponent's new rendering, "Be baptized into a state where you shall receive the remission of your sins." Can they obtain the remission of sins till they are in that state? No. How do they get into that state? By baptism. Baptism is in order to getting into that state. Getting into that state is in order to remission. Hence baptism is as much in order to remission as faith and repentance. My friend has inserted one more link, but as he has baptism as the link above, and remission as the link below, he has remission dependent on baptism in spite of himself.

Let me now ask you to take your Bible and read and compare Acts ii. 38, and Matthew xxvi. 28, and as plain common-sense men, who desire the truth, can you avoid the conclusion that baptism is for the remission of sins? Does not the Spirit of God say so in so many words? My proposition is in the exact language of the Bible. My opponent is not negating my words, but those of the Holy Spirit. To what will sectarianism not drive men? Will you take the assertions, assumptions, and perversions of my friend, or the plain and unmistakable declaration of God's word. We assert men must hear, as a step toward remission. Agreed, says my opponent. They must have faith. Agreed, says my opponent. Must repent. Agreed, says my opponent. Must confess Christ. Agreed, he says again. Must be baptized, says the Holy Spirit, in more than a score of places. Not so, says my opponent. Who is to be taken, this man or the Holy Spirit?

We will here rest our argument, promising you several more arguments from the word of God. We do not rely on one passage, as we are sometimes told, but we have the general tenor of the whole Bible, and over a score of positive declarations. But suppose God has said but once that baptism is for the remission of sins, is not that enough? God said but once "Let there be light," and there has been light over the broad face of the earth for the countless ages. If he laid down as an organic law of his kingdom, "Be baptized for the remission of sins," it will stand while his kingdom endures, for the word of the Lord lives and abides for ever.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. HUGHEY'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My friend does not like *eis* very much, but he likes water first-rate. His feet are standing on slippery ground, and I expect he would like to get into the water pretty soon. [Laughter.]

Now, the question which I have put persistently before him is, what constitutes sin? I have asked him if a man can become guilty before God without an overt act; or if guilt can not be\*acquired before the overt act is committed?

The Saviour says: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say unto you that whosoever look-

eth on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

According to this teaching a man may be an adulterer without committing the overt act. He may never consummate the act, yet God will hold him guilty in his sight. Now which is right, my opponent or the Lord Jesus Christ?

Again, I stated that the guilt of sin was acquired when the determination to transgress was reached; man sinned in eating the forbidden fruit; but when did the separation take place between the souls of our fore-parents and God? It took place when the determination was reached to commit the act of transgression. So says my God, in the passage I have quoted. But my opponent says otherwise. I want him to reconcile his position here with that of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, he tells us, "There was no death until after the overt act of disobedience, and consequently there can be no life till after the overt act of obedience." According to the gentleman's teaching a man might have murder in his heart; but if he have no opportunity to consummate the overt act, he is not guilty before God. But the word of God says, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer." The murderous principle is in the heart, and the man is guilty of the crime before God. He says there can be no such thing as spiritual life till the consummation of the sinner's return in baptism. But if I prove there is, and has been, spiritual life before baptism, I uproot his whole theory, do I not? Most assuredly I do, and my opponent will not call this in question. Is there no spiritual life among the millions of unimmersed Christians? Multiplied thousands who have never been immersed, give every evidence of spiritual life that the scriptures require, both living and dying. Are these all destitute of spiritual life?

But the case of Cornelius proves the gentleman's position false, for he received the Holy Ghost—his heart was renewed, and God received him before he was baptized; consequently he possessed spiritual life before he was baptized; unless a man may receive the Holy Ghost—have a new heart—be received of God, and still have no spiritual life! Because God had thus received Cornelius, and given him the Holy Ghost, Peter received him, and baptized him. This one scriptural example uproots the gentleman's whole theory, and proves that a man can have spiritual life before baptism.

I wish here to touch for a moment upon one point of the gentleman's former speech. He said that John the Baptist "preached the baptism of reformation into the remission of sins:" that *metanoia* signifies not repentance, but reformation. I laid down the principle in the beginning of this discussion, that words are to be taken in their ordinary meanings; and to this he assented. During this discussion he has been earnestly contending for the primary meaning of words. Now I want the gentleman to stand by his own rule. The etymological, primary and ordinary meaning of *metanoia* is repentance, while reformation is but a secondary, or accommodated meaning, growing out of the fact that reformation is the fruit of repentance.

The gentleman quoted Greenfield's Lexicon in defining this term.



Greenfield defines it thus: "Repentance, *i. e.*, a change of mind and purpose. A change of one's mode of thinking, feeling, and acting, reformation of life." He gives as the primary meaning, "Repentance, *i. e.*, a change of mind and purpose." Robinson defines it, "To repent, to change one's mind and purpose." Parkhurst defines it the same way. The gentleman must take the term in its primary—its ordinary meaning.

But he tells us that John preached baptism for the remission of sins. John did no such things; John's whole doctrine is called his baptism. John preached the doctrine of remission of sins; he preached that the people "should believe in him that was to come, that is, Christ Jesus." He did not remit any man's sins; but he baptized them into repentance, proclaiming the law of remission through faith in Jesus Christ. If John remitted the sins of the people by baptism, I want to know why the same persons were baptized again for the remission of sins, according to the doctrine of my opponent?

The gentleman tells us that the persons whom Paul baptized (Acts xix.), who had been baptized with John's baptism, were baptized again that they might receive the Holy Ghost. But was the Holy Ghost conferred on them by baptism? No. After they were baptized, "Paul laid his hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost" Why could not the apostle have laid his hands upon them, and communicated the Holy Ghost unto them without rebaptizing them? To such miserable subterfuges is the gentleman driven in attempting to answer my argument! The apostles baptized all who were converted to Christianity among the Jews, whether they had been baptized by John or not; and if both John's baptism and Christian baptism are for the remission of sins, then the same persons had their sins remitted by baptism twice! But this is contrary to the gentleman's doctrine; he will not baptize the same person twice for the remission of sins!

I asked him how were the patriarchs and Old Testament saints justified? Through what positive institution was it that they consummated their return to God? The scriptures tell us that it was by faith. I brought up the case of Abraham, because Paul tells us that "He believed in God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness;" and that sinners are now justified in the same way.

The gentleman tells that the patriarchs were justified through sacrifice—that this was the positive institution through which their return to God was consummated. But he will not pretend to affirm that baptism, under the gospel, occupies the same place that sacrifice did under the past dispensation. Sacrifice was the medium through which righteous men approached unto God in their devotions, consequently it was constantly repeated. It was not the positive institution through which the sinner consummated his return to God. I knew the moment the gentleman took that position he was gone; for sacrifice under the former dispensation had none of the attributes of such a positive institution, as he claims it is necessary for the sinner to consummate his return to God in. I knew that through all the period before the coming of Christ, he could not find a single case of

return to God through sacrifice, as a positive institution for that purpose; and yet they did return to God, and obtain remission of sins. How was their return consummated? It was by faith in Christ. Will the gentleman dare deny it? This fact cuts up his system by the roots.

I have stated the facts in regard to Mr. Sweeney's remarks on this proposition. I could not get him to take the consequences of his doctrine, as my opponent does, and it was not until he became irritated that he made the remark he did; but still he refused to admit the consequences of his doctrine, as my opponent does.

The gentleman tells me I am not debating with Mr. Campbell. I had found that out long ago. I have read Mr. Campbell pretty carefully, and I know the size of his armor; it is altogether too large for my opponent; it does not fit him, and I would advise him to lay it off altogether. [Laughter]

He tells us God has physical laws, moral laws, and positive laws. Now, I want to know of him if man could not have fallen through the transgression- of moral, as well as positive law? If so, can he not consummate his return through obedience to moral law? This question I want him to answer.

He says that a man must manifest that he is born of God by keeping his commandments. This is true. But must he keep all of God's commandments before he has the evidence that he is born of God? If the passages the gentleman has quoted prove anything in his favor, they prove that a man must keep every commandment of God before he can be justified; and until the gentleman can show that this is the case, the bringing forward of such passages is but hiding his head in the sand like the ostrich!

In the passage in John iii. 5, water is introduced simply for the purpose of illustrating to Nicodemus the nature of the birth Christ was talking about. Nicodemus could not understand the nature of a spiritual birth, and Christ took up this standing symbol of spiritual cleansing throughout the Old Testament for the purpose of illustrating to his mind the nature and character of this spiritual birth. Not another word was said about water after the illustration was introduced; the conversation went on, however, in regard to the nature and necessity of the spiritual birth. "Born of the water and the Spirit" here signifies precisely what "Baptize with the Holy Ghost and fire" does in Matthew iii. 11. To be "Baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire" is not two baptisms, but one; that is the Holy Ghost pervading and purifying the soul like fire does that which is cast into it. So "Born of water and the Spirit," does not mean two births; but born of the Spirit, cleansing the soul, like water cleanses that which it is applied to. This I proved when I showed that wafer is the standing symbol of the Spirit throughout the scriptures.

The gentleman has come at last to Acts ii. 38, and I now will take up his argument on this passage, and view it at length. There was something plausible in his argument on this passage, and when he presents anything plausible, I will always give him full credit for it. "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the

Holy Ghost." "Here," says Mr. Braden, "we have two conditions, repentance and baptism, and they are connected by the copulative conjunction *kai* (and), and if repentance is a condition of the remission of sins, so is baptism a condition also. This is the gentleman's argument stated in its strongest form. It does not follow, however, although "repentance and baptism" are connected with the copulative conjunction, that they are both to be understood as conditions of the remission of sins. I have already proved that water, in both the Old and New Testaments, is the standing symbol of the Spirit; and this being the case there is no difficulty whatever in understanding repentance here in its most comprehensive sense, including faith in the name, or merit of Christ as the condition, and baptism as the symbol of pardon or remission of sins. For the gentleman must not forget the rule of interpretation to which I have called his attention before, viz: "That is often affirmed of the type or symbol, which is only true of the antitype, or thing symbolized." Keeping this well-established rule in view, there is no difficulty in understanding this passage of scripture, as I have explained it, unless he can prove that water is not the symbol of the Spirit, and that cleansing with water is not the symbol of spiritual cleansing in the scriptures.

Now, the question between my opponent and myself is: Did Peter intend to teach by this language, that baptism is a condition of the remission of sins? My opponent says he did; I say he did not, but that baptism here, as elsewhere, must be understood not as the condition, but as the symbol of pardon. Peter did not close his discourse with this general answer to the inquiry of the penitents; but "With many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, save yourselves from this untoward generation," and during his further discourse he more fully set forth what he had first presented in this compendious form. Will Peter's answer here harmonize with his teachings elsewhere, and with the general teachings of the scriptures? When properly understood it will; but according to my opponent there is a flat contradiction here, and in other portions of Peter's teaching, and the scriptures in general.

The preposition *eis* is here used in its ordinary sense of into. To be baptized *eis* (into) repentance; to be baptized *eis* (into) the name of Paul; to be baptized *eis* (into) Moses, etc., and to be baptized "*eis* (into) remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ," all expressions of the same import; and it signifies to be baptized into the profession of repentance—into the profession of obedience to Paul—into the profession of obedience to Moses, etc.—"into the profession of the faith that remission of sins comes only through the name, that is the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ." It does not signify a condition, or "in order to," in any one of these examples. Such a meaning it has not here.

The gentleman tells us that the blood of Christ was shed *eis* for the remission of sins, and he asks if the blood of Christ was shed *eis* ("in order to") remission of sins; does baptized *eis* remission of sins mean "in order to" remission of sins, not as a condition, but as the ground of remission. The two examples are not analogous at all. The

use and meaning of the preposition is not the same in the two passages, and consequently the one can not illustrate the other.

The only point that yet remains to be settled to prove that my interpretation of this passage is correct, is to ascertain whether it harmonizes with Peter's teaching elsewhere, and with the general teaching of the scriptures. If we are able to show by the teaching of Peter in other places, and by the scriptures in general, that baptism is not a condition of the remission of sins, then it follows demonstrably that it is not a condition of remission in this passage.

The gentleman asked me on yesterday if I could give the answer of Peter to a penitent, or if I would give some other answer? I can give Peter's answer to the penitent with Peter's explanation; and I do give it, just in the sense Peter himself explains it. Now I ask him if he could give the answer of Paul to the Philippian jailer to an inquiring penitent, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved?" Here is a plain, clear, and positive answer, and yet the gentleman dare not give it to an inquiring penitent, for if he did he would not remain in fellowship with his brethren very long! The jailer, however, believed, and was saved by faith in Jesus Christ.

I called the gentleman's attention to 1 Peter i. 21, where Peter expressly states that baptism "is the answer of a good conscience," which had been obtained through faith in a risen Saviour. I now ask him to take up this passage, and examine it critically. The word *apothesis*, here translated "putting away," does not have the idea of wash in it at all; and yet the only explanation that has been given by those holding the gentleman's views of this passage of scripture, puts the sense of wash upon this word, and they tell us that "baptism saves us, not by washing the literal dirt or filth from the body, but by purifying the conscience."

Alexander Campbell says: "Thus immersion, says Peter, saves us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt."—Christian System, p. 215.

This is a positive contradiction of the Holy Spirit, who here expressly says that baptism does not make the conscience good, but that it is the "answer of a good conscience." If the idea of washing had been here intended *apolausis*, and not *apothesis* would have been used. The same word is used here that is used by Peter, when he tells us, "Knowing that I must shortly put off (*apothesis*) this my tabernacle." The word means to put off, lay aside, etc., but has not the idea of washing, or cleansing by washing in it. Peter here affirms that "baptism saves us, not by putting away our sins;" but it does save us by answering to that work, which has been accomplished through faith in a risen Saviour.

Here Peter expressly affirms that baptism is not the condition of remission or pardon; but that it is the symbol of remission of sins, and spiritual cleansing. Thus when we have Peter explain his own language, he places baptism not as a condition of the remission of sins, but as the symbol of pardon and spiritual cleansing. Here the argument is conclusive.

But I am not done with the testimony of Peter yet. I will prove by Peter himself that faith is the only condition required of the pen-

itent, in order to the remission of sins, and that persons were saved—had their sins pardoned—and received the Holy Ghost, before they were baptized. If I prove this, then I prove incontrovertibly that baptism is not a condition of pardon, and that the gentleman's interpretation of this passage of scripture is a gross perversion of the word of God. Now turn to Acts x., and read the history of the conversion of Cornelius. The angel that appeared to Cornelius in the vision, said of Peter, "He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." Here we have just such a case as we may look for. a full and perfect presentation of the law of pardon. All the circumstances require it. Cornelius had been informed by the angel that Peter 'would tell him words whereby he might be saved." Now, what did Peter tell him? Whatever Peter told him was necessary in order to the remission of sins, and what Peter did not tell him was not necessary. You may look here for a plain and full statement of all the conditions of pardon.

Here was a penitent inquiring, whom an angel from heaven had informed that Peter would tell him what to do. Just what Peter told him was necessary for him to do, and what Peter did not tell him was not necessary. Now, what did Peter tell Cornelius to do? Here is his sermon, Acts x. 3-1-43:

34 Then Peter opened his mouth, and said: Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons:

35 But in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.

36 The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:)

37 That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached;

38 How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the devil; for God was with him.

39 And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree:

40 Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly;

41 Not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.

42 And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead.

43 To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

Not one word did Peter say about baptism being a condition of pardon; but the moment he announced the doctrine of the remission of sins through faith in Christ, Cornelius and his friends were saved.

—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My opponent appears determined to have me play the part of David in this discussion, I am quite willing to play David, to his Goliath. Indeed it seems very appropriate. You remember that David went up to the relief of his brethren, and while in camp, a giant, whose spear was as a weaver's beam, and its head six hundred shekels' weight, came out to defy the armies of the living God. An exact parallel to this discussion. David proposed to meet him, and rejected the armor of Saul though he stood head and shoulders above the people, "Because the Lord had not chosen it." Exactly so here. I have refused to repeat Campbell's arguments because God has not chosen some of them. He chose a few stones from the brook and fitted them to his shepherd's sling. So I have chosen a few pebbles from the clear stream of God's eternal truth. When Goliath saw the ruddy stripling he was chagrined that one so small should come out to meet him, and cursed him by his gods. He expected to meet a warrior in an armor like Saul's, and he proclaimed that he would make short work of so contemptible an adversary. So, too, in this debate, Goliath was very much chagrined and incensed that so small a man was sent out against him, and he thought our brethren had insulted him. He has boasted that he would make short work of the little job he had on hand, that David would be a laughing-stock for every one, before two days. Do you remember the rest? Goliath was ignominiously slain. I think my friend looks forward with foreboding to the result. I do not say such will be the catastrophe here, but he has given me the *role* of David and I will do my best to play it to the end.

My friend wants to know if a man can sin without an overt act? Yes, sir! I hope that will satisfy him. But that is not pertinent to the discussion. I have read the account of the fall, and showed that man was separated from after a disobedience of a positive command. I then showed that God in requiring him to expect pardon after obedience to a positive command, had merely required man to retrace his steps. My opponent seeing no way to set aside the analogy I pointed out, admitted it, but claimed man became guilty and was punished before I said he did. I read three plain statements of fact from the scriptures, positively sustaining my position; and as flatly contradicting his. He evidently sees he has walked out on to ground that surrenders his whole position, and he now attempts to back out, and to cover his retreat by metaphysical quibbles and hair splitting.

The question before us is, when did man pass under punishment; when was he separated from God's favor? "Death entered by sin, and sin is a transgression of the law. When thou eatest thou shalt die. When they had eaten they were ashamed or guilty." Mr. Hughey, can you understand that? Can you, will you believe it? Will you cease to contradict three explicit plain declarations of God's word? Will you accept them, and cease to try to make the scriptures contradict themselves, by interpreting a general principle so as to contradict positive declarations of fact?

I know how it destroys my friend's whole argument. For if man

was separated from God by disobedience to positive law, we would naturally expect that he would be required to return in the same way; or obedience to a positive command, or baptism would be the 1st act of his return. My opponent is stranded here if there is a logical school in the universe. "But could not man have sinned by violating moral law?" Yes, he could, but the Bible says he did not. "If man departed by violating positive law, could he not return by moral law?" If God had said so he could, but, unfortunately for my friend, God has said, "Be baptized for the remission of sins." We would naturally expect God to require man to retrace his steps, and he has done so.

Man sinned by raising his pride and will against the will of God, and pronouncing a positive command a non-essential. And men now show the same disposition. They will flatly deny God's word and refuse to submit their will to the will of God in obeying his positive ordinance. My opponent is evidently a lineal descendant of her who raised her will in rebellion to God's will, and refused to obey, because it was a non-essential, or she could not see any demerit in the act of eating a "little fruit."

My opponent assumes that all John's disciples were rebaptized, and wants to know if John's baptism could have been for the remission of sins. A more reckless assumption, even my opponent could not make. We read of certain ones at Ephesus, and they were rebaptized in the name of Christ, because they had been baptized by John's baptism after it should have ceased, and to receive the Holy Spirit.

He next reads to you that Abraham was justified by faith. We believe that. We said faith was one of the conditions of our justification, but mark you the Bible does not say he was justified by faith only. We read in James ii. 23:

"Thou seest how Abraham's faith wrought with his works, and by his works his faith was made perfect and the scripture was fulfilled which says 'Abraham believed God and it was accounted unto him for righteousness.' You see then how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only."

Abraham was justified by faith through his works. By his works was his faith made perfect, as a justifying faith. I will say with my opponent, man is justified by faith, but I add with the scriptures, not until his faith is made perfect by works. So a sinner is not justified until his faith is made perfect by the works of repentance, confession, and submission of his will to the will of God in baptism.

My friend finds trouble wherever he finds positive conditions of pardon. He is surely Eve's son, for she found fault with God's positive command. He wants to know if God had positive conditions of pardon under the Jewish and patriarchal dispensations? Yes, sir, he had. Was baptism one of them? No, sir, baptism is a positive condition in the Christian dispensation, and was never commanded in Christ's name till the day of Pentecost, and was never practiced at all till the time of John. Has God then changed the positive conditions of pardon? He has. He could not change the moral conditions which are based on the nature of things, without changing their nature.

Now if my friend will listen we will make the matter so plain "that a wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein." We are

told that Job had to offer prayer and sacrifice for his children, that what they had done wrong might be forgiven them. Sacrifice was a positive condition in the patriarchal age. The Jews sacrificed and kept the ceremonial law. Paul says those who kept the law should live. Hence there were positive conditions for the Jews. Now baptism is the positive condition under the law of Christ.

My friend, like Beecher's dog Noble, has barked again into John iii. He reasserts that the water is the symbol and the Spirit is the thing symbolized. Well, what of it if it were so? They are not therefore identical. If not there were two things spoken of, and we are born of both—born of two things—the water and the Spirit. We are begotten by believing the word of God—this is being begotten of the Spirit, and then born of the water in baptism. It is a pity that so much twisting and perversion and nonsense has to be gone through with so many times for nothing.

But at last he has found an illustration. The baptism of the Spirit and fire. Here the fire was the symbol and the Spirit the thing symbolized. Were they identical and was there but one baptism? Was the external fire that baptism? No, for that would make the Spirit material. Besides, he told us that the spirit of man was baptized with the Spirit of God, hence it was internal, and the external baptism of fire was an entirely distinct matter.

We are asked why we have to comply with all the conditions to obtain pardon, and do all things he commands to retain his favor? Because he requires it. Again he is anxious to know if John's baptism was for the remission of sins? The Bible says it was a baptism for the remission of sins. When men came to John they understood that their sins were to be remitted for they confessed their sins, and were baptized. John understood also that by his baptism men fled the coming wrath and were pardoned.

He next takes up Acts ii. 38, and he twists worse than an eel in a net, to get rid of baptism for the remission of sins. Baptism is a symbol of cleansing and must come after the cleansing. Well, now, what next? The type after the antitype. Does not the very nature of type and antitype require that the type should be first, or introduce the antitype? Then he attempts to raise some fog by asking whether it was Christ's blood, or the shedding of his blood that was a condition of pardon. He asserts that it was not the shedding of blood but the blood that was a condition. That is crushing! I wonder if it had not to be shed before it became a condition! Paul says that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission. That makes the shedding a condition. The quibble has no bearing, and even if it had, it is untrue. Christ's blood was shed for or in order to remission, and we are baptized in order to remission. So says the Holy Spirit, Mr. Hughey to the contrary notwithstanding.

He next cavils at my rendering the verb translated "repent" by reform. It has no bearing on the question, but to save being interminably bored about it, I will notice it. In this passage it can mean nothing but reform. They had heard and were convicted, pierced to their hearts with sorrow for sin, or remorse and sense of guilt. They cried, "What shall we do?" Peter did not say "repent" for they



had repented or felt sorrow for sin. He said "reform," and he used *metanousati* to express that very idea.

He objects to rendering saved in Mark xvi. 16, as meaning pardon or salvation from sin, and quotes Acts xi. 14, where Peter was to tell Cornelius things by which he was to be saved, and wants to know if it can mean pardon, when Cornelius was a just man who wrought righteousness, and was accepted of God. In Hebrews vii. 19 we read "that the law could make nothing perfect but the bringing in of a better hope by which we draw nigh unto God."

In Hebrews ix. 13, we read: "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God. For which reason he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, those which were called might receive an eternal inheritance."

In Hebrews x. 9, "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering often times the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God."

From this we learn that the law made nothing perfect, that the Jewish sacrifices could not take away sin, but rewarded only ceremonial uncleanness, or purified the flesh, that Christ made expiation for all sins, and was a mediator for those in the old as well as the new covenant. Their sins were rolled forward from year to year by these sacrifices till Christ by one offering made atonement for the sins of the whole world. Sacrifices were a condition of this rolling forward, and a condition in that sense of pardon. Then Cornelius was not really pardoned, and as he was now offering sacrifices already done away for years, Peter was sent to tell him what he must do to be saved or pardoned by Christ's sacrifice. Saved here means pardoned just as it does in Mark xvi. 16.

My opponent has at last told you what be baptized into the remission of sins means. But is there one in the house who can tell me what Mr. Hughey's position was? Can you tell how he explained the expression? Can you give a third of the words of the explanation? The reporter has handed me the following as his position:

"Being baptized into the remission of sins, means being baptized into the faith that remission of sins comes in the name of Jesus Christ."

He must have faith then, and after baptism too. The remission comes through that faith. That is what he has traveled so lone: to reach. But how do we come into that faith? We are baptized into it. Can we have remission without that faith? No, sir, Mr. Hughey must say. We are baptized into this faith, and come in in no other way, and hence baptism is a condition of pardon. Mr. Hughey has put in another link, but as it is attached to remission at one end, and to bap-

tism at the other, pardon is still dependent on baptism. He can not separate them. What God hath joined together man can not tear asunder.

But look at the jumble he makes of the plain simple words of the Spirit, We reject this language of the Babel of Ashdod, and choose the pure simple dialect of Caanan. We do not have to wade through eighteen or twenty words, that would puzzle a regiment of Philadelphia lawyers. Listen: "Being baptized into remission of sins, means being baptized into the faith that remission comes through the name of Jesus Christ." If that is the way he simplifies the word of God, I don't wonder that his converts are months and years in "getting through." Now hear the simple words of the Spirit: "Be baptized for the remission of sins." That you can understand. Do you believe it? Do you believe God?

I next meet with a paltry pettifogging trick my opponent resorted to, to obscure the issues, and draw you away from it. I read to you Acts ii. 38 in full, then when discussing it, I omitted the phrase "in the name of Jesus Christ," because it had nothing to do with the issue. My opponent would fain have you believe I have had a design in so doing, that it would be fatal to my argument to have read it, and of course I have been very dishonest in garbling the word of God, and dodging a very important point, that would have destroyed my argument. He knows better. He can not, to save his soul, show how it affects the issue. It is dishonest, contemptible claptrap.

We will next appeal to Peter's course at the house of Cornelius. We read in Acts x. 6, that Peter was to tell Cornelius what he was to do, and in Acts xi. 14, we read that these things that he was to do were to save him and his house. This salvation as we have already shown was the pardon of their sins. Peter preached the gospel. They believed and then he told them what to do. "He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Then this that they were to do to be saved, or pardoned, was baptism. Baptism is for the remission of sins.

But, says my opponent, the falling of the Holy Spirit was for the remission of their sins. Then he admits what he at first denied, that their sins were not pardoned when Peter began to preach. The Holy Spirit fell for what purpose? "For the purpose of remitting their sins," says my opponent. I defy any one to find where the miraculous gift of the Spirit was ever promised or said to be for remission. It was to convince Peter that God had accepted the Gentiles, and it did, for Peter said, "When I saw that they had like precious gift with us (Holy Ghost) who was I that I could withstand God?"

But, says one, were they unpardoned?" Can an unpardoned person receive the Holy Ghost? As an indwelling guest he can not, but as a miraculous gift he can, for Balaam, Saul, King of Israel, Jonah, and Caiphas, all unpardoned, wicked sinners, received him in that way. He was not given as a guest until after pardon.

I have made the remark that my opponent and his fellow-religionists will not answer penitent believers as Peter did on the day of Pentecost, nor will they permit any one else to answer them in the words the Holy Spirit used on such an occasion. To avoid this crushing

truth he retorts, "Nor will you answer them in the language Paul addressed to the Philippian jailer." Yes sir, I will! I will answer every one in his condition, just as Paul answered him, and then I would have them do as he did, be baptized that they may rejoice in the Lord. And I will answer every penitent believer as did the Holy Spirit, "Be baptized for the remission of sins," but you will not, you dare not. Is your religion then the religion of the Bible, if you have to discard the Bible to induct men into it?

When a man believes and repents as Saul had done, I would say with Ananias, "Arise, be baptized, and wash away thy sins."

We will now bring up the case of Saul of Tarsus, as a proof that baptism is for the remission of sins. We are sometimes told that the conversion of Saul was miraculous. The conversion of Saul was like that of all men since the fall in the garden of Eden. Christ appeared unto him, not to convert him nor to tell him that his sins were pardoned, but to make an apostle of him, a witness of his resurrection, because he had seen him. He went into Damascus and tarried three days, fasting and praying. Now here was a most fitting opportunity to pardon a person for faith alone. Did God do it? No, for he had established a law of pardon. "The law went forth from Zion" on the day of Pentecost, and he would not set it aside. None but his disciples could proclaim the terms of pardon, for to them had God committed the work of reconciliation. As in the case of Cornelius, the disciples were to tell him what to do. If God himself would not set aside the law, as proclaimed by the disciples on the day of Pentecost, can my opponent do it, as he is attempting to do now? Ananias was sent by the Holy Spirit to Paul, and what did this divinely commissioned messenger say to him? "Go in peace, your faith has made you whole." No, he talked like Peter on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius; "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Baptism is for the remission of sins.

My next argument is based on the exact uniformity of every conversion mentioned in the scriptures after the day of Pentecost. They all agree. The cases of Cornelius and Saul we have examined. When Philip went down to Samaria, he preached, they believed, and were baptized. The eunuch had Christ so preached to him that he demanded baptism, and was baptized. Paul preached the gospel to Lydia. She believed and was baptized and all her house. Paul preached the gospel to the Philippian jailer, and he believed and was baptized and all his house. Paul speaks of his Roman brethren as having been baptized in Christ's death. So also his Colossian brethren. The Galatians had all been baptized into Christ. He says the entire church had been cleansed by the bath of water, or baptism. He tells Titus that Christ had saved or pardoned all Christians by the washing of regeneration or baptism. All these cases agree with the law as laid down by the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

Another argument is, what is spoken of as the result of baptism in nearly every case. On the day of Pentecost remission of sins was clearly declared to be the result. Washing away of sins was the result in the case of Saul. Rejoicing in the Lord was the result of

baptism in the case of the eunuch and the jailer. Arising to walk in a new life, being baptized into Christ or being in Christ, salvation or pardon, cleansing or pardon, are all spoken of as results of baptism. All agree with the law laid down at Pentecost.

But my opponent finds one or two instances out of so many, where baptism is not mentioned, and assumes that there was no baptism in those cases. Let me reason in the same way. Faith is not mentioned on the day of Pentecost, at the house of Cornelius, in the case of Saul, in the case of the Roman Church, Colossian Church, Ephesian Church, nor in the case of all Christians mentioned in writing to Titus; hence faith is not necessary. But says my friend, God has clearly said, without faith none can please the Lord; hence we know they must have had faith. Yea, sir, and without obedience, none are children of God, is as clear a general principle; hence they all obeyed the command, "Be baptized for the remission of sins."

Let me here help my friend and all his way of thinking out of this trouble. When anything is made dependent on several conditions, the omission to mention one or more of these conditions in giving an account how certain persons obtained the promised privilege, does not imply that the omitted conditions have not been complied with. On the contrary the fact that they are acquired by the law, renders it certain that they have been complied with. When I say a man has taken the oath of allegiance and been naturalized, do I imply that he has not been here for live years, and has not declared his intentions? On the contrary the very fact that he has been permitted to take the oath by a proper officer, is *prima facie* evidence that he had performed ail prior conditions. So when the Bible says a man is pardoned, it is *prima facie* evidence that he has heard the gospel, believed, repented, and been baptized.

Right here let me again ask my opponent, as I have already several times, what baptism is for? For what does he baptize men? I wish the answer in the language of the scriptures. I will, and have told, and every time in the exact words of the Spirit, what baptism is for, and I want a like answer. I shall accept no answer like this one before me, that would require a council of lexicographers, critics, and lawyers to guess at its meaning. I am anxious to hear his answer. Will he place himself on the word of God, and tell us what baptism is for, if not for remission of sins, and give his answer in the plain, clear language of God's word?

We have already brought together several references to baptism in one connected view. We wish now to generalize. We are told in 1 John i. 7:

"But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another; and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin."

How do we obtain access to the blood of Christ? In Gal. ii. 27 we read:

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, hare put on Christ."

Then we are baptized into Christ. By being in Christ we have access to his blood. By his blood we are cleansed or pardoned. Ob-

serve how exactly even the figurative use of baptism accords with the great law, baptism for the remission of sins.

Again in 2 Cor. v. 19: "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. He is regenerated."

Turning to Galatians we read: "We come into Christ by baptism."

Again we are cleansed by Christ's blood. Christ's blood was shed in his death. How can we come in contact with the blood shed in his death? Rom. vi., we read:

"Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him in baptism into his death."

We are then brought to the blood of Christ shed in his death in baptism.

Again we are said in baptism to put off the old man, or our sins and sinful life, and arise to walk in a new life. Rom. vi. This means pardon. Again the old man means our state of condemnation. The new man our state of pardon or acceptance with Christ. We lay off the former and put on the latter in baptism. Thus does every figurative use of baptism accord with and teach the great law baptism for remission.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. HUGHEY'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will answer the gentleman's question directly, and in doing so I will call his attention to the argument he has not deigned to notice, as to what baptism is for. I gave him the testimony of Peter, that baptism is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Baptism saves by answering to that work which had been accomplished through faith in a risen Saviour. He has not noticed my argument on the symbolical import of baptism. He has confounded the sign with the thing signified all the while. Such a confounding of type and antitypes, or signs with the things signified, I have never had the misfortune to see and hear in all the discussions I have had with the gentleman's brethren, as he has given us. But he looks at things through the water, and consequently he can not get a clear view of them. Now I want him to notice my argument on Peter's language. There is no man who can give an exposition of this passage, 1 Peter iii. 21, upon his principles without flatly contradicting the word of God.

Alexander Campbell says that "baptism purifies the conscience." Peter says it does not do any such thing; it answers to a good conscience but it never gives a good conscience. There is the design of baptism set forth, and its relation to the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. I want the gentleman to notice this argument and walk up to the work like a man.

But he tells us I help him to play the David. There are several things quite amusing in this matter. He tells you I think myself a real Goliath. But the gentleman told me in our correspondence

that he was quite as large as I was. Now he is getting to be a mere strip-ling—a little David. He is making wonderful progress. [Laughter.]

But he must come up to the very point at issue. I put the question fairly and squarely to him, if guilt could not be consummated without an overt act of transgression, and he said it could. Then I asked the question: "Could not the sinner consummate his return to God without an overt act of obedience to a positive law?" He admits he could if God Almighty had so arranged it. Now, having made these admissions, the question is, Did God so arrange the economy of human redemption, as to require that the penitent should consummate his return to God by obedience to the positive institution of Christian baptism? This he affirms, and I deny. This brings the matter squarely before us, and I hope the gentleman will meet the issue directly

He says he does not know whether any of John's disciples were rebaptized by the apostles, except the twelve spoken of in Acts xix. It is a fact, however, that the apostles baptized every Jew who was converted to Christianity, whether John had baptized them or not. He tells us also that John's baptism was not the Christian baptism. How, then, I ask, did these persons John baptized, get into the Christian Church, if they did not receive Christian baptism? He tells us Christian baptism was not instituted until the day of Pentecost. I am surprised to hear a man of his intelligence make such a statement. The disciples commenced baptizing when they commenced preaching the gospel, and those whom they baptized before the day of Pentecost were never baptized again. Yet he does not know. I am afraid there are a great many things which he does not know, that he ought to know.

But he tells us Abraham was justified by works when he offered Isaac upon the altar. I knew just what reply he would make here. But was Abraham justified in the sense of having his sins remitted at that time? He will not dare to assume such a thing. Abraham's sins were remitted before the birth of Isaac when he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness. Gen. xv 6. More than a quarter of a century after this, James says:

"Abraham was justified by works when he offered up Isaac upon the altar." Abraham was justified by faith, in the sense of having his sins remitted, but he was justified by works, in the sense of approval, when he offered up Isaac. Paul says:

"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. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Horn. iv. 2-5.

Here Abraham, it is declared, was not justified by works, but that he "believed God, and it (his faith) was counted to him for righteousness." Yet the gentleman would have you believe that Paul and James were talking of the same transaction. Such moral duplicity I would never be guilty of. When I am dealing with men in regard to the law of pardon, I shall deal plainly.

But the gentleman tells us again, that the patriarchs could not re-

ceive pardon only by sacrifice. The sacrifices of the former dispensations were typical of the atonement of Christ, and pointed the faith of the worshiper to Christ, but they were not the condition of pardon, and the gentleman knows it. The Old Testament knew of no such positive institution as baptism, as the condition of pardon. The patriarchs and Old Testament saints were justified by simple faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, or else Paul was mistaken in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. You see when it comes to the Bible his doctrine has no foundation. He does not want to look at it. He can work wonderfully well when he can bring up the opinions of other men; but when it comes to proving his doctrine by the Bible then comes the tug of war.

He still contends that the water and the Spirit, John iii. 5, are two things; and that the one is not the symbol of the other. I have proved, however, that water is the standing symbol of the Spirit throughout both Testaments, and that purification by water under the law was the standing symbol of spiritual purification. Until the gentleman proves that this is not the case, my argument remains unanswerable. "The baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire," are not two baptisms, but the same baptism; fire is here used as the symbol of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit would pervade them like fire. The very same persons were to be baptized with fire who were baptized with the Holy Ghost. It is no violation of the laws of language, nor has he called it in question, "that what is true only of the antitype is often affirmed of the type." This every intelligent man knows is often the case. In John iii. 5, then, there are not two births. "Born of water," is but the symbol to illustrate the spiritual birth; just as cleansing by water had been used as the symbol of spiritual cleansing throughout the Old Testament dispensation.

I asked him: Do we have to keep all the commandments of God before we can be pardoned? He said, no. Which are the commandments then that we must keep before pardon? Let us have fair dealing. Is the blood of Christ a condition of remission? It is not the condition of remission; but the ground upon which pardon flows to the sinner through faith. This has nothing to do with the condition upon which pardon is promised.

But he says, "John preached the baptism of reformation for the remission of sins." I think I have said enough to prove to every one that John's baptism was not the baptism of remission, but of repentance; and that John preached remission of sins through faith in Christ; and I will let the matter rest for the present.

He wants to know if saved and pardoned are not synonymous? I answer, no. Sometimes saved signifies pardoned, but not always. The connection must determine whether saved signifies pardoned or not. In Mark xvi. 16, the connection shows that saved does not mean pardoned, for salvation stands in antithesis to damnation, showing that the salvation there spoken of refers to the future world, not to the remission of sins.

But he tells us no one can understand what I mean by being "baptized into remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ." I think, however, that you can all understand what I mean, if the gentleman can not. I certainly tried hard to make it plain. I stated that to be

"baptized into remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ," is to be baptized into the faith that remission of sins comes only in the name of Jesus Christ. The name of Jesus Christ here stands for his meritorious work; and to be baptized into that name, signifies to be baptized into the faith that pardon comes to us only through the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. He wants to know why I did not state the definition in fewer words, and he asks why did not the passage read that way? Why the Holy Spirit did not use different language in communicating this great truth I do not know. But that this is the meaning of the passage, I have fully proved, both by the meaning of the preposition *eis* and the parallel passages of scripture. I did not say it meant to be baptized because of the remission of sins. I took the preposition in its literal import, "baptized into the remission of sins, ' because it should have been so translated. The present translation does not set forth the true idea of this passage, and therefore I prefer a different translation, one that gives us the true meaning of the Holy Spirit. Now I suppose I have made it plain, even to the comprehension of my opponent.

I will now take up the case of Cornelius, and show that he, and those who were converted at his house, were justified by simple faith before baptism. I told you that the circumstances of the case were such, that we might look for a clear and explicit enunciation of the law of pardon. My opponent tells us that a man can not have spiritual life until he comes into Christ, and that he can come into Christ only by baptism. I showed that many persons gave every evidence of spiritual life who had never been immersed, and that both living and dying, they showed that they had spiritual life. I then gave the case of Cornelius as an example of spiritual life before baptism. The gentleman tells us that the Holy Ghost was given to Cornelius, to convince Peter that God was willing to receive him. But had not Peter already been fully convinced by the vision he had seen that God was willing to receive Cornelius, and that he was to call no man unclean? The Holy Ghost had bade Peter go with the messengers of Cornelius nothing doubting, saying unto him, "I have sent them." And as Peter came into the house of Cornelius, and heard his story of the vision he had seen, he "opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." This proves that Peter was already fully convinced that God was willing to receive Cornelius, and consequently he proceeded at once to preach Christ unto him, and lay down to him the law of pardon.

According to the gentleman's views, Peter must have preached a hypothetical gospel to Cornelius, for he did not know whether God would receive him or not. I have heard of hypothetical baptism, in which the administrator says: "If thou hast not been baptized, I baptize thee," etc.; but a hypothetical gospel is something I never heard of before. According to the views of my opponent, Peter should have said: "Of a truth, if it be a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, if it be true that in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." [Laughter.] He



should have said also, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall obtain remission of sins, if it be true that whosoever believeth in him shall obtain remission of sins." But Peter preached no such hypothetical nonsense. He preached the gospel to Cornelius and his friends upon the authority of heaven. He knew that God was willing to receive Cornelius, and the idea that the Holy Ghost was given to convince Peter that God was willing to receive him is positively contradicted by the facts in the case, and is supremely ridiculous; and the man that would take such a position must feel that he is sorely pressed.

It is a remarkable fact, that just as Peter announced, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," his discourse was cut short by the descent of the Holy Ghost. So soon as this truth—the law of pardon—was announced, they laid hold of it by faith, and were saved. God received them; "their hearts were purified by faith." Then answered Peter, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Peter did not say: "Now I know God is willing to receive these persons;" but he said, "They have received the Holy Ghost as well as we."

The gentleman will say that this was but the communication of the supernatural gifts, the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost. But I ask if the major does not always include the minor? The major proposition here is the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost; the minor is the soul-renewing power of the Holy Ghost. If the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost were conferred, was not also the Holy Ghost himself given in his regenerating power? How can a man have the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit without the Holy Spirit himself? The manifestations of these miraculous gifts convinced Peter that they had "received the Holy Ghost as well as we." They had received the Holy Ghost, they were new creatures in Christ Jesus, they were in possession of spiritual life, and yet they had not been baptized.

Here we have the law of pardon fully set forth by Peter, and yet not one word is said about baptism. Now, I ask, would the Holy Ghost communicate his supernatural power, his miraculous gifts, to an unpardoned sinner, a rebel still out of the kingdom of God? I tell you the thing is preposterous. But not only do we have the testimony of Peter here, but we have the unanimous testimony of all the prophets. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name (that is, through his atoning sacrifice—his vicarious sufferings), whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins." Here the whole teaching of the scriptures, in regard to remission, is summed up in one single sentence, like ten thousand rays converging to one common center. The whole testimony of the word of God is contained in this sentence, which declares that faith in the atoning merit of Christ, brings the blessing of pardon to the soul. Where, I ask, do any of the prophets speak of baptism for the remission of sins? The Old Testament prophets often speak of believing in the coming Messiah, and of salvation coming to the penitent through (his medium, but they never intimate that there is some overt act, such as baptism, to be performed, before remission can be obtained.

This closes the argument, for it shows that a man may be justified, renewed, brought into Christ, and made an heir of heaven without baptism. This demonstrates that my position is right, and my opponent's wrong, for if baptism is a condition of the remission of sins in one case, it is a condition in all cases, and if remission can be obtained in one case without baptism, it may be in all cases. Thus it is demonstrated that baptism is not a condition of remission of sins, but that it is only the symbol of remission. Taking this correct and scriptural view of the nature and design of baptism, all these passages of scripture which speak of coming into Christ by or through baptism; of being washed and cleansed by water, etc., are easily understood, for the nature of baptism demands that we understand them not literally, but figuratively or symbolically. Baptism symbolizes our entering into Christ, and our being cleansed from sin. In this way Paul's sins were washed away, as Mr. Campbell himself tells us. And as this is his fifth passage to prove remission of sins in baptism, I will read to you his own explanation of how Paul's sins were washed away in baptism. Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 51(i):

"The water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed. Yet he had no solemn pledge of this fact, no formal acquittal, no formal purgation of his sins, until he washed them away in the water of baptism."

If baptism is only the formal declaration of the fact that our sins are pardoned through the blood of Christ, it stands only as a symbol of that spiritual cleansing which has already been obtained through faith in Christ. So we have the clear and unmistakable testimony of Mr. Campbell himself that the sinner is pardoned, renewed and saved without baptism. Peter was sent to Cornelius to tell him words whereby he might be saved. He came and told these words without saying any thing about baptism, and he was saved, God purifying his heart by faith, and if saved, he was pardoned, and numbered among the sanctified, and then admitted into the visible church of God by baptism; just as in the case of Paul, the jailer, Lydia, and the converts of the apostles in general. On the day of Pentecost all those who gladly received the word were baptized. They received baptism as the symbol that their sins were washed away through the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And this harmonizes with the general teachings of God's blessed book.

He tells us that by baptism we are put into Christ: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit."

But the baptism here spoken of is spiritual baptism. The baptizer is the Holy Spirit. It will not do to say there is no such thing as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, for this is too clearly recognized in the scriptures. John says:

"I, indeed, baptize you with water: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

The baptism of water symbolizes the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It does not introduce us into the kingdom of God, but it symbolizes

that which has been accomplished through the regenerating power of the Spirit of God. The very same thing is brought to view in Romans vi. 1-8. Baptism imports a death to sin, and a life to righteousness. But my opponent lets the substance go, and catches at the shadow. He takes the symbol, and lets the thing symbolized—the spiritual realities of the gospel—go. Thus baptism does not put away our sins, but it answers to that work. Faith in Jesus Christ brings pardon, and baptism witnesses to that glorious work.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—We feel like shouting with one of old, "Eureka!" "I have it! I have it!" After pressing my opponent through four speeches to tell us what baptism is for, and after several long and confused jumbles of words, driven at last to the scriptures, he gives us a scriptural answer, and if he is not irrevocably committed to baptism for the remission of sins, I can not see how he can be by human language. I was intending to use that passage in 1 Peter iii. 21, as one of my strongest proofs of my position. Now my friend uses and accepts it as an answer to what baptism is for. We are making progress. We can soon settle the question.

"Baptism is the answer of a good conscience," or that by which we answer the requirements of God's law—that which enables us to answer with a good conscience. Can we have this good conscience till after baptism? No! for this is the means by which we answer with a good conscience. Can we be pardoned until we have this good conscience? No! for my opponent himself says we can not be pardoned till we have faith, in the sense of reliance on God. This we can not have till after baptism, according to his own showing, for it enables us to answer with a good conscience, or to rely on God. So says John: "If our hearts condemn us we have not this reliance; it is because we know we have not obeyed God's requirements. But if we know we have complied with all his requirements, we have this reliance." Then according to my opponent's own position, baptism is a condition of this reliance, and a condition of pardon. He has answered in scriptural language, and the answer is fatal to his whole theory, and most explicitly sustains my position. Keep out of the Bible, Mr. Hughey, for it always speaks the same things.

We will now proceed to unfold our argument based on this passage:

"The like figure whereunto baptism doth now also save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It (baptism) is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God."

Baptism saves us by bringing us into the death of Christ, and we are raised, as he was raised. He was raised for our justification or pardon, and we, in baptism, are raised, or partake of his resurrection, and are justified or pardoned. This is the salvation spoken of. The apostle declares that baptism is not a mere ceremonial cleansing, or a figurative cleansing, as our opponent would have it, like the cleansings

of the old law. Such is the meaning of putting away the filth of the flesh, for we read in Hebrews ix. 13:

"The blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh."

Then baptism is not a mere ceremonial cleansing, the apostle says. What is it? The answer of a good conscience toward God, or that which enables us to answer the demands of God's law, and have a good conscience, or a condition of that reliance necessary to pardon, or a condition of pardon.

The real meaning of the original word clearly shows this. *Eperootao*, the verb, means to inquire, to ask, to demand, to require, hence *eperootema*, the noun, means an inquiry, a demand, a requirement. Bezo translates it into Latin in this place by *stipulatio*, a stipulation or condition. Hence baptism is the stipulation, or condition, or requirement of a good conscience—the condition on which we have a good conscience, or have reliance on God, which the gentleman says precedes, and is a condition of pardon. So says Paul: "He that comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of such as diligently seek him." We have this belief, says John, when we keep his commandments. This places baptism before pardon, and make it a condition of pardon. The gentleman has settled the question against himself in his own words. Out of his own mouth have we condemned him.

We are told that Abraham was justified by faith alone, and justification in that instance meant pardon. I do not know how more misstatements could be well crowded into one sentence:

1. How do we know that justification means pardon? Where is the scripture for it? He assumes it to carry his point, though he knows that all the writers of his church say that justification is regarding a man as just after he is pardoned.

2. It is not said that Abraham was justified by faith alone—the "alone" is interpolated by my opponent. Here he abandons his position that man's return to God is by successive steps, and goes back to the old dogma "faith alone."

3. James, in James ii., beginning at the nineteenth verse, most emphatically declares that Abraham was not justified by faith alone, but by works and faith together. But does not Paul say Abraham was justified by faith without the works of the law? Certainly.

Let us look at Paul's argument. He had proved that neither Jew nor Gentile could be saved by their works, for one had not lived up to the light of nature, and the other had not kept the Jewish law. How were they to be saved? By faith in Christ, without the deeds of obedience to the law of nature or the Jewish law. "But," says the Jew, "how can he justify a man without obedience to the Mosaic law?" "Why," says Paul, "he justified Abraham without obedience to this law before the law was given, for the law was not given. In like manner he has done away with the law now, and he justifies men after the law without the deeds of the law, as he did before the law." But Paul nowhere teaches that either saint or sinner can be justified by faith alone, without works of obedience to the law of Christ. On the contrary, he teaches that the sinner must

hear and believe the gospel, repent, and obey God in baptism, before he can be pardoned and justified, and that the saint must continue to do all things whatsoever Christ commanded, to retain the favor of God, and obtain eternal salvation. I have dwelt on this at some length to remove the rubbish men heap on it to conceal the real meaning of the word of God with their dogmas.

I have again, for the fiftieth time, the stale nonsense about water and the Spirit, and the fire and the Spirit, being one and the same thing. Hence, when we are born of the Spirit, or have faith, we are born of the water, and birth of water does not mean baptism. I have so often shown the gross absurdity, the utter nonsense of such a position, that were it not that I wish to drive Noble from his empty hole, for his own benefit, I should not insult your common-sense by noticing it.

But is not the water the symbol of the Spirit, and the Spirit the thing symbolized? We have repeatedly denied this, and called for scriptural proof, and we have only the gentleman's vociferous assertions, without a word of proof. But suppose this were so, does it make them the same thing? No; it most conclusively proves they are two entirely distinct and separate things, for symbol and thing symbolized are never the same. The Jewish sacrifice was a type of Christ. Were they the same thing? But the same things are predicated of the type as the antitype. Does not that show that they are the same? No, by no means, Remission was predicated of sacrifice, and of Christ. Are they the same? Sacrifices were said to obtain pardon So is Christ said to obtain pardon. Then when I say that sacrifice was a condition of pardon under the old dispensation, and that Christ was a means of pardon under the new, do I mean in the last assertion that when a man is pardoned by Christ, he is pardoned, also, by the Jewish sacrifices? So my opponent reasons on John iii. Because water is a type of the Spirit, when a man is born of the Spirit, he is born of water also. What utter nonsense.

Water is mentioned in John, and is no symbol of the Spirit. The Spirit is mentioned, and they are entirely different. We are begotten of the Spirit when we believe the gospel, as more than a dozen scriptures declare. We are born of water and the Spirit when we are baptized, as the scriptures declare, as the fathers declare all through their writings. As John Wesley, and all commentators, divines, and theologians have uniformly declared in all ages, till the necessities of an unscriptural position drove reckless disputants, like my opponent, to make nonsense of the word of God, to destroy its emphatic denial of their dogmas. My opponent's jumble, and mixing, and perversion of scripture is aptly expressed by the doggerel Arthur Criehfield puts into the mouth of a Universalist:

"These things, I hardly know how to fix them,  
For the Partialists put it full strong;  
So I'll just jumble and mix them,  
And proceed with my song."

So my friend exclaims:

"These things, I hardly know how to fix them,  
For the Bible is against me full strong;  
So I'll just jumble and mix them,  
And proceed with my song."

And he does "jumble and mix them and proceed with his song" about faith alone. Now, Mr. Hughey, for the sake of your own reputation, for the respect you should have to the good-sense of your audience, don't nauseate us with a rehash of that stale twaddle.

But he wants to know if our actions are the only conditions of pardon. No, sir, the shedding of the blood of Christ was a condition on the part of God. Paul says so, for he says that without the shedding of Christ's blood, there could be no remission. There are conditions or actions on the part of God, as well as on our part, but we can never avail ourselves of the conditions of God's part, till we have done what he lays down as conditions on our part. So the whole scriptures teach.

We are again told that John's disciples were rebaptized, and how could that be if John's baptism was for the remission of sins. My friend puts on his spiritual discerning-stone, and he sees that all John's disciples were rebaptized by Christ and his disciples. Where did he learn that. Not in the scriptures, for they mention only one case of rebaptism, in Acts xix. These persons had been baptized by John's baptism, after the Christian dispensation had been established for years. Paul rebaptized them because they had been baptized with a baptism that had been done away, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. This baptism does not contradict the idea that John's baptism, before it was done away, was for remission. But how did John's disciples come into the Christian Church. Just as the one hundred and twenty disciples, to whom the three thousand were added on the day of Pentecost, came into the church. John preached a baptism for the remission of sins, preparing in this way for Christ's kingdom. All who were prepared, by this work of John, for the kingdom, were received into the kingdom when set up. All who received John's baptism, after it was abrogated, were rebaptized, for it was then of no effect. Now I hope this is clear, and that we shall have no repetition of the case of the rebaptized disciples of John.

But the gentleman tells us what these disciples were baptized into. Hear him: "Baptized into the faith, that remission comes through the blood of Christ." Baptized into the faith! How do we get into that faith? Why we are baptized into it. Can we have remission until we are in this faith? No, sir, for without faith it is impossible to please God, and the gentleman has told us this faith procures pardon. Then we are baptized into the faith, which procures pardon, and we can get into it in no other way, therefore, baptism is a condition of pardon. No, sir, you can't pervert the language so as to remove baptism for remission.

My opponent next turns to the account of the conversion of Cornelius, and reads till he comes to "whosoever believes on the name of the Lord shall be saved," and claims that faith is, therefore, the only condition. He attempts to confirm this by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and asks if the Holy Spirit were ever given to unpardoned persons? Let us analyze this conversion. Peter was to tell them what they were to do to be saved or pardoned. When he entered the house he preached Jesus and the necessity of faith in his name. But shall we stop there? No, for he next proceeds to tell them what to

do. As he was beginning this the Holy Spirit fell on them. Did he fall on them because they were converted, or to prove that they were pardoned? No, for it was a miraculous outpouring, such as was never witnessed except on two occasions, here and on the day of Pentecost, and will never occur again. What was this miraculous outpouring for? What effect did it have on Peter? He exclaims, "Who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Again, when he met the church at Jerusalem, he says, "Seeing they had received like precious gift with us, who was I that I could withstand God." Then the outpouring was to convince Peter that God had accepted the Gentiles, putting no difference between Jews and Gentiles, and it did convince him.

It was not to convert the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius, nor a proof that they were pardoned. But does the Holy Spirit ever fall on unconverted persons? As an indwelling guest, none but a pardoned person can receive the Holy Spirit. But this was a miraculous outpouring, and such were given to wicked persons often, for purposes of revelation, and never, necessarily, made the person receiving them any better. The Holy Spirit was miraculously given to wicked Balaam, to the murderous Saul, king of Israel, to the wicked, rebellious Jonah, and to the wicked Caiaphas. He was here also given to unpardoned persons to convince Peter.

Peter was convinced, and as he had not told them all they were to do to obtain pardon, he now did so, and commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. For what purpose? Why, to obtain pardon, for he was to tell them what they were to do to be pardoned. He preached as he did on Pentecost, "Be baptized for the remission of sins." He preached then, as he did in his letter, that baptism was a condition of a good conscience, or a confidence that would procure pardon. Then this account is a most convincing proof that baptism is for the remission of sins, when we read all of it.

The gentleman says baptism is a symbol of pardon, and must be placed after the thing symbolized. That is a new idea. The type always precedes the antitype. Baptism, even if we admit it to be a symbol of pardon, can and would, from the nature of the case, be a symbol of pardon to come, and not pardon past.

Baptism formally washes away our sins, he says. Well, sir, you are coming along pretty fast. If baptism formally washes away our sins, can we claim that we are pardoned, or know it, without the formal cleansing? If a criminal is pardoned, the formal pardon, or the document signed by the governor, is a condition of his pardon, for the mental resolve of the governor would never release him without the formal pardon. If there is a certain form to be complied with before our sins are washed away, or remitted, is it not absolutely necessary that we comply with that form, before our sins are washed away or remitted? My opponent has walked right up to the point at issue, and has accepted it, without knowing on what ground he was treading.

He next quotes: "By one Spirit are we baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii.) Now, my opponent knows well that there is nothing there that positively shows that the Holy Spirit is meant. Some give it in one spirit or disposition of heart, are we baptized into one body.

But we think it means this, "by one Spirit," by one Spirit's direction are we baptized into one body, just as persons are said to be begotten of the Spirit, when they believe the words of the apostles. Paul says the Spirit begat the Corinthians, and also that he did himself. The Holy Spirit did it through the truth Paul preached. So we are baptized by one Spirit, through the agency of those who obey the directions of the Spirit in baptizing us.

We will now bring forward our remaining arguments. In Romans iv. 25, we read Christ was raised for our justification, or we are justified by the resurrection of Christ. When do we partake of his resurrection? When we are raised with him to walk a new life in our baptism. Rom. vi. Col. ii. 12.

Again, the baptism into Moses in the cloud and the sea, teaches baptism for the remission of sins. The Israelites were under the power of Pharaoh until after that baptism. Then they were under the authority of Moses. In like manner we are under the power and condemnation of sin till after baptism; then we are pardoned, and under the power and authority of the King of kings.

Again, we are said to be separated from our sins, or the old man, in baptism, and to put on the new man. (Rom. vi. Col. ii.) We are said to put off the old man, or the practice, guilt, and punishment of sin in baptism, and rise to walk a new life thereafter.

Again, Christ is the door to his church or kingdom. How do we come into Christ, or enter this pardoned state? By baptism. (Gal. ii. 27.)

Again, we are said to be justified by the name of Christ. (1 Cor. vi. 11.) We put on his name and have his name called on us in baptism.

Again, God said where he had recorded his name, there he would meet and bless men. (Exod. .xx. 24.) The sinner first meets his name in baptism, and then he receives the first blessing God bestow, on men—pardon.

Again, in Titus iii., we are told that we are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit. Washing of regeneration here means baptism, as the birth of the water means baptism in John iii. So all the fathers and commentators have explained the passage. Salvation means salvation from sin, or pardon.

Again, we are said, in Ephesians v. 26, to be cleansed or pardoned by the washing of water by the word. For by this cleansing, or pardoning, the individual members by baptism, he (Christ) cleanses or purifies the whole church.

Thus does every reference to baptism, even the figurative or incidental, corroborate and teach the great law of baptism for remission.

In Romans vi. 17, we read:

"But God be thanked that though ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed the form of doctrine which was delivered unto you, and were then made free from sin."

When did they obey this form of doctrine? What was this form of doctrine? Paul declares the gospel, or the doctrine he preached,



and by which they were to be saved, to be the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. (1 Cor. xv. 2.)

In Romans vi. 1,4 and Colossians ii. 12, we are told these truths are symbolized, or formally set forth in baptism; hence it is the epitome, or form of doctrine. They obeyed the form of doctrine in baptism, and were then set free from sin or pardoned.

Lastly, we are told in 1 Peter iii. 21, that baptism is the condition of a good conscience, or reliance on God, such as we must have to be pardoned. It is the positive stipulation on which we base our pardon.

Thus we have placed twenty-five arguments before you, and over a hundred scriptures, to establish our proposition. We have found it in the fall, in the commission, and stated in the great organic law of pardon, given when the kingdom was set up, and in all conversations, and all figurative and incidental allusions.

There are two-thirds of all that my opponent has said, though it is incorrect, that I might admit, and it makes no figure in the case at issue. I care not whether water be a symbol of the Spirit or not; I care not whether baptism be a symbol of cleansing or not. It does not affect the case any more than a line from Mother Goose. These petty side issues, over which our Noble has made so much needless noise, are vociferated here merely to fill time, raise dust, befog the issue, and set up men of straw that he may display his prowess in cutting them down.

We have read to you the positive declaration of the Spirit, that baptism is for the remission of sins. Will you believe it, or will you allow yourselves to be led away by the side issues, and jumbling of the scriptures, and perversions, and other distortions of God's word into childish nonsense, that have been resorted to here. Judge whether God's word be true, or this man who flatly gives the lie to revelation.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S FIFTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will take up the remark the gentleman last made while it is fresh in my mind. He says it does not affect his position if baptism is the symbol of a spiritual cleansing! I confess I did not expect him to attempt to meet my argument by admitting its truth, when that admission is fatal to his whole theory.

There is not an individual here so blind as not to be able to see that if baptism is the symbol of pardon, it can not be the condition of it. If it stands in the relation of a symbol of spiritual cleansing to the gospel, it can not be the condition of spiritual cleansing. And when I prove that it is the symbol of cleansing, I prove that it does not occupy the relation of a condition of the remission of sins. When my opponent admitted that it is a symbol of pardon he gave up his proposition. There is no question about it. The very moment he takes baptism as the symbol of pardon and spiritual cleansing, that moment he abandons the position that it is the condition of pardon

and spiritual cleansing, for it can not occupy these two relations to the economy of the gospel.

I have been pressing this upon him all the time, and I intend to keep it before him, that he can not take the symbol of spiritual cleansing under the law, and make it that cleansing itself under the gospel. It is so opposed to reason and truth that no man can believe it. The application of water to a person under the law was the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing, and it is contrary to reason and the genius of the gospel to suppose that that which was the symbol of spiritual cleansing under the law, should become that spiritual cleansing itself under the gospel.

Yet this is precisely what the gentleman contends has taken place! No wonder he does not wish to inquire into the question whether baptism is the symbol of pardon or not, for if it is, and I have proved clearly that such is the case, his whole doctrine of baptismal remission is gone.

I did not say that baptism occupied the same relation to the sinner's return, that eating the forbidden fruit did to the fall. I said that faith is the consummating act in the sinner's return to God.

He states that his position here agrees with the general teachings of God's book. I showed that "To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

Now, I ask if any of the prophets ever spoke of baptism as a condition of remission of sins? Examine the whole prophetic canon and gee. Indeed Alexander Campbell says that there are but six passages in the New Testament that "plainly import any connection between baptism and the remission of sins," and of this number but four speak of remission of sins at all, and three of these have reference to John's baptism, which we have seen was not the baptism of remission, but of repentance, and one of them has no connection whatever with the remission of sins. It is Eph. iv. 5: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." The other two passages we have shown do not make baptism a condition of remission of sins.

But when we come to examine these passages which speak of faith as the condition upon which pardon is to be obtained, we do not count them by the half-dozen, but we find them everywhere, on almost every page of God's book, and interwoven with the very texture of the gospel itself. Instead of baptism, as a condition of remission of sins, agreeing with the general teachings of the Bible, it stands diametrically opposed to its teachings, which is that the sinner is justified by faith in the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Then I showed you that if his doctrine is true "the gates of hell have prevailed against the church." This Mr. Campbell himself has told us, and he certainly has told us the truth one time in his life. [Laughter.]

I said nothing about what is to become of me and my party if this doctrine be true; but I showed if it were true, "the gates of hell have prevailed against the church." This I proved by Mr. Campbell.

Again, if this doctrine be true, the penitent may be left to perish in his sins, simply because there is no person to put him into the water!

I may be penitent, I may believe, I may be ready to receive salvation, and Christ may be ready to bestow salvation upon me, but there is no person to put me in the water, and therefore I must perish! This takes the work of salvation out of the hands of Christ, the only mediator, and puts it into the hands of another mediator, who stands between the sinner and Christ! Do you suppose that God would make such an arrangement as this, in the great scheme of human redemption? The gentleman may deny these consequences of his doctrine, but they are there in spite of all his denials. These revolting consequences prove that the doctrine itself is false. He is of the opinion that in such cases the sinner may be saved without baptism, and that even some good-meaning Pedobaptists may be saved! But if his doctrine is true his opinion is false; and if his opinion is true his doctrine is false.

The gentleman says the word *eperotema* translated answer, 1 Pet. iii. 21, means to demand, to question, to inquire, etc.

*Mr. Braden*—I said it meant requirement or condition.

*Mr. Hughey*—This meaning the word never has. The word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament; *eperootaoo* occurs some fifty-eight times, and always in the sense of ask or demand in form of a question. *eperootema* signifies to ask a question, to make an inquiry, to seek for something, or to answer a question; but it never signifies a requirement or condition upon which something is bestowed. "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Baptism, as a symbol, requires a good conscience, seeks a good conscience, or is the answer of a good conscience; but it does not give the good conscience. It looks for the good conscience outside of itself—points to it, but it does not confer the good conscience. My opponent tells us that baptism is the requirement or condition upon which a good conscience is obtained. But this is precisely the opposite of what Peter says. Peter says, "Baptism is the answer of a good conscience," which has been made good through the resurrection of Jesus Christ; that is through faith in a risen Saviour.

He tells us that he never did understand that baptism in this passage meant "literally to wash the dirt from the body;" but that baptism here signifies "not the putting away of legal or ceremonial uncleanness," as did the baptism under the law. But there is no such uncleanness or filth as this to be put away under the gospel, and consequently Peter could not speak about putting away a thing that has no existence. But what was the import of all the baptisms or purifications under the law? They all imported spiritual cleansing—they looked to this as their antitype. In this way the people washed away their legal uncleanness in these typical baptisms. But he tells us Peter says that "baptism is not the putting away of such legal condemnation or uncleanness," but it is "the putting away of sin." Now what is meant by "the filth of the flesh," in this passage? It must mean either literal dirt, or spiritual pollution—sins. It can not mean legal or ceremonial uncleanness, for there is no such thing under the gospel. It does not mean literal dirt. On this Mr. Braden and my-

self are agreed, for he says he never understood this passage to mean "the washing of literal dirt from the body;" therefore, it must mean spiritual pollution or sin, for it can mean nothing else. Hence Peter here expressly declares that baptism does not put away sin! This is not the way it "saves us;" but it "saves us" by answering to that work which has been done through faith in a risen Saviour.

But the gentleman tells us that there is no difference between the justification of Abraham in James ii. 21 and in Romans iv. 1, 10. In Romans iv. 3, it is written:

"For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."

This was before Isaac was born. Some thirty years after this, at least, he offered up Isaac upon the altar, and concerning this transaction James says:

"Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works, when he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect."

Now, I ask every intelligent man and woman present if there was not a difference between these two justifications? In the one case it is the justification of a sinner, and in the other it is God's approval of a righteous man.

I will read to you Paul's account of Abraham's justification. (Rom. iv. 1-5):

"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.

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

Now mark the expression: "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Here is the justification of an ungodly man without works, his faith being counted for righteousness. If this is not justification by faith alone, I would like to know what it is? I was surprised to hear my opponent say that both James and Paul refer to the same justification. Paul is speaking of the justification of a sinner, while James is speaking of the justification of a righteous man, whose obedience demonstrated his faith, and proved that he was a justified man. Paul quotes from David, also, in confirmation of his position:

"Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying: Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

Then, in the conclusion of this chapter, Paul tells us:

"Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed unto him; but for us, also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe

on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification."

So you see it was by simple faith in Christ that Abraham was justified. When were his sins pardoned? When he offered up Isaac? No; but thirty years before when his faith took hold of the divine promise. It was, then that Abraham was pardoned. But this is not all. Paul says that sinners are justified now in the same way—the same faith is imputed to us for righteousness, if we believe in Jesus Christ, and Peter proclaims the same doctrine to Cornelius.

Mr. Braden wants to know if the Holy Ghost and fire are the same thing in the passage, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire." I answer that there are not two baptisms, but one and the same baptism. Fire is here used as the symbol of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit should pervade and purify them as fire. This is the idea conveyed by this passage. So born of water and the Spirit is not two births, or one birth of two things, but it is born of the Spirit, purifying the soul as water purifies or cleanses that to which it is applied. Both water and fire are symbols of the Spirit in the Old Testament, and both are so used in the New. Now I do think my opponent can understand the difference between the type and antitype, between the symbol and the thing symbolized. How can a man be literally born of a type? He can not be born of a type at all, and there is no necessity of understanding a literal birth of water here at all. Why can not my opponent see a truth that is so plainly set forth in the volume of divine revelation?

But he wants to know if the blood of Christ is a condition of pardon? I answer, the blood of Christ is not a condition of pardon, but the ground upon which pardon is bestowed. The blood of Christ alone can cleanse from sin. It is the only sacrifice for sin. It is faith, however, which takes hold of that blood, and makes it the means of spiritual cleansing to the penitent.

The gentleman tells us that to "be baptized into the remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ," is to be baptized into the state or condition in which remission of sins can be enjoyed. But I showed you the import of the preposition *eis* used in similar passages which fixes the meaning here, and showed that it does not mean "into a state or condition," but a profession of faith in, or obedience to a person. And this proves that to "be baptized into remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ," is to "be baptized into the faith that remission of sins comes only in the name, that is through the merits of Christ." I can not see why my opponent can not understand it. The reason must be "because the natural man can not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him." But he asks if remission of sins comes only in the name of Christ, how are we to get remission except by being baptized in the name of Christ? But if to "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" brings us into remission of sin in his name, then to be baptized in the name of the Father is to receive remission in the Father's name, and to be baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit is to receive remission in his name. But we do not receive remission of sins in the name of the Father and Holy Spirit, yet we are baptized in their name. In this passage (Acts ii. 38) bap-

tism is set forth as a solemn declaration or profession of the faith that remission of sins comes only in the name of Jesus Christ.

But I ask again how did those persons John baptized get into the Christian Church? How does any person get into the Christian Church? Only by Christian baptism, the door of entrance into the visible church of Christ. The whole history of the Apostolic Church shows that the disciples of John were baptized with Christian baptism, whenever they were converted and brought into the church, and this proves incontrovertibly that John's baptism was not for the remission of sins, according to the gentleman's own views; for he will not baptize the same person twice for the remission of sins. This one fact not only takes away half of his scripture proofs for the remission of sins in baptism, but it cuts up the whole system by the roots.

But the gentleman contends that a man may possess the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and not possess the Spirit himself, and that this was the case with Cornelius. He instances the cases of Balaam, Jonah, Saul and Caiaphias. But Balaam was a true prophet of God, and spoke by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The whole history of Balaam's case shows that he was a true prophet, but that, in an evil hour, he fell, through temptation, and he is held up in the New Testament as a fearful example of apostasy. That Jonah was a true prophet of God is certain, and I never heard his character as an inspired prophet called in question before. So these two examples fail the gentleman entirely.

The case of Saul, king of Israel, is one of those peculiar cases where the Divine Spirit controls evil men by bringing them under divine influence for the time being to prevent them from accomplishing their evil purposes. But it is expressly said of Saul, "The Spirit of God was upon him also." He not only possessed some supernatural gifts, but the Holy Spirit had complete control of him, to hold him from his wicked purpose.

In the case of Caiaphas, it is not certain that he spoke by divine inspiration; but if he did he was the high priest, and it was through him that communications were often made to Israel, because of his official position. But neither of these cases are at all analogous to the case of Cornelius, and therefore they can not be brought forward to illustrate it. The Holy Ghost came upon him, not to restrain him from wickedness, but to dwell with him, and to sanctify his nature. When the Holy Ghost comes upon a man under the gospel, as he did upon Cornelius, he comes "to abide with him." My opponent says a man can not have the Spirit of Christ until he is baptized. But I have showed you a New Testament example where persons did possess the Spirit of Christ before they were baptized. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Peter had not yet said one word about baptism. But as he uttered the sentence: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins," the Holy Spirit fell upon them, and

they were saved by believing in the name of Jesus. But my opponent says this was done to convince Peter that God was willing to receive the Gentiles! But Peter was convinced that God was willing to receive them before he uttered one sentence, as I showed you from his own language. The outpouring of the Holy Ghost was not to convince Peter that God was willing to receive them, but it convinced him that God had received them, for he said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Here Peter expressly declares that they "had received the Holy Ghost," not merely his miraculous gifts. The same thing is stated by Peter. (Acts xi 14, 17; xv. 8, 9.) I never have seen such trifling with the word of God, as the gentleman's exposition of this passage affords.

My opponent tells us that the "one Spirit" in 1 Corinthians xii: 13, is not the Holy Spirit, but the spirit or temper of the Christian! But Paul here says:

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit."

Here the Spirit is the agent by which we are baptized into the one spiritual body of Christ, and by which we are made to drink into the Spirit of Christ. To say that this is the spirit of the Christian, and not the Holy Spirit, is the most perfect nonsense I ever heard of.

But the gentleman tells us that God can only be found where he records his name, and that he records his name in baptism; therefore, he can only be found in baptism! Under the former dispensation God selected a place where he recorded his name, and where the people were to meet and worship him, and this was done to prevent idolatry. But what has this to do with baptism for the remission of sins? God did not record his name upon the worshiper, but in the place where he was to be worshiped, and to bring up this passage of scripture to prove remission of sin in baptism is not only a gross perversion of God's word, but it is trifling with divine things.

My opponent tells us that the "form of doctrine," in Romans vi. 17, is immersion! He tells us the doctrine is: "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures," and that the form or type of this doctrine is being buried in, and raised up out of the water. But I showed you conclusively on the former proposition in my argument on Rom. vi. 1, 6, that there is, and can be no form, type, or resemblance between the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and immersion under water. Hence the apostle did not mean obedience to immersion, by obedience to the form of doctrine delivered. The word here translated form signifies rule, and primarily means "to mark out a way." In this passage it means the rule or system of doctrine delivered by the apostles, which rule of doctrine the Roman Christians had obeyed from the heart, and had been made free through the truth. To talk about obeying a "form of doctrine" in the gentleman's sense of that term is the veriest nonsense.

In Titus iii. 5, "the washing of regeneration," we have the symbolical import of baptism set forth again clearly. The renewing of

the Holy Ghost purifies the heart; the washing of regeneration, (baptism) symbolizes this inward renewing. If the "washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" both mean baptism what becomes of immersion? for this washing, this renewing is "poured out, or shed upon us richly through Christ Jesus!"—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I shall briefly notice the few things, worthy of notice, in my opponent's speech, then give you a general review of what he has said, and at the close give a resume of all we have said on the affirmative, as fully as time will permit,

We are asked again if water in the rite of baptism be a symbol of cleansing or remission, can we take that which is a symbol of cleansing and make it a condition of cleansing or remission? I can not see why we can not. What is in the way of doing so? Mark, we do not, and never have said water was a symbol of either the Spirit or remission. We have said that were we to admit his assumption that it is, it would have no bearing on the case.

Again, we are asked if the use of water in the rite of baptism can be a symbol of remission, and man's use of the symbol a condition of pardon? Why not, pray? Where the inconsistency? Would God take the symbol of cleansing under a former dispensation, and make it a condition of remission under the new dispensation? Why not again? The gentleman has raised a series of phantoms, and makes great eyes and grimaces of wonder at them, as if they were real. I can not see a single objection or a particle of relevancy in all he has said.

We would call your attention to his new assumption that water is a symbol of remission. He has abandoned his old cry that it is a symbol of the Spirit. We now deny that water is a symbol of either the Spirit or remission. Baptism, he says, then is the symbol. Baptism was not a symbol under the old dispensation for there was no baptism. Water might be a symbol of cleansing, and immersion in it a condition of cleansing. Baptism could be a symbol of cleansing and a condition of cleansing. There would be no incongruity in either case.

Next comes the reckless statement that Peter mentioned only faith at the house of Cornelius. I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten we have Bibles, and can read them. Peter was to tell them what they were to do to be saved. He told them to believe. Here the gentleman stops, and asserts that they were pardoned by faith alone. I read the whole account and I find they were to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Both faith and baptism were things that he told them to do. I can read the account, in Acts ii. 30, as he does this, and threw out faith, for Peter says not a word about faith there. He mentions only repentance and baptism. The gentleman has forgotten our rule, though he never attempted to impeach it. We are to take all the conditions mentioned in different places and combine them.

We have next a regular howl about consequences. I care not what the consequences are. Let those who dread the consequences take the proper steps to avoid them, and not attempt to denounce and deny



God's law. If God has said, as we have shown, that baptism is for the remission of sins, he will never change his law to save you from the consequences of denying and disobeying. He will demand of you that you suit your conduct to his law, or take the consequences. If the consequences are so dreadful to you and your friends, obey God's law and avoid them. The question is, what does God's law say? We have shown that it says baptism is for the remission of sins, and there it will stand forever. You might as well attempt to blow the stars out of the heavens, as to attempt to set aside a positive law of God, by declaiming about consequences.

I regret now that I have to charge my opponent with deliberately misrepresenting me. He asserted that I read or pretended to read requirement or condition, as renderings that Greenfield gave to the noun *eperootema*. Also that I admitted that baptism was future, or after a good conscience. Grosser misrepresentations could not be made. I took the verb *eperootao* and read to seek, to require, as meanings, and then said that the noun then must mean also a seeking, as a requirement, or in other words a condition, and referred to Beza's translation into Latin, in which he renders it in this place by *stipulatio*, a stipulation or condition. I never read or attempted to convey the idea that Greenfield gave these as meanings of the noun. I showed from the verb that they must be meanings. Again I most emphatically stated that baptism was a condition of a good conscience, and the good conscience or conviction that we had done what God demanded was before remission.

But the gentleman now seeks to evade the force of his answer to the question, What is baptism for? by saying it is the seeking of a good conscience. That is still worse for him. Baptism is a seeking of a good conscience, or in baptism we seek or obtain a good conscience, or that confidence John speaks of, or the reliance the gentleman says is a condition of pardon. Then we never have that good conscience, or reliance till we are baptized, and we can not be pardoned; or baptism is a condition of remission of sins. My opponent quoted the language of the Bible in an unlucky moment, and it has overturned his position, and he can neither back out nor patch it up. He is irrevocably stranded on his own answer.

We never said that man was pardoned in baptism. We said in our first speech it was just on the other side of baptism. His own answer places baptism or the seeking before pardon, hence there is no conflict as he would attempt to show between our position and our rendering of Peter's language.

He next tells us we are justified by faith alone. He contradicts God's word which says we are not justified by faith alone, James ii. 24, and abandons his position that the return was one of successive steps. Indeed I can not think of an important position he has taken in this discussion, that he has not afterward abandoned.

Again we are told that we did not notice his argument on the baptism of the Spirit and fire. Here the fire was a type of the Spirit, and when men were baptized with the Spirit, they were baptized with fire. He is certainly strong on symbols. Water is a symbol of the Spirit, and fire is a symbol of the Spirit. Was the fire here a literal fire, and

was it identical with the Spirit. If so, he naturalizes the Spirit of God. This fire was the baptism, hence the Spirit was water not fire. All this talk about symbols, and things symbolized, is sheer nonsense, and the assumption that they are one is an insult to common-sense. He only resorts to it to befog the idea of baptism.

He again tries to fetch up baptized into remission of sins. The last time he looked at it through his spiritual discerning-stone and reads .

"Baptized into the great fact or truth that remission of sins comes only through the blood of Christ."

What does that mean? What a butchery of the simple declaration of God's word, be baptized for the remission of sins? But has he got rid of baptism for remission? No, sir. What does he mean by being baptized into a fact or truth? Is the language literal? No, it must be elliptical. There must be an ellipsis between into and fact or truth. What does he mean? To be baptized into a state or condition where it is a fact, or you can believe it to be a fact or truth, that your sins are remitted through the blood of Christ. Baptism for the remission of sins again in spite of all his twisting and turning. The gentleman had better fall back on "because of" for "into" will make him say "baptism for the remission of sins" in spite of him.

Again, water is a type of the Spirit, and to evade the force of our objection to having the type and antitype brought together, when, as he claims the birth was of the antitype alone, he asks if we can not bring in the type as an illustration of the antitype. No, for we have the antitype mentioned as in the passage, and it therefore needs no illustration. When we have a man before us we do not need his picture to enable us to understand him. The gentleman had better drop that stale nonsense, for the longer he talks the greater nonsense he makes of it.

How did the disciples of John get into the church? We have already answered that. They came in as did the apostles and the one hundred and twenty disciples, to whom the others were added on the day of Pentecost. He attempts to prove that Balaam, Saul, Jonah, and Caiaphas were good men. They were prophets. That does not prove them good men, but mediums of God's revelation. Balaam was attempting to curse Israel to gratify his avarice, Saul was hunting David to murder him, and Caiaphas was plotting the murder of Christ, when they were made the recipients of the miraculous outpouring of God's Spirit.

But they were exceptional cases. So were the household of Cornelius exceptional cases. The miraculous gift of the Spirit proves pardon and goodness no more in one case than the other. But Mr. Hughey found no allusion to the idea, that the baptism was to convince Peter that God had accepted the Gentiles. Peter mentions it as a convincing proof of that fact, both at the house of Cornelius, and at Jerusalem. He so understood it.

He wants to know if a man can have the Spirit before his pardon? As an indwelling guest he can not. As a miraculous gift several cases prove he could.

He next parades by one Spirit are we baptized into one body. We

have already shown that it means by the direction of one Spirit, or in obedience to the commands of one Spirit, just as we are begotten by the Spirit, and said again to be begotten by the one who preaches the words of the Spirit. In Rom. vi. 16, we read:

"Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, ye are his servants to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness. But God be thanked, that though ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness."

Mr. Hughey tells us that this form means a rule. It can not be a rule for all life, for it applies only to the point of time when we were, made free from sin. When did they obey it? When they believed, repented and were baptized. All this is formally exhibited or symbolized in baptism, as we have in Romans vi., and we have then an outward epitome or form of the gospel as stated in 1 Cor. xv. We obey this form in baptism and are then made free from sin or pardoned.

We are told Abraham's faith justified him in the sense of pardon. I might deny this, but it is of no consequence whether pardon or justification are the same or not. Paul does not say he was justified by faith alone. James referring to the same event, Abraham's justification, says, he was justified by faith and works. Paul nowhere declares we can be justified by faith without works of obedience to the law of Christ. Indeed he says we were made free from sin or pardoned in baptism. He enjoins works as does James. The works of obedience to be performed by the sinner, are faith, repentance, and obedience, or baptism. So Paul teaches. Enough has been said on that point.

We will now review some of the positions of the gentleman in opposition to our affirmative. We began by stating our position to be that baptism was one of the conditions of pardon, the last step or crowning act of the sinner's return to God. We appealed to the fall, and showed that in arranging the return of man to God thus, we arranged it just as man had departed from God. We showed that it was in exact accordance with man's mental and moral condition, that it was in exact accordance with the principles of God's moral government, that it was in exact accordance with the commission Christ gave his disciples, that it was in accordance with the preparatory work of John the Harbinger, that it agreed exactly with the law of Christ's kingdom as he announced it in anticipation to Nicodemus, and lastly, that it agreed with each of the commissions, when examined singly. Here was work for my opponent to examine the passages and show that they did not teach what I claimed to find in them. Did he address himself to this work? No, he began with an *ad captandum* appeal to the prejudices of his audience, attempting to arouse pride and prejudice to reject what he plainly saw he could not set aside by argument. He has made this his favorite subterfuge during the whole debate. His efforts have been mainly directed to fanning the flames of prejudices and sectarian bigotry, by clamor about consequences.

Now, here let me say once for all, that I have nothing to do with consequences. I am to show what the word of God plainly teaches. Let those who are concerned, inquire and decide what will be the con-

sequences, and let them avoid the consequences, by conforming to God's law, and not attempt to evade them by destroying the law. The infidel objects to the consequences of preaching that there is no salvation out of Christ. Must we then cease to preach Christ as the only name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved?

We preach that men must obey all the conditions God has laid down before he will pardon them, and we find the conditions in the plain unequivocal words of inspiration. Does my opponent accept them? No, like the infidel, he assails God's law on account of consequences. Nine-tenths of the arguments of the religionists of our day against the primitive gospel are essentially infidel in spirit and tendency. Rather than accept the plain teachings of God's word, which they call Campbellism, they will turn infidel and attempt to destroy them.

Let me urge you, then, to inquire, regardless of consequences, what God's word teaches, and then make your conduct agree with it, though you have to reject all you have regarded as orthodox, and the consequences will be well with you.

My opponent accepted the analysis of the fall and return in the arrangement I gave, but he placed the point of guilt and condemnation in another place. He says man was condemned before the overt act, for the wrong determination of heart, which led to the act. Now wrong determinations of the heart are sins, but in this and all cases, the wrong determination causes and remains in, and all through the wrong act, and as simultaneous with the wrong act. But this is a question of fact, and not of theory. When does the Bible say man was condemned? It tells us that moral death, or condemnation, entered by and after sin, and that sin was a violation of the law, that is, that the sin was not consummated, and the condemnation was not passed on man, till the sin was consummated. Again, God said, "When you eat," not when you resolve to eat, "you shall die." Again, the Bible says, when they had eaten, not when they resolved to eat, they were guilty, or their eyes were opened and they were ashamed, or guilty. Now here we have three plain and explicit statements of a fact. The gentleman has not noticed one of them, though he flatly denies the fact the Spirit of God declares in each one.

No, he launches off into metaphysical disquisitions the point of guilt, and quotes a general declaration that wrong determinations of the heart are sins, in fact, the sin, and are before and entirely distinct from the sinful act. He here violates a plain principle of common-sense which says, where there is a seeming conflict between two passages in a book, the weaker must always be interpreted in accordance with the stronger, and general principles must always be so limited as to agree with positive facts. I say a man can not be saved without faith. I am pointed to a deaf mute who can not read, and asked if he will be condemned?

Here is a fact, that such an interpretation of my principle as the gentleman gives to his, would involve God in gross injustice. I modify my principle, to agree with the fact, and say man's responsibility is limited by his ability and knowledge. So here the gentleman's general principle can not be so interpreted, as he persists in doing, as to

falsify these unequivocal statements "of facts in God's word. If he does, he accomplishes nothing in so doing, but to destroy the Bible, for he makes it contradictory. Suppose an infidel were here to-day. What a weapon my friend has placed in his hand. He could say to my opponent, "You affirmed that the condemnation was in the sinful determination, and before and distinct from the sinful act." "Yes, sir," says Mr. Hughey. "Does the Bible say so, or teach so?" "Yes, sir." "Then your Bible contradicts itself, for it, in no less than three places, says man was not condemned till after the sinful overt act." This whole course of reasoning, which arrays general principles against undeniable facts, is infidel and vicious. Indeed, my opponent, all through this discussion, would rather destroy the word of God than to accept its teachings, when opposed to his dogmas.

Again, his reasoning is faulty in another respect. It reasons on the determinations of sinless beings the same as on those of depraved beings. "But," says one, "we are talking about the return of sinful beings." Yes, and for this very reason we have baptism placed where we place it. My opponent gives as the steps of the return hearing the gospel, faith in the sense of belief of the gospel, repentance, confession, and then faith in the sense of reliance on God, or confidence in him as one who will pardon our sins. Now I might easily disprove this, but I prefer to show that this places baptism before remission. A man has heard the gospel, believed it, repented, confessed Christ before men, resolved to do all God has commanded, and he may be regarded by God as one who will do all that is required, and who will be worthy of pardon. But as pardon is an act in heaven, how does man know the mind of God? How and when can he have this reliance on God, as one who will pardon his sins? How can he have confidence to ask God to pardon his sins? Let John tell us. I wish our religious friends would read more of what John says about how we know we are pardoned, and trust less to visions, sights, sounds, and feelings, which may be all delusive and imaginary. 1 John iii. 19:

"Hereby do we know that we are of the truth, and shall persuade our hearts before God. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knows all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask him we receive, because we keep his commandments."

Then baptism was instituted to test our wills, our submission to God, and to give us confidence to look up to God for forgiveness, because we have from the heart complied with all the conditions he has laid down, and we rely on him as one who has pardoned our sins, after baptism, because we have his eternal and unchangeable word that he will do so.

We now leave this subject, reminding you that while my friend here says that the determination of the heart consummated man's separation from God, the Bible, in three places, unequivocally says, that the eating or the sinful act consummated his separation from God. You can choose whom you will believe, God or my opponent. Also, accepting his analysis of the return, the Bible says man can only have confidence that God will pardon his sins, when he has submitted his will to the will of God in complying with all the conditions, or has

been baptized, and that in instituting baptism, our heavenly Father has mercifully met a want of our natures, and gave us this confidence and reliance necessary to pardon. We ask you now to remember these clear conclusions, and let neither perversion nor misrepresentation lead you away from them.

We have here several quibbles we may as well now dispose of. He speaks of the faith that we require, as a mere belief or mere intellectual assent to a truth. We have been so misrepresented thousands of times. All persons know we require a belief with the whole heart. Can you show me one who believes with the whole heart, who is not a Christian? Let us have an end of such bearing false witness against our neighbor.

He wants to know if God changes his conditions of pardon when man is ignorant or unable to obey? He does not, but he modifies man's responsibility, in accordance with man's knowledge. My opponent finally has but one condition—faith. He can not deny that God does not require this of the heathen, who never heard the gospel; nor of infants, who can not understand; nor of deaf mutes, unable to read, who can not obtain a knowledge of it. I will agree to find millions who can not be held to his one indispensable condition, faith, for every one he can find who has believed, and can not be baptized. Let us have an end of this attempting to impeach God's laws on so frivolous grounds.

He next attempts to make capital by dishonestly urging that my position would make all baptized persons members of the church, when the question reads penitent believers. Baptism would do no more good to an impenitent unbeliever than to a stick of wood.

He next attempts to dodge John iii. by making gross nonsense out of our Saviour's language. He reads first water even the Spirit, making them the same by the force of *hat*. We showed that *kai* is never rendered even, except when it joins different titles, or names of the same person. Water and Spirit are never used as synonymous, as interchangeable, and never as titles or names of the same person. Common-sense and every principle of the language forbid such an absurdity.

Next water, he urges, is a symbol of the Spirit. This we have denied, and have not yet heard a syllable of proof, except the dogmatic vociferations of the gentleman that it is. We next showed that even were this the case the water and the Spirit were not one. The type which precedes and the antitype which follows can never be the same. Jewish sacrifices were a type of Christ, but all common-sense declares that they are not the same. He urges that since the same thing is predicated of both, when we are born of the Spirit we are born of the water. We exploded this nonsense by asking him, if when it is said Christ offered himself for our sins, made expiation for our sins, it meant the Jewish sacrifices, and Christ made expiation for our sins. Can we say we listen to the picture of Mr. Hughey and Mr. Hughey when he is talking such nonsense?

We object to the folly of bringing in both water and Spirit, if a birth of the Spirit is all that is meant. He replies that the symbol, water, is brought in to illustrate the thing symbolized—the Spirit.

We reply we have the Spirit, the person symbolized in the passage, and he needs no explanation. It is tautology and nonsense, if the gentleman's position be true.

We object to his reasoning and speaking of the Spirit of God as a thing. The water is a material substance; the Spirit is a divine being or person, and they can not be one, nor can we say that when we are born of the Spirit, we are born of the material water. It is nonsense, worse than nonsense, an insult to reason, and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and the Son of God to so pervert what one has recorded, and the other said, in any such way. My opponent evidently would rather make nonsense of God's word, and destroy it, than to accept its teachings, when against his theory.

He next attempts to set aside the argument based on the fact that John's baptism was for remission. He renders "for," "into," and is anxious to know what "into remission" means. We reply into a state where our sins are remitted, and as we are baptized into that state, baptism is a condition of our being in that state, or of remission. He then attempts another dodge. The repentance was for remission, but the baptism was not. We then showed that John said he baptized them into repentance, for *eis* was used before repentance in that passage. "Well," said our opponent, "what does into repentance mean?" We reply it means into a state or condition of repentance, or reformation, for so the word means. Since we come into that state only by baptism, and repentance was for remission, baptism was still a condition of remission.

He then asks why all the disciples of John were all rebaptized, thus perverting the scriptures. We reply that in only one instance were they rebaptized, and that was when they had been baptized after the kingdom was set up, and the preparatory baptism of John was abolished, and then Paul rebaptized them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. How did John's disciples get into the church? John came to prepare a people for the kingdom, and the way for it; and when the kingdom, which he was preparing for, was set up, all whom he had prepared for it were received into it, if they accepted Christ, just as the one hundred and twenty were received and made the nucleus of the new kingdom.

My opponent has evidently had enough of "because of" as a rendering of *eis* in his former discussions. He tries a new dodge. He holds me to the primitive meaning "into." I am as ready to accept that as he can be in all cases where *eis* follows baptism. Baptized into repentance, what does that mean? Into a state or condition of repentance or reformation. Baptized into the name of Christ? Into a state where we wear the name of Christ, and are under the authority of his name. Baptized into the name of Paul? Into a state where you wear the name of Paul. Baptized into Moses? Into a state which places you under the authority of Moses. Baptized into remission of sins? Into a state where your sins are remitted. I am most happy to accept the gentleman's meaning of *eis*.

He next approaches the language of Christ in Mark xvi. 16. He has learned a new trick here; the salvation is the eternal salvation, and baptism is the "all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

The salvation is the eternal salvation, because *katakrisis* means eternal damnation, in all cases where it occurs, and the verb, "to eternally damn." We exploded the folly of this by showing that the same word was used when the condemnation of the adulterous woman was spoken of, and also when the condemnation of Christ was spoken of. It meant merely condemnation. When one refused to believe the gospel, he rested then under the condemnation and guilt of sin.

In like manner when one believed the gospel and was baptized, he was then saved, or freed from the guilt and condemnation of sin, or pardoned. We substantiated our position by showing that the apostles spoke of pardon as salvation, and of pardoned persons as saved. Paul speaks of those he wrote to, as saved, meaning that they were saved from the condemnation of sin, or pardoned. Peter exhorts, on the day of Pentecost, "Save yourselves from this perverse generation," or from the condemnation resting on this perverse generation. He speaks in his epistle of a present salvation his hearers had already enjoyed, and an eternal, or everlasting salvation, they were to obtain by living godly lives. Hence, the declaration remains: "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved" from the guilt or condemnation of sin, or pardoned.

We showed the fallacy of attempting to make a specific command, baptism, include or stand for a generic term, as "all things which Christ had commanded." We showed, by our examination of Matthew, that making disciples was equivalent to Mark's belief, and baptizing of course was his baptism, and that these were before one became a subject, and ready to be taught the "all things." Hence baptism is before pardon, and forms no part, even, of the "all things" pardoned persons are to do.

He next proceeds to Acts ii. 38. He here abandons the old subterfuges that repentance alone was for remission, and that "for" means "because of." He says they were to repent, and be baptized into remission of sins. We accept this, and show that it means be baptized into a state or condition where our sins are remitted," and as we have to be baptized into that state before our sins are remitted, baptism is for remission. He refuses to accept this meaning. We ask him what he means by "be baptized into remission of sins." After long caviling we get this, "baptized into the truth that remission of sins comes through the blood of Christ." We show that if that lingo means anything, it can mean only "baptized into a state or condition where it is a truth that our sins are remitted through the blood of Christ."

He tries it again: "Baptized into the great fact that remission of sins comes through the blood of Christ." Baptized into a fact; what does that mean? If this jumble of words means anything, it means baptized into a state or condition where it is a fact that our sins are remitted through the blood of Christ." We get into this state by baptism, or baptism is a condition of pardon.

He tries it again: "Baptized into the faith that remission of sins comes through the blood of Christ." That can mean only "baptized into a state where you can have the faith that your sins are remitted through the blood of Christ. Baptism for the remission of sins.



A fourth time he essays to destroy the meaning of God's word and make nonsense of one of his plainest and most important commands: "Baptized into a profession of the faith that remission of sins comes through the blood of Christ." He has come nearer his object in this than in any other attempt, for it would take an army of critics, lawyers, and lexicographers to make this jumble of words mean anything. "Baptized into a profession of the faith that remission of sins comes through the blood of Christ!" What an insult to common-sense and God's Spirit to give that as the meaning of the simple words "be baptized for the remission of sins."

Has this helped him? We are to be baptized into a profession of this faith. James tells us that faith without works is dead, being alone. Then this faith is a dead, ineffectual faith until we are baptized, or make the profession. This alone makes it a live faith that will procure us remission. So taking the gentleman's perversion we still have baptism as a condition of remission. We can not make the profession till we are baptized into it.

I confess I have a curiosity to see what he will try next. Now let me ask you to seriously ponder on such perversions and distortions of language, as plain and simple as language can be made by Infinite Wisdom. Can one of you remember one of his distortions of these words, so plain and simple? Can you tell me even the idea conveyed by them? Are they, then, explanations of what is so plain that it needs no explanation? No, they are reckless attempts to evade the plain teachings of the word of God, by making nonsense of it. I have never in controversies with infidels met with one who would so recklessly pervert, and distort, and make nonsense of the word of God as this man, who professes to be a teacher in the church of Christ.

He next proceeds to the household of Cornelius. He at first denies that they needed pardon. When we refuted him by Peter's words, he then claims that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit was to convert them. When we challenged him to show a single instance where a miraculous gift of the Spirit was promised as a means of pardon, or was mentioned as a means of pardon, he then claimed that as they had received the Holy Spirit, they must have been pardoned persons, or they could not have received him. We showed then by numerous cases that the Holy Spirit was miraculously given without regard to moral character, and such gift was no evidence of pardon.

He then resorts to the old trick of scrapping the scriptures, and reads down to where Peter requires faith, and preaches faith alone. He thus abandons his acknowledgment of successive steps in conversion. Indeed, we know of no position he has taken in this discussion that he has not subsequently abandoned, except his position as one who opposes the truth.

Peter required them to believe on Christ. What is it to believe on Christ? To believe that he is our Redeemer, and if we do what he requires he will pardon us. Mr. Hughey would have them pardoned as soon as they had done one thing Peter required them to do. I take the whole account, and read that he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. When they had done this they had done what Peter told them to do, and were pardoned, and not when

they had done one-third of what he told them to do. So says common-sense. When several things are mentioned as conditions of pardon, we are to combine all of them, and not stop when one-third through, and claim this as the only condition.

He evaded for a long time our query, "What is baptism for?" At last he gave Peter's language, "the answer of a good conscience," or the means by which we can answer God's requirement with a good conscience. Now, according to the gentleman's own language, we can not be pardoned till we can rely on God, or have the confidence given by a good conscience; hence we can not have this reliance or good conscience till we are baptized, as baptism is a condition of pardon. After willfully misrepresenting me, he changes answer into "the seeking of a good conscience." We show, again, that this does not help him, for if we seek a good conscience, or this reliance on God in baptism, we can not have it until we are baptized, as baptism is still a condition of pardon.

Finally, he falls back on to the old cry, faith alone, and refers to Abraham's justification. We showed that justification does not necessarily mean pardon. That Abraham was not justified by faith alone, but by faith and works, and that the word of God most positively contradicts this idea of justification by faith alone, for it says, "A man is justified by works and faith conjointly," and not by faith alone. Such is all we have had to contend with in this discussion.

We object to our opponent's arguments, or course, on this proposition:

1. He has all through tried to arouse prejudice and bigotry to reject what he could not disprove, instead of meeting it manfully.
2. He has challenged and contradicted the word of God in regard to when man became guilty in the first transgression. Indeed he has, all through the debate, contradicted God's word, when opposed to his dogmas.
3. He has made sheer nonsense of the simplest declarations of God's word, when opposed to his position, recklessly preferring to destroy the word of eternal truth, could he do so, to having his position tested by it.
4. He has, on several occasions, willfully misrepresented me and my positions.
5. He has read but a part of Bible history, and persisted in leaving out two-thirds of certain portions because opposed to his theory.
6. He has expounded a few plain, simple words, into long, unmeaning, nonsensical sentences, to destroy the obvious meaning of one of God's great laws, an essential part of the organic law of his kingdom.
7. He has persisted preaching "faith alone," in opposition to his own position at first, and God's word.

We will now proceed to a brief review of our arguments in proof of our position that "Baptism is for the remission of the past sins of the penitent believer." We began with certain preliminary remarks to prepare the way for the consideration of the proposition.

We premised that all men concede that man needs reformation. The Christian world profess to accept the Bible as a revelation of

God's scheme for saving man from the practice, guilt, and punishment of sin. As God is infinite in power, wisdom, and love, he could and would make it so plain that every responsible being could understand the way of salvation. He has himself declared that "he has made it so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein." In opposition to this we find modern theology makes it all a mystery, and something that can not be understood till you have it, and then you can not describe it. Are not such teachers like those of old, who took away the key to the temple of knowledge, and would not enter themselves nor permit others to enter?

We will now look to the commission as the great organic law of Christ's kingdom. Here we expect to find the great principles, in accordance with which the church is, for all time, to perform the great work assigned to her—saving men.

In the commission Christ commanded three acts: Faith, Repentance, and Baptism. He had some object in each of them. That design can not be accomplished without obedience to the command. None of God's laws are non-essentials, for the Infinite God of the universe never stoops to such folly as to command non-essentials.

The third act is a positive ordinance, and all such must have one specific and clearly-defined object. The object must be stated, for it can not be inferred from the act commanded. As all of God's commands are to be obeyed, man secures God's approval by obedience, and incurs his displeasure by disobedience.

As man is finite in knowledge and ability, his responsibility is modified by his knowledge of God's commands, and his ability to obey them. Men are not guilty in not obeying a law of which they are unavoidably ignorant, and which they can not understand. Nor are they guilty for not obeying a law that they can not comply with.

This extends to moral, as well as positive law. Men are required to believe. But the heathen, who can not hear; children, who can not understand; deaf mutes, who can not understand or obey, are excused from this duty. Even those who have been wrongly taught are excused. God has winked at ignorance and tolerated evils for a time, in times of ignorance.

Men are never required to obey a law till given. God has had positive conditions of pardon in all ages, and has modified or changed them when he has changed the dispensations. The law of baptism in the name of Christ was declared first at Pentecost. Then we have nothing to do with pardon before that time, nor with those who never heard the law, nor with those who can not obey it, nor with those who have been misled, except to teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly.

We are talking of those who can know the law, and can obey it. Hence we mean just this: "Since the day of Pentecost, in all cases where men have been properly instructed in the gospel law of pardon, baptism is one of the conditions of the remission of the past sins of the penitent believer, when obedience to that command is possible.

It is a condition, not the only condition, and we prove this by an appeal to the law of pardon, the history of pardoned persons, and the references to pardon in the discussions of Christ and his apostles con-

cerning pardon. In our investigations we have been controlled by this law:

1. In any law giving the conditions on which anything depends, different conditions may be given in different parts of the law, each part giving what it specifically prescribes.

2. While the thing to be obtained can not depend on less conditions than are mentioned in any particular part of the law, it may, and generally does, depend on more and other conditions mentioned in other parts of the law.

3. To learn all the conditions, we must collate all the law, and combine all the conditions, and place them in their proper order.

4. The thing to be obtained must depend on all the conditions, and can not on less than all, for the requirements of the whole law must be met.

You remember one illustration based on the law of naturalization. Also the one based on the pardon of a rebel. All assented to this law, so plain and common-sense like, and yet my opponent, though he dare not challenge it, violated it in every speech, and nearly every thing he produced as arguments.

Following out this law we have examined all places where pardon is mentioned in the discourses or writings of Christ and his apostles, that is pardon in his kingdom when established; and we have collated the law, and have combined all the conditions, and we have taken them in their proper order, and have assigned to each its proper significance and design. We find some of these mentioned in one place, and others omitted, just as the circumstances demand, for men were never required to do what they had already done, or what they were not prepared to do. The circumstances, and logical train of thought or conduct, determined what was mentioned.

We did not conclude that we could take what was mentioned in one place to the exclusion of all others; nor did we conclude that the scriptures clash, for they nowhere make pardon depend on one condition, but they invariably imply the others. We appeal to your candor if this is not fair, logical, and the only true course. Yet my opponent has continually violated this plain, fair rule. Witness his reading a part of what Peter said at the house of Cornelius, and persistently stopping and saying that was all he said, and demanded.

1. Our first argument was based on the analogy that exists between man's departure from God in the fall, and his return in the gospel. We turned to Genesis, and we learned that man was made subject to moral, physical, and positive law. We read the account of how he fell. We learned that falsehood was preached; falsehood was believed. Still man had not fallen, as he was not condemned for belief or faith alone. Next his desires were excited or perverted. Still he had not fallen, for had he never eaten he would not have been condemned. Next he arrayed his will against the will of God in violating a positive law. Then he fell, or was condemned.

To sustain this we presented the explicit and unequivocal statements of God's word. "Death entered by sin or a transgression of the law." God's declaration: "When you eat you shall die, or be condemned." Lastly, the positive statement that "when they had eaten

their eyes were opened, and they were ashamed," or were guilty. From this we concluded that man's departure was a progressive work, not performed by one step, but by a succession of steps. That the crowning act was the disobedience of a positive command of God.

We concluded, also, that the sin was not in the act of eating, abstractly considered, but in the disobedience to God's law. She was not condemned, however, till she had violated the law. The disobedience of this positive law was before, and in order to condemnation. It was not the only act of her fall, nor the most important, but the last and crowning act. Hence we have reached this conclusion, that man fell or departed from God by disobeying a positive law as his last act, and this disobedience of a positive law was before and in order to condemnation, and we would naturally expect God to require man to retrace his steps and return to God in the same way, or obedience to a positive law would be the last, and before and in order to the removal of the guilt. This is our first argument.

2. We collated the versions of the great commission given by Christ to his apostles, and found the steps of the return to be, hearing the gospel, believing the gospel, repentance and baptism. Man must hear the truth, believe the truth, or have faith; but he is not yet pardoned, just as the woman was not guilty when she believed the tempter, or man is not pardoned "for faith alone," any more than she was condemned "for faith alone." He must repent, but he is not pardoned any more than she was condemned for her desires. Lastly, as the crowning act, he must submit his will to the will of God in obeying the positive law of baptism, just as she raised her will in rebellion to the will of God in eating the fruit. Then he is pardoned just as she was condemned.

The merit is not in the act, but in the obedience; but the obedience can not exist without the act. Baptism has precisely the same place in time and sequence in the return that disobedience of the command, "Thou shalt not eat," had in the fall. It has the same merit that that act had demerit. It is "in order to" pardon, just in the same sense and to the same extent that eating the fruit was in order to condemnation.

Any reason that militates against baptism being before and in order to pardon, destroys also eating being before and in order to condemnation. As man was not separated from God till he had violated a positive law, so we say he is not restored or pardoned till he has obeyed a positive law. Thus every part of man's departure has its counterpart in the return, and we must reason on one as we do on the other. We must assign the same place and efficacy to one that we do to the other.

Then we conclude that God, in the commission, makes baptism before and in order to man's pardon, just as in the law in Eden he made disobedience to a positive law before and in order to condemnation. This is our second argument.

3. This agrees with the moral and mental constitution God has given man. Hearing perverted his ideas. This produced belief of the tempter's falsehood, which perverted his judgment or reason. This aroused his desires and perverted his heart, or motive power.

This produced the volition, and the simultaneous evil act which arrayed his will against the will of God, and stained his character with guilt. Then he was condemned.

In the return, hearing corrects his ideas. This produces faith, which corrects his reason or judgment. This produces repentance, or corrects his motive power or heart. This produces volition and the obedience to God's will, which corrects his volition or will, and then he is pardoned.

4. This is in exact accordance with God's moral government. God did not condemn man till he was entirely alienated from, and in opposition to his government. Hearing changed his ideas, belief his judgment, desire his motive power or heart. Disobedience arrayed his will against the will of God. Then he was entirely arrayed against God's government, and he was condemned.

In like manner, hearing the gospel corrects his ideas. Faith his reason or judgment. Repentance his motive power or heart. Baptism, or obedience to a positive law brings his will in subjection to God's government. The whole man is in subjection to God's government. Then God can, and does pardon him—he can not, and does not before.

5. Baptism was in order to remission in the preparatory work of John the Harbinger. He came to prepare the way for Christ's kingdom. The Bible declares that his baptism was for the remission of sins. He himself so preached it, for he regarded men as fleeing the coming wrath or condemnation by it. The people so understood it, for they confessed their sins, and were baptized for their remission. Hence John objected to baptizing Jesus, for he had no sins to be remitted. As John prepared the way for the kingdom, the same great law held in the kingdom when established.

6. Jesus announced baptism for remission, as one of the great laws of his kingdom, when he announced its laws, in anticipation to Nicodemus. Man must be born of the Water and the Spirit. Birth of the Spirit we showed by a score of examples was faith, or belief of the gospel. Birth of the water, from Titus iii. 5 and Mark xvi. 16, and the early teachings of the fathers and commentators, and divines in all ages, and from the analogy in the figure, means baptism by immersion, or immersion which alone is baptism. Then birth of the water or baptism is for remission.

7. We next examine Matthew xxviii. 19. We find three things required. One, observance of all things Christ had commanded, applies to his subjects, or those who are in his kingdom. Belief, or being discipled, and baptism are before one becomes a subject, and are to make them subjects, or in order to the pardon of the alien.

8. We next examine Mark's account, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be condemned." Here salvation is present, and immediately after baptism. It means salvation from the condemnation of sin or pardon; just as he who believes not rests under condemnation. This scripture alone is sufficient to prove our proposition. Christ declares that he who believes and is baptized shall be pardoned. He connects forever, in the organic law of his kingdom, pardon with faith and baptism, and makes

it alike dependent on both. What God has joined together let not man tear asunder.

9. We come now to the climax of this cumulative mass of proof. On the day of Pentecost, the disciples were baptized in the Holy Spirit, and then "whose sins they remitted were remitted," or they had the power of announcing how men could henceforth and forever receive pardon. Peter was to unlock the kingdom to the Jews and Gentiles. He unlocked it to the Jews here in his discourse. The Holy Spirit spoke through him, and for the first time the gospel was preached in fact, and the law of the kingdom was laid down which was to endure forever.

Peter preached Jesus as the Lord Messiah, and their guilt. They were pierced to the heart with a sense of guilt and conviction of sin. They inquired what they should do to escape the guilt and condemnation of sin. They were not pardoned, or the Holy Spirit would not have told them to repent, for we can not have a pardoned impenitent. Did the Holy Spirit answer the question? He did. What did he lay down as the terms of pardon, or law of pardon in the kingdom of Christ? Listen, and believe, and accept regardless of consequences to your dogmas, for the Spirit of God speaks and lays down a law as extensive as the gospel dispensation in time and space, and to endure as long as the Eternal One endures: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."

I feel as if I was dishonoring the word of God to stoop to argue the matter further. God has here declared baptism to be for the remission of sins forever after in his moral government.

It is here expressed in words as plain as human language can make it. There is not one in this house, that were he to try to express baptism as a condition of pardon, could do it in clearer and stronger language than this. I have the exact language of my proposition in the positive declaration of God himself. His law, which is to be the rule of his church forever, affirms my proposition. My opponent is not opposing me, but God. How long will men persist in giving the lie to Jehovah?

We corroborate this by comparing the expression, both in Greek and English, with Matthew xxvi. 28, and are compelled to conclude that as the shedding of the blood of Christ was a condition of pardon, so baptism is a condition of pardon. Since repentance and baptism are connected together as they are, baptism is as surely a condition of pardon as repentance. It would be a violation of every law of common-sense, to insert be baptized between repent and remission, if remission modified repent alone.

Again, leave out the expression, and the passage proves baptism for remission. These convicted believers asked what they were to do to be pardoned. The Holy Spirit told them to repent and be baptized. This as conclusively settles the matter as any other view we have taken of it. "For" means "in order to" because its primary meaning, "into" gives it that force, and the question demands that it should be used in that sense in the answer. Pardoned persons would not be asked to repent, and such would be the meaning, if for means because of par-

don. Also for, in Matthew xxvi. 28, can not mean because of, for that would make Christ's solemn language nonsense.

Lastly, because it would still leave baptism for, or in order to remission. They were to repent and be baptized because of a blessing yet future; for they were impenitent persons, and consequently not pardoned. Whatever is done because of a future blessing, is done in order to obtain it. My opponent's butcheries of this plain, simple law I have already sufficiently noticed. Then God says, "Baptism is for the remission of sins;" and we take his eternal word for our guide.

10. We will next follow Peter to the household of Cornelius. Cornelius was to send for him to tell him what he should do to be pardoned; because Peter was to unlock the kingdom to both Jew and Gentile. He preached the same gospel as on the day of Pentecost. He told them to believe the gospel. When they had done so, he told them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. He laid down the law to them, just as he did on Pentecost; and as he was to tell them what to do to be saved, or pardoned, and baptism was one thing he told them to do, baptism is a condition of pardon. My opponent's scrap reading and perversions can not change this fact.

11. We take next the case of Saul of Tarsus. Christ appeared to him to make him an apostle; but still his conversion was like all others since Pentecost. Christ would not take out of the hands of his disciples what he committed to them. If God ever pardoned a man for faith, prayer and mourning, as modern theology teaches, he would have done so with Saul. But Saul, like all others, had to comply with the great law of the kingdom. Ananias came to him. He had complied with all the conditions but one. Ananias announced that. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." His sins were remitted after baptism, like all others, and not till then. This is so plain it needs no argument.

12. We next take up the conversion of the Samaritans. They believed and were baptized, both men and women. It seems preaching the gospel includes baptism. It did in Philip's day.

13. The conversion of the Eunuch. Philip preached Jesus. That must have included baptism, for he demanded baptism, received it, and went on his way rejoicing.

14. Conversion of Lydia. She heard the gospel, believed, and was baptized. Somehow the preaching of the gospel in those days led to baptism immediately.

15. Philippian jailer. He heard the gospel, and was immediately baptized. Baptism must have been preached to him. He was baptized, and rejoiced with all his house, as a result of what he had done.

16. Let us now call your attention to the fact that baptism was a part of all these conversions. At Pentecost, at the house of Cornelius, at the jail of Philippi, in Lydia's family, in the case of Saul, in the case of the eunuch, in the case of the Samaritans, baptism formed an essential part of their conversion. In several instances it is said to be for pardon. Persons did not rejoice in pardon till after it. Does not this prove that baptism was an essential part of conversion in apostolic times? Baptism was for the remission of sins then.

17. We are said to be pardoned by the blood of Christ. 1 John i.



2. We come into Christ and have access to his blood through baptism. Gal. ii. 27. We meet his blood in his death. We are baptized into his death. Rom. vi.

18. We are justified by the name of Christ. 1 Cor. vi. 11. We put on his name in baptism.

19. If any be in Christ he is a new creature. He is regenerated. 2 Cor. v. 17. We come into Christ in baptism. Gal. ii. 27.

20. We are justified by the resurrection of Christ. Rom. iv. 25. We are raised with Christ, or partake of his resurrection, in baptism. Rom. vi. Col. ii. 12, 13.

21. We are justified by the life of Christ. We are raised to new life, or partake of his life, in baptism. Rom. vi. Col. ii. 12.

22. We lay off our old man, and put on the new man, in baptism. Rom. vi.

23. Baptism is a separation between our old and new life. Rom. vi. Col. ii.

24. We are separated from our sins in baptism. Rom. vi. Col. ii.

25. Analogous is the baptism into Moses. 1 Cor. x. Before that baptism the Jews were under the power of Pharaoh. After it they were under the power of Moses. So we are released from our bondage to sin, and come under the authority of Christ, in baptism.

26. We are said to be justified by the blood of Christ. Rom. v. 9. We meet his blood in him, and in his death, in baptism. Gal. iii. 27. Rom. vi.

27. We are justified by Christ. Gal. ii. 17. We put on Christ in baptism. Gal. iii. 27.

28. Christ is the door to the church. John x. We come into Christ, and by him, when pardoned, into the church, in baptism. Gal. iii. 27.

29. We come into Christ in baptism. Gal. iii. 27.

30. We put on Christ in baptism. Gal. iii. 27.

31. We ask you now to observe how beautifully and completely all these figurative references to baptism agree with the great law, baptism is for the remission of sins. Does it not show that this thought was ever present in the mind of the Holy Spirit? This incidental proof is one of the strongest corroborative evidences that could be offered.

32. In Titus iii. 5, salvation from sin, or pardon, is attributed to baptism and the Holy Spirit. This explains John iii.

33. In Ephesians v. 26, Christ is said to cleanse his church by the washing of the water and the word. This agrees also with John iii. and Titus iii. 5. By faith and baptism he pardons or cleanses each one, and makes the church clean.

3-1. We offer this thought also. An ordinance which God placed in the organic law of his church must be important, and have a great design. By placing it where God places it, we honor God and his law. Remission exalts the ordinance. All other ends degrade it into a non-essential, and charge God with enacting a needless law in the same place with those of eternal import.

35. In Exodus xx. 14, God says he will meet and bless men where

he has recorded his name. The sinner meets the name of God first in baptism, and there receives his first blessing—pardon.

36 In Romans vi. 16, the Romans are told that when they had obeyed the form of doctrine delivered to them, they were then made free from sin. Paul describes this doctrine, in 1 Cor. xv., as the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. These are formally set forth in baptism. Rom. vi. Then we obey this form in baptism, and are made free from sin, or pardoned.

37. In 1 Peter iii. 21, we are told, 1st. That baptism saves from sin, or, we are pardoned after baptism. It is for pardon, or remission.

2d. It is an answer, or seeking, or condition, of a good conscience, or in it we answer, or seek a good conscience; or it is the condition on which we have confidence that God will pardon our sins, because we have complied with his terms.

Such is the outline of what we have presented to sustain our position, and we have not exhausted it yet. Now, we ask you, do you need more proof? If a proposition agrees with God's government as seen in the first transgression, and as exhibited by Christ in his great commission empowering his disciples to set up his kingdom, with man's moral and mental constitution, with the law of preparation as laid down by John, with every version of the commission, with the law of the kingdom as laid down by the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and in the house of Cornelius; is indeed affirmed in that law in the very words we have used in our proposition; if it agrees with every apostolic conversion, and every figurative reference to baptism; if it is affirmed in several places in the apostles' writings to the churches, can not, will not you accept it?

If you do not, you would not, though God were, to-night, to thunder it in your ears with the voice of Sinai's thunder. We wonder often that the Jews could, with the cloud and thunder and lightning before them, leave the worship of Jehovah and worship the golden calf. Let us wonder no longer. Men in this day will abandon God's clear and perfect word, and worship the golden calf of sectarian dogmas.

Baptism for the remission of sins is as clearly and plainly taught in the Bible as faith. It was taught by Wesley, Watson, Benson, and many other fathers of Methodism. Were they here to-night, they would not own the dogmas we have listened to. John Wesley taught baptism for remission of sins more strongly than Alexander Campbell. He out-Campbelled Campbell on this point. Were there time, I would read them to you. But my opponent will not deny it.

Let me here enter my protest against your misrepresenting me, and reporting, "he argued for baptism alone." I have most positively denied such doctrine all through the debate. We are said, in the word, to be justified by ten different things. We believe and accept all. We place no "onlys" where God has none.

We are said to be saved by thirteen, and pardoned by eight. We accept all of these and reject none. We object to all scrapping the word of God. Cease to be troubled about consequences, except consequences of rejecting the plain teaching of God's word. Don't borrow

trouble about men in the desert or in the moon, and attempt to impeach God's law with frivolous, improbable cases.

Study the law of the Lord. Take its plain meaning—make it the rule of your lives—walk in its commands—do as it tells you—"be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," as God demands, and you will receive this great favor—do all he has commanded, and you shall have the right to enter through the gates into the eternal city, whose maker and builder is God.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S CLOSING REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will begin just where my opponent quit. I am very sorry he did not read from Watson's Institutes and Wesley's work just what they have said. I can not tell why it is that men will get up and make statements that are entirely without foundation in fact, and yet that is what my opponent has just done. Do you suppose that John Wesley, who records his own justification in his journal in this wise, "When at the meeting in------(giving the time and place), as one read Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Galatians, I felt my heart strangely warmed within me," could hold and teach that remission of sins comes only in baptism?

*Mr. Braden*—I will verify from Mr. Wesley's own writings what I have said.

*Mr. Hughey*—Let him verify it if he can. Let him show where 3Ir. Wesley ever taught that without baptism there can be no pardon. Now, mark you, he said that Mr. Wesley took stronger ground than Alexander Campbell on this question. Let him produce the passages from his writings. I know what Mr. Wesley taught about baptismal regeneration in regard to infants, and I hope he will bring it up when we get upon the subject of infant baptism; but not a single sentence does he utter going to show that there is no salvation without baptism, for such a doctrine was never taught or held by Wesley, or by any of the friends of Methodism. I know not why my opponent should make such statements. I never charge upon the followers of Mr. Campbell doctrines that they do not teach, and why charge upon the friends of Methodism doctrines so contrary to all their teachings, and make statements that have no foundation, or the shadow of foundation in fact. But this is the way the statements of my opponent have been made throughout this discussion.

But I will proceed with the review of the gentleman's speech. He says that he does not care for the consequences! Now, he certainly knows that the consequences which legitimately follow from premises often prove the premises themselves false. He knows there is no rule of logic better established than this. If I prove the legitimate or necessary consequences of his premises are absurd, impossible, or contradictory, I prove that the premises from which these conclusions are drawn are false. After calling the gentleman's attention to this universally admitted and self-evident principle, I called his attention to Mr. Campbell's statement, that if his doctrine be true, "the

gates of hell have prevailed against the church of Christ." Mr. Campbell says.

" If there are no Christians among the sects, there was a long time when there were no Christians in the world, and the gates of hell have prevailed against the church! But this can not be; consequently there are Christians among the sects!"

Here the consequences prove the doctrine false—Campbell, himself, being judge. This is one of the consequences I wanted him to look at.

Another consequence of this doctrine is, it takes salvation out of the hands of Christ, the only Mediator, and puts it into the hands of a third party. A man may desire salvation, Christ may be willing to save him, but there is no person ready or willing to baptize him, and he must consequently perish! When you place baptism as the last link in the chain of conditions of pardon, you make it impossible for remission of sins to be obtained without baptism; thus taking salvation out of the hands of Christ entirely! These consequences prove clearly that the premises upon which they are based are false, and they totally overthrow his whole system.

Another consequence of this doctrine is, except a man is baptized, and that by immersion, there can be no spiritual life, no union with Christ; and this being the case, all those persons who belong to Pedo-baptist churches are mistaken in their hope of heaven. There is no spiritual life, there is no vital piety in them. But the whole history of the church shows this is not true, for many thousands of unimmersed persons, in all Christian lands, are giving in their spirit and lives unmistakable evidence of spiritual life.

Here is another of the consequences: It does not simply "send me and my party to hell," but it says no unimmersed person has, or can have spiritual life! But he has not dared to look at these consequences?, that he knew must necessarily result from his doctrine, and prove it false.

The gentleman is like a Universalist preacher I once had a discussion with. He was not a very able man, and as I was constantly pressing the *reductio ad absurdum* on him, he finally got out of humor, and said: "I don't care if my doctrine is absurd, it is enough for me to know that it is true." "But," said I, "when I prove your doctrine is absurd, I prove it is false." So by the consequences of the gentleman's doctrine, I prove his doctrine itself is false. But he has no time to look at consequences!

I confess that I was a little surprised at his replies to some of the points I made in my last speech. You remember that the argument on 1 Peter iii. 21, turns upon the meaning of *eperootema* (answer) and *apothesis* (putting away). The gentleman told us that *eperootema* here signifies the condition of a good conscience. But I showed you in my former speech, that there is no such idea in the word as a condition upon which something is to be bestowed. It can not be tortured into any such signification. It occurs but once in the New Testament, and that is in this place; but in its usage in the Greek language it is always used in the sense of asking or answering a question, etc.

Never in the sense of a condition upon which something is conferred.

This is a strong point, and I knew it was fatal to his position. Baptism, according to Peter in this passage, looks for something, seeks for something, or answers to something outside of itself, but it does not confer that to which it answers. Now what is the position of my opponent? Why that baptism gives us a good conscience—baptism makes the conscience pure. Here the gentleman's position flatly contradicts the word of God. No wonder that he wanted to get away from this passage of God's word.

I did expect my opponent to make something like a fight on this passage, but I was mistaken. He tells us that "the putting away of the filth of the flesh" here, does not mean washing away literal dirt, but it means legal *or* ceremonial uncleanness! This I confess is a new idea, and it is doubtless original with my opponent. But the difficulty with him here is, there is no such defilement under the gospel, and consequently there can be no such cleansing under the gospel, and his interpretation of this passage must, therefore, fall to the ground. As I said before, there is but one of two senses in which the term filth can be understood in this passage. It must either mean literal dirt on the body, or sin on the soul. My opponent says it does not mean literal dirt on the body, and consequently it must mean sin on the soul. Thus he gives up his whole argument.

Mr. Campbell understands "the putting away of the filth of the flesh," as the washing away of literal dirt from the body; while "the answer of a good conscience," he tells us, signifies "purifying the conscience," or making the conscience good. But I showed that *apothesis* could not mean wash, and that the idea of wash was not in the word at all. Every one of Mr. Campbell's brethren takes his position in reference to baptism "purifying the conscience," although it flatly contradicts the Holy Spirit, for he does not say that baptism purifies the conscience or makes it good, but that it is "the answer of a good conscience," which has been made good through faith in a risen Saviour.

There is no possible chance under heaven to get around the argument here. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, that is, the sins or defilement of the soul, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.) Not by putting away sin, but by answering to that word which has been done for us through faith in Christ.

This is a positive "thus saith the Lord" in reference to the design of baptism, and there is no possible chance of escape from it.

I am surprised at the defense my opponent made at this point, for I expected a stronger effort on his part to save his system. But he is a wily little fellow, and he saw clearly enough that he could not answer my argument, and he hastened from it as soon as possible. But I intend to rivet it upon your mind, so that you can never forget it, for this one passage of scripture, properly understood, settles the whole controversy on the design of baptism, and the relation it sustains to remission of sins under the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But the gentleman asks me why can not the symbol of pardon and spiritual cleansing be also the condition of pardon? Why, the very nature of things precludes it. It is one of the things that must appear self-evident to every reflecting mind. There is something so incongruous between the two things that you can not suppose them to coexist in the same thing. When I made this statement the gentleman did not undertake to refute it, but simply asked the reason why it could not be so! He will not even undertake to argue that the same thing can be the symbol and the condition of spiritual cleansing. Again I asked if God would take that which was the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing under the law, and make it the cleansing itself under the gospel, thus making the type the antitype of itself? The thing is too absurd to be entertained for a single moment. If baptism is the symbol it can not be the condition of pardon; so when I prove that baptism occupies the place of a symbol of spiritual cleansing, I prove that it is not a condition of the remission of sins.

I must reply to his remarks about justification by faith alone. He says that I admitted that there are other things necessary. But what are we talking about? The justification of the penitent sinner. How are the sins of the penitent remitted? What are the conditions required of the penitent inquirer in order that he may obtain the remission of sins? I answer, the only condition required of such an one, is faith in the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. But my opponent says that faith and baptism are required. Now how are we to determine which is right, my opponent or myself? The word of God must settle the question.

Now let us take up the case of Abraham, and see how he was justified—how he obtained remission of sins. Paul expressly states that Abraham was justified by faith without works. Rom. iv. 5: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Not his works but his faith that admits him into the favor of God, and it is counted unto him for righteousness. Thus I proved that Abraham was justified or pardoned by faith alone, without works. Now what did my opponent say in reply to this? He said Paul was here speaking of the works of the law! How could Abraham perform the works of the law, when the law was not in existence until four centuries after this? This only shows the straits into which the gentleman has fallen. Paul tells us in Ephesians ii. 8—10:

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.

"Not of works, lest any man should boast.

"For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

The good works here are not the works of the law, but such as are commanded by the gospel, and this passage shows that works, good works, are not the condition of pardon, but the fruits of it. The sinner is justified by faith, not by works, and afterward he walks in good works. This is the relation works sustain to pardon under the gospel.

But the gentleman quotes the passage in James ii. 21-23

"Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered up Isaac his son upon the altar?

"Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

"And the scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness."

But what was the length of time that elapsed between these two transactions. The one was before Ishmael was born, the other was after Isaac had grown up to manhood. It was perhaps thirty years after "he believed in God, and he counted it to him for righteousness," that he offered up Isaac upon the altar, and thus proved that he was the friend of God by his obedience. God had before declared that he was righteous, and now he was justified by his works, for his works proved that the scripture was true, which had declared that Abraham was a righteous man, and in this sense was the scripture fulfilled; it was shown to be true that Abraham was the friend of God.

The gentleman still contends that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost vouchsafed to Cornelius and his friends were just such as those given to Balaam and Caiaphas. But I showed you that Balaam was a true prophet of God, and enjoyed this high privilege until after he uttered the sublime prophecies on the heights of Moab, concerning Israel's future glory. He said to the messengers of Balak: "If Balak would give me a house full of gold, I can not go beyond the word of the Lord, to do either good or bad. What he saith that will I speak." After he had uttered his prophecies concerning Israel, he was tempted by Balak's gold, and he fell from his steadfastness, and taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before Israel. And he is held up in the New Testament scriptures as a fearful warning against apostasy.

Now, if we take up the case of Caiaphas, I have this reply to make: That God often overrules the words and purposes of bad men for his own glory. If there were any inspiration in Caiaphas at the time of his uttering that prophetic language, it was one of those exceptional cases that sometimes occur in official characters like him. But whether he spoke by the Holy Spirit, or was under the control and direction of the Holy Spirit or not, can not be brought forward to illustrate the reception of the Holy Spirit by believers under the gospel. The cases are not analogous, and it is little, if any thing short of blasphemy, to attempt to explain the one by the other. Under the gospel the possession of the supernatural gifts of the Holy Ghost was the evidence that the Holy Ghost, in his regenerating power, had been received. This was Peter's view of the case before us, as I have already showed. With these remarks, I will proceed to a brief review of the argument presented on this proposition.

My opponent started out with the proposition, that in the creation man was placed under moral, physical, and positive law. That the object of the positive law was to test man's obedience; that man fell by the transgression of positive law; and that he must return to God through obedience to positive law; that the fall was consummated by progressive steps, and that the return must also be consummated by progressive steps. You remember the various steps that he said were

necessary to consummate guilt in the fall. 1. There was the preaching of the falsehood. 2. There was the hearing of the falsehood. 3. There was the desire to eat the forbidden fruit. 4. There was the determination to commit the act. 5. There was the overt act of transgression. 6. There was guilt, or condemnation. He said the overt act was necessary in order to consummate guilt. I showed you, however, that the whole principle upon which his argument was based was false. I showed, by the express declaration of the Saviour, that the law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart, and that guilt can be consummated without an overt act of transgression; and that guilt is consummated when the determination to transgress is reached. Jesus says: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." And John says: "He that hateth his brother is a murderer." So a man may be guilty, before God, of adultery and murder, and yet never commit the overt acts.

It does not matter what the various steps were by which man fell; for it is certain that when the determination of will to transgress was reached, guilt was consummated in the eye of the divine law. I pressed this upon him until he admitted that man could have fallen by the transgression of moral law; and that his return to God might be consummated by obedience to moral law, if God had so arranged it in the economy of grace. This admission set aside his whole argument, and showed that obedience to a positive law is not necessary to consummate the sinner's return to God, unless God has so specially ordained it. This brought us back to the question, "Does God, in the economy of grace, require obedience to a positive law as a test of man's loyalty, in order to the sinner's obtaining pardon, or does he not?" Is there some special overt act of obedience to be performed before the sinner's return can be consummated? This is a question that must be decided by the word of God.

The gentleman then enumerated the steps of the sinner's return. He said these were: 1. Hearing. 2. Believing, or faith. 3. Repentance. 4. Confession. 5. Obedience, or baptism. 6. Salvation, or the remission of sins. I showed you, however, that the steps of the sinner's return to God were: 1. Hearing. 2. Believing, in the sense of assent to the truth preached. 3. Repentance. 4. Faith, in the sense of trust or confidence, and 5. Salvation, or the remission of sins. This is the gospel order of the sinner's return to God.

The gentleman's second argument was, that this arrangement is in exact accordance with the mental constitution of man. But in reply to this, I showed that the law of God is spiritual in its requirements—that it takes hold of man's intellectual and spiritual nature, and that consequently the mental constitution of man requires that the various steps of the sinner's return should be mental and spiritual, not external and physical; that as sin is consummated by the determination of the will, so should the return to God be consummated by the submission of the will to God, and the trust of the heart in the atoning merits of Christ. So I showed that his position is opposed to the mental constitution of man.



His third argument was, that his position is in exact accordance with man's new birth. John iii. 3-5, etc. In reply to this, I showed conclusively that, as water was the standing symbol of the Spirit under the law, and cleansing with water was the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing, that the water is here introduced simply as an illustration to show to Nicodemus the necessity of spiritual cleansing; and that there is no literal birth of water embraced in the passage at all. I showed the absurdity and impossibility of the cleansing with water, which was the type of spiritual cleansing under the law, becoming the antitype of itself, the real spiritual cleansing under the gospel. Here the argument was conclusive.

His fourth argument was, that his position was in exact accordance with the express teaching of the Holy Scriptures. His first scriptural proof was Mark i. 4, 5: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins;" and the parallel passage, Luke iii. 3. But I showed that John's baptism was not the baptism of remission, but the baptism of repentance. Then he undertook to translate *metanoian*, reformation; but I showed that the primary and proper meaning of *metanoian* is repentance, or a change of mind, and not reformation, or a change of life; and he has contended all the while that words are to be taken in their primary and proper meaning. Thus I proved his position false by his own rule of interpretation, and here he let the matter rest.

My second reply to this was, that John remitted the sins of no man; but that he preached something for the remission of sins. He proclaimed how sins were to be remitted. He taught the people that they were to believe on Christ in order to obtain remission of sins. It was prophesied of John by his father, at the time of his circumcision, that he "should go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give the knowledge of salvation unto his people by (or through) the remission of their sins." John came as the harbinger of the Saviour, calling on the people to repent, and baptizing them as a sign, or profession of repentance, and proclaiming remission of sins through faith in his name: "Saying unto the people that they should believe on him that was to come; that is, on Christ Jesus."

I then asked my opponent if there are two baptisms in the New Testament for the remission of sins? I then showed that the same persons whom John baptized were baptized by the apostles; and if John's was the baptism of remission, and Christian baptism is for the remission of sins, then we have the same persons baptized twice for the remission of sins!! But this is contrary to the gentleman's teaching and practice. But he said we have no account of any persons whom John baptized being baptized by the apostles, except the twelve in Acts xix. 1-7; and these, he said, were baptized again that they might receive the Holy Ghost!! Such a reply I should have been ashamed to make. I showed that these persons did not receive the Holy Ghost by baptism, but by the laying on of the apostles' hands after they had been baptized. But I asked if these must be baptized in order that they might receive the Holy Ghost, why was it not necessary that all

those whom John baptized should not be baptized again in order that they might receive the Holy Ghost? I asked him if a man could get into the church of Christ without Christian baptism? In reply to this, he said those persons John baptized came into the church just like the one hundred and twenty disciples spoken of in Acts i. 15. But did not these come into the church by baptism? The apostles baptized all the Jews who received Christ during his personal ministry, as you will see, John iii. 22 and iv. 1, 2. Here his answer was a total failure. The New Testament does not teach that the same person must be baptized twice for the remission of sins, my opponent being judge; and yet everywhere in the New Testament, both before and after the ascension of Christ, the apostles are represented as baptizing every person who received Christ as the Messiah, whether they had been baptized by John or not. This settles the matter forever, and proves that John's baptism was not for the remission of sins.

The gentleman next brought forward the language of Peter, on the day of Pentecost. "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." On this passage, my opponent made something like an argument. "Baptism and repentance," said he, "are connected here by the conjunction *kai*, and what is affirmed of one, is also affirmed of the other." My reply to this was, that water is the standing symbol of the Spirit throughout the scriptures, of both the Old and New Testaments, and that consequently cleansing by water is the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing throughout every dispensation of the church. This my opponent has not denied, and he knows he dare not deny it. This being the case, it is not necessary that we should understand repentance and baptism, both to sustain the same relation to pardon in this passage, although they are connected by the copulative conjunction *kai*, for there is a rule of interpretation which must never be lost sight of in investigating the word of God, which is:—"That is often affirmed of the type or symbol, which is only true of the antitype, or the thing symbolized." This plain rule sets aside his whole argument. My second position, in reply to his argument on this passage, was, "That the preposition *eis*, here rendered for, primarily and ordinarily means 'into,' and should have been so translated in this passage." I showed, that "to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, into the remission of sins," was not "to be baptized in order to remission of sins," but that it signifies "to be baptized into the faith that remission of sins comes only in the name of Jesus Christ"—the name of Christ, here as elsewhere, stands for his sacrificial death—his atoning merit. You remember how the gentleman tried to evade the force of my argument here, by stating that "to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, into the remission of sins," was to be baptized into a state or condition, in which remission of sins could be enjoyed. But I showed from parallel passages the utter futility of his interpretation. I showed that to be "baptized *eis* (into) the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," was not to be "baptized into a state or condition where we can wear the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," but it is to "be baptized into the profession of faith in, and obedience to, the Father, Son, and

Holy Ghost." To be "baptized *eis* (into) Moses," I showed did not signify to be "baptized into a state or condition, where the people could wear the name of Moses," but a profession of faith in the doctrines which Moses taught, and obedience to the laws which he enjoined. So, to be "baptized *eis* (into) repentance," does not mean in order to repentance, but a profession of repentance. To be "baptized *eis* (into) the name of Paul," does not mean to be "baptized into a state or condition, where we can wear the name of Paul," but it signifies a profession of obedience to Paul, instead of Christ. So then, to "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, *eis* (into) remission of sins," does not mean "in order to remission of sins," but a profession of the faith that remission of sins comes only in the name—the vicarious sufferings of Christ. This closed the argument on that point, and I think conclusively.

After having shown that this is the only correct interpretation of this passage, I went one step further, and showed that this interpretation was absolutely demanded by parallel passages, and by the general teaching of God's word, which puts faith in Christ everywhere, as the only condition of remission to the penitent sinner.

I showed that Peter himself expressly declares that baptism does not save us by putting away our sins, but that it does save us by answering to that work. That is, baptism is not the condition, but the symbol of remission of sins, and spiritual cleansing. This I showed incontrovertibly is what Peter affirms. 1 Peter iii. 21. Peter here declares that baptism does not make the conscience good, does not give the good conscience, but answers to that work, which has been accomplished through faith in a risen Saviour. The interpretation of this passage given by my opponent is, that baptism is the condition of a good conscience, and consequently it, as Campbell says, "purifies the conscience." But this is a flat contradiction of the word of God. This argument I consider wholly conclusive, and it uproots the whole system of my opponent, for it is an express thus saith the Lord, that "baptism does not put away sin."

I then took up the case of Cornelius and his friends, to show that Peter taught that remission of sins comes through simple faith in Christ, without baptism. But here the gentleman met me with the statement:—"That sins are forgiven only in baptism, that we are admitted into the kingdom of heaven by baptism, and that there can be no spiritual life enjoyed before baptism, for baptism brings us into Christ, and we can not have the spirit of Christ until we are in him." In reply to this position, I stated, that if I could show from the scriptures that persons had enjoyed spiritual life, and had their sins pardoned before baptism, I would thus tear up his whole system by the roots. Then I took up the case of Cornelius and his friends, and showed that the angel of the Lord had told him to "send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter. He lodgeth with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by the sea-side; he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do," Acts x. 5, 6. Peter's version of it is: "Send me to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Cornelius and his friends were therefore ready to

receive the message from God, which Peter brought, and to do whatever Peter commanded. There was nothing wanting but the enunciation of the law of pardon. When Peter came into Cornelius' house, after giving him an account of the vision he had seen four days before, he said:—"Now, therefore, are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God. Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." In making this declaration, Peter gives us the strongest assurance possible, that he was fully convinced that God had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles. He then commenced preaching Christ unto them, and when he came to this remarkable sentence:—"To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," the Holy Ghost fell upon them, and they were saved. The miraculous gift of tongues, accompanying this outpouring of the Holy Spirit, convinced Peter, and those who accompanied him from Joppa, that God had received them. See Acts x. 45-47, and xi. 15-18. Here Cornelius and his friends received the Holy Ghost, enjoyed spiritual life, and obtained remission of sins before one word had been spoken about baptism. Peter, in telling Cornelius "what he ought to do," never mentioned baptism, until he and his friends were saved! He did, however, lay down the law of pardon, and the moment this was announced in the language, "to him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," Cornelius and his friends accepted the terms, laid hold on Christ by faith, and were saved. The gentleman told us, however, that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit were conferred upon Cornelius and his friends to convince Peter that God was willing to receive them!! But he knows that Peter had been convinced of this by miracle, before he uttered one sentence of his sermon.

Then my opponent undertook to show that unconverted persons had received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and that Cornelius and his friends were still unconverted, and had only received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, like King Saul and Caiaphas. But I showed -that the cases were not analogous at all, and that the one could not illustrate the other. I showed also that Cornelius and his friends received not only the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, but that they received the Holy Ghost himself, in his renewing and sanctifying power, and that after this Peter baptized him, and that this was the ordinary practice of the apostles. My opponent also brought up Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," and contended that being saved here, meant remission of sins, and that both faith and baptism are conditions of remission. But I showed that being saved in this passage does not mean remission of sins, but final salvation in heaven. Salvation stands in antithesis to damnation, and if one relates to time, so must the other. But they are both future, and refer to the eternal state. I showed also, that as baptism is the door of entrance into the visible church of Christ, it here stands

as the synonym of Christian obedience, and the passage means: "He that believeth, and afterward leads a life of obedience to God's commandments, shall be saved." The passage itself proves that this is its meaning.

Then he brought up the passage in Acts xxii. 16: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." But I proved by Alexander Campbell himself, that "Paul's sins were really washed away when he believed and only formally washed away when he was baptized." This is precisely the position I have taken during this discussion, and here Mr. Campbell deserts my opponent, and comes over to my side of the question. So all those passages in the New Testament, which speak of the believer, or the church, being "washed or cleansed with the washing of water by the word," etc., must be understood in the same way. "The blood of Christ really washes away sin, the water of baptism only formally washes away sin," as Mr. Campbell declares, and while I have abundantly established the symbolical character of baptism, by this means I have answered every argument he can bring from any of those passages.

I might have asked the gentleman, where does the Bible ever place baptism among the evidences of pardon? I answer, nowhere. On another proposition I will bring up the evidences of pardon, and show that baptism is never mentioned among them.

Finally the gentleman brought up the passage in Romans vi. 17:

"But ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you."

Here he contended that there was a certain form or type of doctrine delivered, which form or type must be obeyed. This argument is usually presented by the gentleman's brethren thus:

"The doctrine is, Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures, was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the scriptures, and the form or type of this doctrine is being buried in, and raised up out of the water."

But the immersion of a man under water is not the form or type of Christ's death upon the cross, and his burial in Joseph's new tomb. I showed you also that there was no such form or type taught in this passage. I showed that the word here translated "form" means "rule or system" of doctrine, and that the Roman Christians had obeyed the rule of doctrine delivered to them, and had been made free by it. I showed also that this form or rule of doctrine teaches everywhere that the sinner is justified the moment his heart lays hold of Christ by faith, as his Saviour and Redeemer; just as Abraham believed in God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.

I have now gone through with the argument on this proposition, and the question is submitted to you to decide in your own minds, in view of your responsibility to God. I have proved, I think, conclusively, both from reason and the word of God, that Christian baptism is not a condition of the remission of sins. The gentleman has not been able to prove his proposition by the word of God, for there is no support for it in God's book.

I showed you that Mr. Campbell claimed only six passages in the

New Testament to have any direct reference to baptism for the remission of sins, and only ten which speak of baptism in any connection with spiritual rights and privileges in the kingdom of heaven. Three of his six direct passages refer to John's baptism, which I have demonstrably proved was not for the remission of sins. One of the remaining three is Ephesians iv. 5, which has no reference whatever to remission of sins. Another one of them, which is the language addressed to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins;" which I showed Mr. Campbell himself says was only "a formal, not a real" washing away of sins. So the only passage left is Acts ii. 38, and I have proved beyond the possibility of successful contradiction, that this passage does not teach his doctrine. Thus I have shown clearly that there is no foundation for his doctrine in the word of God. Yet my opponent holds and teaches that unless a man is baptized, that is immersed, he has no spiritual life, and is still out of Christ, it matters not what evidences of spiritual life he may give.

The consequences of such a doctrine to him that teaches it are fearful! He that tortures the word of God into a seeming support of such a fatal error, until he leads simple souls astray from Christ, will have an awful account to render to the final Judge! I would not stand in his place for ten thousand such worlds as this. He is teaching men to rely on that for remission of sins which God Almighty has not taught them to rely on. I do not intend to wind up my speech with an exhortation, as my opponent has done, but I want to impress upon your minds the importance of the proposition before us; and also the fact that the gentleman has utterly failed to establish his proposition, that Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins. He has done his best, and has made as strong an argument in support of his proposition as can be made. My opponent is no stripling of a David, he claims to be a real Goliath, and was much offended at the intimation "that he was not equal to Elder Hughey in learning, ability, and gentlemanly deportment!" But this modern Goliath has failed to find anywhere in God's word that remission of sins can be obtained only in submission to Christian baptism.

I beseech you, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the account you will have to give in the last day, rest not your souls upon such a fallacious hope as this, for I tell you unless your sins are washed away through faith in the blood of Christ, and the seal of pardon is placed upon your hearts, you will be undone, world without end.—[*Time expired.*]

*Mr. Braden*—The question of veracity having arisen, I wish to obtain Wesley's Notes and Watson's Institutes.

*Mr. Hughey*—I presume the gentleman can get them in town.

# QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.





## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Before the commencement of Mr. Hughey's speech, Mr. Braden rose to a question of privilege, and said:

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—There was a question of veracity raised in regard to a statement that I made last evening, which I would like to have settled before we proceed to the discussion of this proposition. I wish to read without remark certain passages to prove the position which I assumed and to have them go upon the record.

*Mr. Hughey*—I will not agree to the proposition to make no remarks on what is read from Mr. Wesley. The gentleman has made the statement that if Mr. Wesley and the fathers of Methodism were to arise from the dead, they would repudiate my doctrine; and when he reads from them I shall claim the right to give the proper explanation of their language. The only question now between us is: Did Mr. Wesley and the fathers of Methodism hold and teach that baptism is a condition of pardon? This Mr. Braden has affirmed, and I deny that any of them ever held any such sentiments.

*Mr. Braden*—I wish to submit the following statements as the substance of what I said last evening:

John Wesley taught baptism for the remission of sins more strongly than Alexander Campbell ever did—he "out-Campbelled" Campbell.

The fathers of Methodism also taught the same doctrine, and were Wesley and these fathers here they would repudiate the teachings of my opponent.' Is not this what I said?

*Mr. Hughey*—Yes, sir.

*Mr. Braden*—There is a question of fact here, which has arisen during this discussion, and I propose to read the passages upon which I base that question of fact, and let it rest there.

*Mr. Hughey*—I shall most assuredly explain the views of Mr. Wesley on this subject.

*Mr. Braden*—I propose that you make no comments, and I will make none.

*Mr. Hughey*—I will not agree to make no comments. I want to show the proper meaning of the passages from Mr. Wesley, and what were his real views.

*Mr. Braden*—I have the affirmative here, and if I make no comments, I do not see how the gentleman can make any.

*The Moderator* (Mr. Kuykendall)—That is a matter for the gentlemen to settle between themselves.

*Mr. Braden*—I think the proposition I made is a perfectly fair one, and perfectly in accordance with the rules of order, that I should

read my testimony, that Mr. Hughey should read his, and then that the matter in discussion should be submitted to the audience, who can discuss and settle it for themselves. It is simply a question of fact, and all that is necessary is the testimony.

*Mr. Hughey*—I am agreed so far to the proposition, that I will submit the testimony without comment any further than to give an explanation of Mr. Wesley's views; and show the meaning Mr. Wesley put upon his own language. This is all I propose to do.

*Mr. Braden*—I will put no interpretation upon Mr. Wesley's words, but simply read them.

*Mr. Hughey*—Proceed to read and I will see what I will do. Mr. Wesley, I know, states that "baptism is both a means and a seal of pardon, and that in the primitive church they usually went together." But Mr. Wesley never taught that baptism was a condition of pardon. He held that it "is an outward sign of an inward and spiritual grace."

*Mr. Braden*—As my friend has got in his explanation out of order, and in an ungentlemanly manner, I suppose that I can now read without comment. Will he now submit the proposition?

*Mr. Hughey*—If you will take out the word "ungentlemanly."

*Mr. Braden*—I will use unparliamentary instead, although as I take it, what is unparliamentary can not be gentlemanly. I will now submit my testimony. I ask you to remember that I said that Wesley taught baptism for remission of sins more strongly than Alexander Campbell. I did not say that he used the words baptism is a condition of pardon, or ever formally stated that proposition, but that he taught that baptism was for the remission of sins. He went beyond Campbell in this, for Bro. Campbell held that it was for remission of sins to penitent believers alone. Mr. Wesley held that it was for remission of sins to infants which Campbell never did.

Remember also that Wesley makes a distinction between justification and pardon. Pardon he regards as removing the guilt and remitting the penalty of sin. Justification as the act of God in regarding and treating the pardoned sinner, as just or justified by the blood of Christ. Baptism he regards as for the remission of sins and the justification of the pardoned person depending on faith alone. What Wesley says on justification will not be german to the question.

I will now read from Wesley's Notes, what he says concerning the new birth. John iii. 5:

"Except a man be born of water and the Spirit.

"Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized, (wherever baptism can be had), as the outward sign and means of it."

I will next read from his comment upon the conversion of the household of Cornelius, and the words, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?"

"He does not say they have the baptism of the Spirit: therefore they do not need baptism with water. But just the contrary; if they have received the Spirit, then baptize them with water.

"How easily is the question decided, if we will take the word of God for our rule. Either men have received the Holy Ghost or they

have not. If they have not, Repent, saith God, and be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. If they have, if they are already baptized with the Holy Ghost, then who can forbid water?"

We will refer next to the account of Paul's conversion. Acts xxii. 16, where this language is used. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Mr. Wesley says:

"Baptism administered to the real penitent is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God in the primitive church ordinarily bestow this on any, unless through this means."

Again we will read to you his comment upon Romans vi. 1:

"As many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have been baptized into his death.

"In baptism we, through faith, are ingrafted into Christ, and we draw new spiritual life from this new root, through his Spirit, who fashions us like unto him, and particularly with regard to his death and resurrection.

"We are buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion; that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory—glorious power—of the Father, so we also by the same power should rise again; and as he lives a new life in heaven, so we should walk in newness of life. This, says the apostle, our very baptism represents to us."

In regard to Galatians ii. 27, he says:

"For as many of you as have testified your faith, by being baptized in the name of Christ, have put on Christ. Have received him as your righteousness, and are therefore sons of God through him."

In regard to 1 Peter iv. 21, he says:

"The antitype whereof the thing typified by the ark, even baptism, now saveth us; that is, through the water of baptism we are saved from the sin which overwhelms the world as a flood; not indeed the bare outward sign, but the inward grace; a divine consciousness, that both our persons and our actions are accepted, through him, who died and rose again."

I will now read from Wesley's works, v. 9, p. 157, in his "Treatise on Baptism."

[This extract we can not find. The reader will look for it in the Appendix, page 1, marked "A," where it will be printed if supplied to us.—PRINTER.]

I will now read from "Doctrinal Tracts," a book published and approved by the Methodist Book Committee for some twenty-five years. I read from Wesley's Essay on Baptism.

"1. What are the benefits we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is, the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death. That we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin, and that all sin deserves eternal misery, was the unanimous sense of the ancient church, as it is expressed in the Ninth Article of our own.

"But 'as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life.' And the virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death are applied to us in baptism. 'He

gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word;' Eph. v. 25, 26, namely, in baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this, our church prays in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be 'washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of this heavenly washing;' and declares in the rubric at the end of the office, 'It is certain, by God's word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved.' And this is agreeable to the unanimous judgment of all the ancient fathers.

"2. By baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that everlasting covenant, which he hath commanded forever; Psalm cxi. 9; that new covenant which he promised to make with the spiritual Israel; even to 'give them a new heart and a new spirit, to sprinkle clean water upon them' (of which the baptismal is only a figure), 'and to remember their sins and iniquities no more;' in a word, to be their God, as he promised to Abraham, in the evangelical covenant which he made with him and all his spiritual offspring. Gen. xxii. 7, 8. And as circumcision was then the way of entering into this covenant, so baptism is now; which is therefore styled by the Apostle (so many good interpreters render his words), 'the stipulation, contract, or covenant of a good conscience with God.'

"3. By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ its head. The Jews were admitted into the church by circumcision, so are the Christians by baptism. For 'as many as are baptized into Christ,' in his name, 'have' thereby 'put on Christ;' Gal. iii. 27; that is, are mystically united to Christ and made one with him. For 'by one Spirit we are baptized into one body;' 1 Cor. xii. 13, namely, the church, 'the body of Christ.' Eph. iv. 42. From which spiritual, vital union with him, proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized; as from our union with the church, a share in all its privileges, and in all the promises Christ has made to it.

"4. By baptism, we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.' This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.' John iii. 5. By water then, as a means, the waters of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the apostle, 'the washing of regeneration.' Our church therefore ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long continued wickedness.

" 5. In consequence of our being made children of God, we are

heirs of the kingdom of heaven. 'If children' (as the apostle observes), 'then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.' Herein we receive a title to, and an earnest of 'a kingdom which can not be moved.' Baptism doth now save us, if we live answerable thereto; if we repent, believe, and obey the gospel: supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, so into glory hereafter."

I will now read from Benson, also a standard Methodist authority, what he says on Acts xxii. 16. I need not, however, as he gives *verbatim*, Mr. Wesley's remarks making it a means of pardon or a means of obtaining pardon.

I might read also from Watson, and a score of others of the fathers of Methodism. I should have prepared myself to do so had I supposed that my opponent would have had the temerity to deny my statement.

I submit now, that I have proved that Wesley teaches baptism for remission of sins, when he says it is a means of our obtaining remission of sins, and that he goes beyond Campbell, for he makes it a means of pardon to infants, which Campbell never did. Should the gentleman read anything contradictory, thus he merely makes Wesley contradict himself.

*Mr. Hughey*—I will also read some passages from Mr. Wesley's works, in order to show what his opinion was in regard to the design of baptism; whether it is a condition of pardon or not. This is the only question between us. We are not discussing the question whether Mr. Wesley held that baptism is a means, but did he hold that it is a condition of pardon. I will read first from Wesley's Sermon on the New Birth. Wesley's Sermons, v. i. pp. 404, 405:

"IV. I proposed in the last place to subjoin a few inferences, which naturally follow from the preceding observations.

"1. And, first, it follows that baptism is not the new birth; they are not one and the same thing. Many, indeed, seem to imagine that they are just the same; at least they speak as if they thought so; but I do not know that this opinion is publicly avowed by any denomination of Christians whatever. Certainly it is not by any within these kingdoms, whether of the established church, or dissenting from it. The judgment of the latter is clearly declared in their large catechism:

"Q. What are the parts of a sacrament?

"A. The parts of a sacrament are two: the one, an outward and sensible sign; the other, an inward and spiritual grace, thereby signified.

"Q. What is baptism?

"A. Baptism is a sacrament wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water, to be a sign and seal of regeneration by his Spirit.'

"Here it is manifest, baptism, the sign, is spoken of as distinct from regeneration, the thing signified.

"In the church catechism likewise, the judgment of our church is declared with the utmost clearness:

"Q. What meanest thou by this word sacrament?

"A. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.

"Q. What is the outward part, or form, in baptism?

"A. Water, wherein the person is baptized, in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

"Q. What is the inward part, or thing, signified?

"A. A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness.'

"Nothing, therefore, is plainer than that according to the Church of England, baptism is not the new birth.

"But, indeed, the reason of the thing is so clear and evident, as not to need any other authority. For what can be more plain, than that the one is an external, the other is an internal work; that the one is a visible, the other an invisible thing, and therefore wholly different from each other; the one being an act of man purifying the body: the other a change wrought by God in the soul; so that the former is just as distinguishable from the latter, as the soul from the body, or water from the Holy Ghost.

"From the preceding reflections we may, secondly, observe that as the new birth is not the same thing with baptism, so it does not always accompany baptism; they do not constantly go together. A man may possibly be 'born of water,' and yet not be 'born of the Spirit.' There may sometimes be the outward sign, where there is not the inward grace. I do not now speak with regard to infants; it is certain our church (the Church of England) supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy, are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants (the office, or ritual, of the Church of England) proceeds upon this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we can not comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in persons of riper years. But whatever be the case with infants, it is sure all of riper years, who are baptized, are not at the same time born again. 'The tree is known by its fruits;' and hereby it appears too plain to be denied, that divers of those, who were the children of the devil before they were baptized, continue the same after baptism, 'for the works of their father they do;' they continue servants of sin, without any pretense either to inward or outward holiness."

Now you will remember what I said in regard to Mr. Wesley's views on the regeneration of infants. Mr. Wesley took the ground that the Church of England took, that infants were regenerated by baptism; that it washed away original sin in the case of infants as my opponent read. But this is not the question at issue. (To Mr. Braden) I was not commenting, but simply making a statement in order to get the views of Mr. Wesley fairly before the audience.

I will now read without comment from Mr. Wesley's Sermon on "Justification by Faith," where he lays down the conditions of pardon fully, and at length.

"IV. 1. But upon what terms then is he justified, who is altogether ungodly, and till that time worketh not? On one alone, which is faith: he 'believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly.' And 'he

that believeth is not condemned;' yea, he is 'passed from death unto life.'

"2. Faith in general is a divine, supernatural *eleichos*, evidence, or conviction, 'of things not seen,' not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine evidence or conviction that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,' but a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for my sins, that he loved me, and gave himself for me. And at what time soever a sinner thus believes, be it in early childhood, in the strength of his years, or when he is old and hoary-haired, God justifieth that ungodly one; God for the sake of his Son, pardoneth and absolveth him, who had in him, till then, no good thing.

"Repentance, indeed, God had given him before; but that repentance was neither more nor less than a deep sense of the want of all good, and the presence of all evil. And whatever good he hath or doeth from that hour, when he first believes in God through Christ, faith does not find, but brings. This is the first of faith. First the tree is good, and then the fruit is good also.

"3. I can not describe the nature of this faith better, than in the words of our own church:

"'The only instrument of salvation' (whereof justification is one branch) 'is faith; that is, a sure trust and confidence that God both hath, and will forgive our sins, that he hath accepted us again into his favor, for the merits of Christ's death and passion. But here we must take heed that we do not halt with God through an inconstant, wavering faith. Peter coming to Christ upon the water, because he fainted in faith, was in danger of drowning. So we, if we begin to waver or doubt, it is to be feared that we shall sink as Peter did, not into the water, but into the bottomless pit of hell-fire.'—Second Sermon on the Passion.

"'Therefore, have a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available for all the world, but that he hath made a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou mayest say with the apostle, he loved thee, and gave himself for thee. For this is to make Christ thine own, and to apply his merits unto thyself.'—Sermon on the Sacrament, first part.

"4. By affirming that this faith is the term or condition of justification, I mean first that there is no justification without it. 'He that believeth not, is condemned already,' and so long as he believeth not, that condemnation can not be removed, but 'the wrath of God abideth on him.'

"As 'there is no other name given under heaven,' than that of Jesus of Nazareth, no other merit whereby a condemned sinner can ever be saved from the guilt of sin; so there is no other way of obtaining a share in his merit, than by faith in his name.

\* \* \* \* \*

"5. Faith, therefore, is the necessary condition of justification. Yea, and the only necessary condition thereof. This is the second point carefully to be observed; that the very moment God giveth

faith, for it is the gift of God, to the 'ungodly,' that 'worketh not,' that 'faith is counted to him for righteousness.' He has no righteousness at all, antecedent to this, not so much as negative righteousness, or innocence. But faith is imputed to him for righteousness the very moment that he believeth. Not that God, as was observed before, thinketh him to be what he is not. But as 'he made Christ to be sin for us;' that is, treating him as a sinner, punishing him for our sins, so he counteth us righteous, from the time we believe in him; that is, he doth not punish us for our sins, yea, treats us as though we were guiltless and righteous.

"6. Surely the difficulty of assenting to the proposition, that faith is the only condition of justification must arise from not understanding it. We mean thereby thus much, that it is the only thing, without which no one is justified; the only thing that is immediately indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As on the one hand, though a man should have everything else without faith, yet he can not be justified; so on the other, though he be supposed to want everything else, yet if he hath faith he can not but be justified. For suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his utter inability to think, speak, or do good, and his absolute meetness for hell-fire; suppose, I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts "himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ, which, indeed, he can not do but by the grace of God, who can doubt but he is forgiven in that moment? Who will affirm that any more is indispensably required, before that sinner can be justified?"

"Now, if there ever were one such instance from the beginning of the world; and have there not been, and are there not ten thousand times ten thousand, it plainly follows, that faith is, in the above sense, *the* sole condition of justification."—Wesley's Sermons, v. i. pp. 49, 50, 51.

Here are Mr. Wesley's views in regard to the conditions of pardon, clearly set forth. I have not had time to examine Benson, but I know that he occupies precisely the same position as Mr. Wesley, and all the fathers of Methodism.

The gentleman has referred to "Watson's Institutes." As I have not the "Institutes" at hand, I will read a passage from "Watson's Dictionary" to show that he teaches no such doctrine as baptism for remission of sins.

*Mr. Braden*—I object. Watson has not been brought forward this morning.

The objection was sustained.



# SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.



# SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

---

## PROPOSITION' FOR DISCUSSIONS

*Infants are Scriptural Subjects of Christian Baptism.* MR. HUGHEY.  
affirms.

### MR. HUGHEY'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I arise before you this morning to open the discussion on the proposition: "Infants are Scriptural Subjects of Christian Baptism." We have discussed the "Mode of Baptism," we have discussed the "Design of Baptism," and we now proceed to inquire who are the proper subjects of Christian baptism. I affirm that "Infants are Scriptural Subjects of Christian Baptism;" my opponent denies this and affirms that believers only are scriptural subjects of Christian baptism.

By the term infants, I do not mean infants in the legal state—I do not mean a minor. But I mean by the term infant, an infant proper, one who has not come to the years of accountability, and consequently one who is incapable of exercising "repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." I presume this definition of the term is satisfactory to my opponent. I affirm, then, that not only are believers proper and scriptural objects of Christian baptism, but that infant children, who have never transgressed God's law by any positive act of disobedience, stand in a justified relation to God, and are entitled to stand in that relation in his church—to the household of faith.

The position occupied by our church on the question of infant baptism, is not that which is occupied by many Pedobaptist churches, which predicate the right of the child to baptism, on the ground of the relation of the parents to the church, and who consequently only baptize the children of one or both believing parents. We do not predicate the right of infants to baptism upon the relation their parents sustain to Christ or to his church; but we predicate it upon the relation the infant itself sustains to Christ, in the economy of the gospel. We do not practice infant baptism because we believe it washes away the pollution of original sin. But we predicate the right of infants to this ordinance on the fact that they belong to Jesus Christ—that he died for them—that they are interested in his atoning merits, and stand in a gracious relation to him in the covenant of grace.

This is the ground upon which our church predicates the right of infants to baptism. I will read you from our "Discipline" a specific

statement of our views, in order that you may properly understand our position on the right or ground of infant baptism:

The question asked—"Are all young children entitled to baptism?"

Answer—"We hold that all children are, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the atonement, members of the kingdom of God, and, therefore, graciously entitled to baptism."—*New Discipline*, p. 39.

There is no mistake here. "All children, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the atonement, members of the kingdom of God, are graciously entitled to baptism," which is an outward recognition of the relations which they already sustained to the kingdom of God, through the atoning merits of Christ.

I remark, in the first place, that there are three ways by which a practice may be proved to be scriptural, either one of which is sufficient to establish the scriptural authority for the practice:

1. If a practice can be shown to be demanded by the genius of Christianity, or to be in accordance with the nature of things under the gospel, it stands justified beyond impeachment. For that which is in accordance with the nature of things rests upon the highest authority, and, therefore, can not be unscriptural.

That which is established by the nature of things does not need any other authority to establish it. If I prove that a thing is in accordance with the nature of things, I have the highest authority that can be adduced to authorize it. So it is in regard to any practice, or in any principle, if it can be shown to agree with the nature of things, the practice or principle stands justified beyond impeachment, and can not be contrary to that with the nature of which it agrees, and the nature of which demands that relation. Therefore, if we can prove that infant baptism is in accordance with the nature of things under the gospel, we establish the practice by the very highest authority under heaven—that which is demanded by the nature of things.

The second way by which a practice may be proven to be scriptural, is by a positive precept from the word of God—a positive "Thus saith the Lord," is an end of controversy. If, therefore, a practice can be shown to be commanded or enjoined by a passage of scripture, fairly interpreted, by sound rules of interpretation, this must be a final end of controversy concerning the scriptural authority for the practice. This is admitted by all who receive the scriptures as the rule of Christian faith.

In the third place, a practice may be shown to be scriptural if it can be shown that the apostles practiced it, for the inspired apostles would not, and could not, practice a thing contrary to the word of God.

Infant baptism stands justified by all these methods of proving a practice scriptural, and by all of these methods we propose to establish our proposition in the present discussion.

My first argument in support of infant baptism I will adduce from the nature of the evangelical covenant, showing that the nature of the covenant of grace demands the relation recognized by infant baptism. If I succeed in establishing this point, the controversy is at

an end; for that which the nature of the covenant of grace demands, can not be contrary to the teachings of the New Testament. This proposition is so plain that any one can understand it. In establishing this position I shall show that when God first visibly established the covenant of grace in the family of Abraham, recorded in Genesis xvii., he put infants into it, or rather recognized them as belonging to it at eight days old; showing that this relation is in accordance with the nature of that covenant, for had it not been, the relation would not have been established when that covenant was made. So if I succeed in establishing this proposition, I prove my first point that infant baptism is demanded by the nature of the covenant of grace.

In developing this argument I shall call your attention, first, to the general promise made to Abraham, recorded in Genesis xii.:

"Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee:

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

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

Here we have the general promise made to Abraham embracing two particulars:

1. It gave Abraham the promise of a numerous posterity—a literal seed. "And I will make of thee a great nation," and an earthly inheritance—the land of Canaan.

2. It gave him the promise of a spiritual seed, and a heavenly inheritance. "And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

Upon this general promise God made two covenants with Abraham; the one with Abraham and his literal seed, recorded in Genesis xv., securing the earthly inheritance; the other with Abraham and his spiritual seed, securing the spiritual promise and heavenly inheritance, recorded in Genesis xvii.

The opponents of infant baptism generally take the ground that the promise in Genesis xii. 1-3, is the spiritual covenant. But there is no covenant transaction recorded in Genesis xii. Here is simply the general promise upon which the covenants were afterward based, and we must not confound this promise with the covenants which were afterward founded upon it.

I wish to call your attention, especially, to the difference between a promise and a covenant. A promise is where one party proposes or promises to bestow something on another. A covenant is where two parties mutually bind themselves to each other to the performance of certain conditions or stipulations. Now, in Genesis xii., we find not the first attribute of a covenant, but simply of a promise. Now if you will turn to Genesis xv. you will there find where God made a covenant with Abraham and his literal seed, through the line of Isaac and Jacob, securing to them the literal inheritance. I will now read from Genesis xv., beginning with the seventh verse:

"7. And he said unto him, I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.

"8. And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?

"9. And he said unto him, Take me a heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle-dove and a young pigeon.

"10. And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another: but the birds divided he not.

"11. And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away.

"12. And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram: and lo, a horror of great darkness fell upon him.

"13. And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years;

"14. And also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.

"15. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age.

"16. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.

"17. And it came to pass that when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces.

"18. In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates:

"19. The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites,

"20. And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims,

"21. And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites."

Here we have a covenant plain and positive—a covenant made by sacrifice—a covenant ratified according to the usual method of ratifying covenants in ancient times, which was by sacrifice. An animal was slain and cleft asunder from the point of the nose to the tip of the tail, along the spinal column, and laid one piece opposite the other, and the contracting parties passed between those pieces. This was the ratification of the covenant, and it imported that the party who proved recreant to his covenant obligation should be cleft asunder, as the animal had been. In this way covenants were ratified by all nations in ancient times, and my opponent will not call this statement in question.

Here is a covenant ratified between two parties. Who are the parties? There was the burning lamp and the smoking furnace which passed between the cloven sacrifice. The smoking furnace represented Israel in Egyptian bondage. The burning lamp represents Jehovah. Here is the temporal covenant made with Abraham, securing to his literal seed the earthly inheritance. God said expressly to him, "unto thy seed," not will I give this land, but "have I given this land." Here we have the temporal inheritance embraced in the original promise secured by covenant. There can be no possible mistake here,

for the metes and bounds of the earthly inheritance are laid out, and it is signed and delivered by the Almighty in the usual manner of ratifying a covenant in ancient times. All that is necessary to secure the blessings of a covenant, when once properly ratified, is for both parties to remain faithful to their covenant obligations. In this case, we know that both parties were faithful to their covenant engagements. Abraham did not forfeit the blessing secured by this covenant by any act of his, and we know God is faithful; so there was no abrogation of this covenant; consequently if we find another covenant made by the Almighty with Abraham, it must relate to something else, it must secure some other blessing than that which was secured by this covenant—in short it must be a spiritual and not a temporal covenant. This covenant was sufficient to secure the temporal blessings of the promise, and it was not necessary to have another covenant to secure the same thing. You can not but see and feel the force of this fact. If God made another covenant with Abraham, it must be a covenant securing the spiritual blessings of the promise to him and his spiritual seed.

Now we will turn to the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, and find where God made another covenant with Abraham and his spiritual seed:

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

"2. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly."

Here it is not said "I have made my covenant," but "I will make my covenant," and this is the covenant:

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

"4. As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.

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

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

"7. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

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

"9. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee, in their generations.

"10. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man-child among you shall be circumcised.

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

"12. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among

you, every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed.

"13. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.

"14. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin, is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

Here we have the spiritual covenant made with Abraham and his spiritual seed, through Christ Jesus, meeting its conditions and fulfillment only under the gospel, for it embraces all believers. The covenant of circumcision is proven to be the general covenant of grace in Christ Jesus.

1. From the language of the covenant itself. Notice the manner in which God speaks of this covenant. He does not call it "a covenant" as he did the former one in the fifteenth chapter; he calls it "my covenant." This is God's covenant in a peculiar sense. The manner in which this covenant is introduced, shows that it was then first unfolded to Abraham. "As for me, behold my covenant with thee." The word "is," is a supplied word, and dropping it out, the passage shows us that God is just unfolding something to Abraham that he was unacquainted with before. "Behold my covenant. I am now unfolding it to you; look at it and consider it." This is evidently the meaning of this verse.

2. The covenant of circumcision is proven to be the general covenant of grace, by the specifications of the covenant.

The first specification of this covenant is: "I will multiply thee exceedingly," and "thou shalt be a father of many nations," "for a father of many nations have I made thee." In allusion to the numerous posterity here secured to Abraham, his name was changed from Abram, a high father, to Abraham, a father of a great multitude. It was the custom in ancient times, when a great event took place in a man's life, or a great change in his relations to society, to take a name importing that change. So when Abraham was constituted the father of all believers by the covenant of circumcision, his name was changed to correspond with that relation.

Paul expressly states that this specification is fulfilled under the gospel, and under the gospel only, by all believers becoming the children of Abraham. I will now read from the fourth chapter of Romans, from the ninth to the seventeenth verse:

"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.

"10. How was it then reckoned? "When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

"11. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:

"12. And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the



circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.

"13. For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

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

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

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

"17. (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were."

Now I want to call your attention especially to this specification. Abraham is here said to be constituted the father of all believers, and all believers are said to be the children of Abraham. But this is not all. Abraham is said to be constituted the father of all believers by circumcision.

Mr. A. Campbell tells us that circumcision was a seal only to Abraham. I admit it. But what was circumcision a seal to Abraham for? What did circumcision seal to him? How was Abraham constituted the father of the faithful—of all believers? "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised." For what end did he receive this seal? "That he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." Then Abraham received the sign of circumcision for the specific purpose of constituting him the father of all believers. Circumcision then sealed Abraham the father of all believers in all ages of the world. This is the express declaration of the word of God.

But there is another point I want to call your attention to here. Not only does this passage declare that Abraham is constituted the father of all believers by circumcision; but it is also expressly stated that he is "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision." Now, here Abraham is not only constituted the father of all believers by circumcision, but he is constituted "the father of circumcision to all believers." Here is a point I do not want you to forget. How was Abraham by circumcision constituted "the father of circumcision" to believers under the gospel? Circumcision does not come down to us. How then was Abraham constituted the father of circumcision to us? Simply because we by faith are put into the covenant of circumcision. That is just how it is done, and in no other way. Yet Abraham, mark you, was constituted "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision," and he was so constituted by the seal of the covenant—circumcision. This demonstrably proves that the covenant of circumcision is the general covenant of grace, into which all believers are gathered in Christ Jesus.

It does not matter by what means we are brought into the covenant, it is the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham, and by which he was constituted the father of all believers; for he is "the father of circumcision" to us "who are not of the circumcision." It was by the seal of the covenant—circumcision—that Abraham was constituted the father of believers, and we are constituted the children of Abraham. It does seem to me that language could not be more explicit and positive, for it is a simple "Thus saith the Lord."

The second specification of this covenant declares that God "will establish his covenant between himself and Abraham, and his seed after him for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto Abraham and his seed after him." This must certainly secure the greatest spiritual blessings which God can bestow or man want. When I have the promise and assurance from God that he will be my God, and the God of my children, it secures not merely temporal good, but the highest spiritual blessings that God has to bestow. And such did God engage himself to Abraham, and to his seed after him. But mark you, the seed of Abraham here secured, and with which this covenant was made, was the spiritual seed, not the natural. The literal seed of Abraham is not brought to view in this covenant at all, but the spiritual seed, which was secured to Abraham by the covenant of circumcision.

The third specification of this covenant is: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." This specification presents us with the promise of the heavenly inheritance to the spiritual seed, which was typically set forth by the earthly Canaan.

This is the only specification that can be understood to have any temporalities in it. In consequence of this language even Pedobaptists have understood that this is but a reiteration of the former covenant, while anti-Pedobaptists have endeavored to prove, because it is here stated that God would give unto them "the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession," that, therefore, it was simply a covenant granting temporal blessings. After much and mature thought and investigation on this subject I have reached the conclusion that this specification has no temporalities in it at all. This, like the two former specifications, contains only the promise of spiritual blessings as I shall show you.

I said that under this specification is presented the heavenly Canaan of which the earthly was the type, for there is nothing more certain than that the earthly Canaan, promised to Abraham and to his posterity, was typical of the heavenly Canaan. I will read to you upon this subject from Fairbairn's *Scripture Typology*, vol. 1, pp. 358, 359, 360:

"But now to apply all this to the subject under consideration—the promised inheritance. If that inheritance was premised in a way, which, from the first, implies a resurrection from the dead before it could be rightly enjoyed; and if all along, even when Canaan was possessed by the seed of Abraham, the man of faith still looked forward to another inheritance, when the curse should be utterly abolished, the

blessing fully received, and death finally swallowed up in victory; then a twofold boon must have been conveyed to Abraham and his seed, under the promise of the land of Canaan; one to be realized in the natural, and the other in the resurrection state. A mingled and temporary good before, and a complete and permanent one after the restitution of all things by the Messiah. So that in regard to the ultimate designs of God, the land of Canaan would serve much the same purpose as the garden of Eden, with its tree of life and cherubims of glory. The same, and yet more: for it not only presented to the eye of faith a type, but also gave in its possession an earnest of the inheritance of a paradisiacal world. The difference, however, is not essential, and only indicates an advance in God's revelations and purposes of grace, making what was ultimately designed for the faithful more sure to them by an installment through a singular train of providential arrangements, in a present inheritance of good."

They thus enjoyed a real and substantial pledge of the better things to come, which were to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Nothing less than this is certainly taught in what is said of the inheritance, as expected by the patriarchs, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And, truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city I Without entering into any minute commentary upon this passage, it can not but be regarded as conclusive upon two points:

"1. That Abraham, and the heirs with him of the same promise, did understand and believe that the inheritance secured to them under the promise of Canaan (for that was the only word spoken to them of an inheritance), was one in which they had a personal interest. And, then—

"2. That the inheritance, as it was to be occupied and enjoyed by them, was to be not a temporary, but a final one—one that might fitly be designated a 'heavenly country,' a city built by divine hands, and based on immovable foundations; in short, the ultimate and proper resting-place for risen and redeemed natures. This was what these holy patriarchs expected and desired, and what they were warranted to expect and desire; for their conduct in this respect is the subject of commendation, and is justified on the special ground that otherwise God must have been ashamed to be called their God. And, finally, it was what they found contained in the promise to them of an inheritance in the land in which they were pilgrims and strangers; for to that promise alone could they look for the special ground of the hopes they cherished of a sure and final possession."

Throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews we have the fact fully set forth that the earthly Canaan was the type of the heavenly inheri-

ance, as the literal seed was a type of the spiritual seed. So the entrance of the literal seed into the earthly inheritance, is made the type of the entrance of the spiritual seed into the heavenly inheritance. Indeed we have evidence of this throughout the scriptures of divine truth.

When God, in this specification, promised unto "Abraham and his seed all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession," it was not the literal, but the spiritual—the heavenly Canaan.

Here I will call the attention of my opponent again to the well-established rule of interpretation, which must never be lost sight of, viz.: "That is often affirmed of the type or symbol, which is only true of the antitype or the thing symbolized, and *vice versa*." Now, keeping this rule in view, there is no difficulty in understanding this specification as referring exclusively to the heavenly inheritance promised to Abraham's spiritual seed, under the type of the earthly Canaan.

In the next place, I remark, this interpretation is absolutely demanded by the connection. It is a fact that the covenant of circumcision was made with Abraham and his spiritual seed. This I have fully proven by showing that by this covenant Abraham was constituted the father of all them that believe. But neither Abraham nor his spiritual seed were ever possessed of the literal Canaan as an inheritance. Where, in all the book of God, can you find a promise of the earthly Canaan to Abraham's spiritual seed? No such promise was ever made. This proves demonstrably that the land of Canaan is here used as the type of the heavenly inheritance, and under this type the heavenly inheritance is secured to Abraham and his spiritual seed. Abraham himself confessed that he was a stranger and a pilgrim in the land of promise, seeking for a heavenly inheritance; and yet if that heavenly inheritance was not secured to him in this specification, where, I ask, did Abraham ever receive the assurance of it? You may look in vain for any such promise to Abraham, only as it is veiled in type in this specification, and yet we know that Abraham had such a promise, and that he lived with direct reference to it; and that promise we find in this specification of the covenant of circumcision.

In this specification, the land of Canaan is secured to Abraham and his seed jointly, and yet we know that Abraham himself never possessed a foot of the land of Canaan for a possession, except the field and cave of Macpelah, which he bought of the sons of Heth for "a possession of a burying-place." Abraham was a stranger in the land of promise, and it is expressly stated in the scriptures that he never did receive the land of Canaan as a possession. It was secured to his literal seed through the line of Isaac and Jacob; but they did not possess it as an inheritance until four hundred years after this covenant was made. In the covenant securing the literal Canaan to Abraham's literal posterity, in Genesis xv., it is said: "Unto thy seed have I given this land," not "unto thee and thy seed." But in this specification God says: "And I will give unto thee, and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God." This forever settles

the question, and demonstrably proves that it is not the earthly, but the heavenly inheritance, which is here secured to Abraham and his spiritual seed, under the type of the literal Canaan.

My second argument to prove the evangelical character of the covenant of circumcision is drawn from the nature and character of circumcision, the sign and seal of that covenant. Now, there must be, in the nature of things, an equivalent between the covenant and the sign and seal of the covenant. If the covenant be a spiritual covenant, the sign and seal must import spiritual, and not temporal things. If temporal blessings only were secured by it, then the sign and seal must also import temporal things. This is a self-evident proposition, and only needs to be stated in order to be proven. Circumcision, we are told, was both a sign and a seal. Now, I ask, what was it a sign and a seal of? I will read to you from the thirtieth chapter of Deuteronomy, and sixth verse:

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

And also from Jeremiah iv. 4:

"4. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem." And again from Romans ii. 28, 29:

"28. For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:

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

These passages clearly prove that circumcision was the sign of a new heart, that it was the sign of regeneration. Now, what was it the seal of? We are not left here to infer what circumcision was a seal of, but we have a positive and emphatic, "Thus saith the Lord." Abraham "received the sign of circumcision as a seal of righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised." It was "a seal of the righteousness of faith." It was then a sign of regeneration or a new heart, and "a seal of the righteousness of faith," and according to every sound principle of common-sense, we must understand that the covenant of which circumcision was the sign and seal, secured the blessings of a new heart, and the righteousness of faith; and it was consequently the evangelical covenant, or covenant of grace in Christ Jesus. This is a self-evident proposition, and every one can see its force.

Here I might rest the argument so far as the nature of the covenant of circumcision is concerned; for I have proved that it was the general covenant of grace in Christ Jesus, by arguments that I know can not be answered.

The general covenant of grace, entered into with Abraham, of which circumcision was the sign and seal, secured to the believer the blessings of a new heart, and the righteousness of faith. When this covenant was first established in the family of Abraham, infants were put into it at eight days old by the express command of God, and this proves clearly that infant church-membership is not opposed to, but

that it is in harmony with the nature of the covenant of grace, God himself being judge. Thus I prove that infant baptism, which under the gospel recognizes the relation which God placed infants in, to his church, is founded in the nature of the covenant of grace, and it stands justified by the highest authority—the nature of things. That which is founded in the nature of the covenant of grace can not be contrary to the scriptures, but must be in harmony with them.

Now, I expect my opponent, in reply, will tell you that Abraham's servants, "those born in his house, -and bought with his money, were also circumcised." This is true. But they were not partakers of the temporal inheritance secured to Abraham's seed, and if circumcision was the sign and seal of the temporal covenant, the servants of Abraham would have been excluded from it. But Abraham's servants were all embraced in the spiritual covenant, which embraced the whole human family, and therefore they might properly have the sign and seal of that covenant put upon them. My opponent will not claim that Abraham's servants were slaves proper. No such relation existed in the family of Abraham. Abraham was a patriarchal king, and his servants were his subjects, not his slaves. They became his subjects by contract, and he was not permitted to receive any into his family or tribe, who would not submit to be circumcised, and become a worshiper of the true God. All infants in the family of Abraham were brought into the church by circumcision, and made partakers of the benefits of the covenant.

My third argument to prove the evangelical nature of the covenant of circumcision is drawn from the parable of the vineyard, found in Mark xii. 1-11, and in Luke xx. 9-23, and Matthew xxi. 33-46:

"33. Hear another parable; There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country:

"34. And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it.

"35. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another.

"36. Again he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise.

"37. But last of all, he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.

"38. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance.

"39. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him.

"40. When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?

"41. They said unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

"42. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head

of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?

"43. Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

"44. And whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

"45. And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them.

"46. But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet."

There is no such thing as giving a sensible exposition of this parable upon the hypothesis of my opponent. The vineyard here is unquestionably the covenant of circumcision; the husbandmen, the Jewish nation; the letting of the vineyard, the bestowing of this covenant upon the Jewish nation at Mt. Sinai; the servants sent were the prophets, which were persecuted and killed in various ways; the son was the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom the Jews crucified; the destroying of the wicked husbandmen, the disinheriting of the Jews, and their consequent destruction as a nation, and the letting out of the vineyard unto other husbandmen, the bestowal of the covenant of grace—the covenant of circumcision upon the Gentiles. No sophistry can evade the force of this parable. Christ does not say that he will destroy the vineyard and plant a new one, but he will destroy the husbandmen, and let the same vineyard to other husbandmen. Again the Jewish teachers are here recognized as builders in the temple of Christ, but as rejecting Christ the stone who was to become the head-stone of the corner. The chief priests and Pharisees were able to perceive the true import of this parable, "for they perceived that he spake against them." This is more, I am afraid, than my opponent has yet been able to do!

My fourth argument to prove the evangelical character of the covenant of circumcision, is drawn from the parable of the olive-tree. Rom. xi. 16-24:

"16. For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches.

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

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

"19. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

"20. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear.

"21. For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

"22. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

"23. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again.

" 24. For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by

nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive-tree?

Here the covenant of circumcision is called the good olive-tree, and the Jews were "the natural branches." The unbelieving Jews were broken off, while those who received Christ still remained as branches in their own olive-tree—they continued in the covenant of circumcision. The believing Gentiles are brought in with those believing Jews, and are grafted in among them, in the good olive-tree, the covenant of circumcision, and the unbelieving Jews, if they repent and turn to Christ, "shall be grafted into their own good olive-tree," from which they had been broken off, along with the believing Gentiles. There is no evading the force of this parable, and there is no way to explain away its obvious meaning. The old olive-tree is not cut down, and a new one planted, and Jews and Gentiles grafted into it. The Gentiles are grafted into the same olive-tree from which the unbelieving Jews were broken off.

My opponent told us on the former proposition, that those who were baptized by John, were admitted into the Christian Church by that baptism, and by this he admitted that those who received Christ among the Jews never lost their membership in the church. It is a fact that can not be denied, that these Jews who received Jesus as the Christ were never cast out of the church. Although Jesus baptized all those who received him (that is, his apostles did), it was not for the purpose of admitting them into a new church, but it was a sign of the fact that they received him as their long-expected Messiah. The Jews who believed never lost their church-membership for a single moment; they remained, as Paul here tells us, in their own good olive-tree; while the unbelieving Jews who were broken off, when they repented, were, along with the believing Gentiles, grafted back again into their own good olive-tree, the covenant of circumcision.

The relation here recognized by Paul as existing between the converted Gentiles and the covenant of circumcision, is recognized everywhere throughout the scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments. And hence the Old Testament prophets always represent the conversion of the Gentiles to Christ, as a bringing of them into the church in which the prophets themselves lived. Isaiah lx. 1-12, addressing the church in view of the latter-day glory, says:

"1. Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

"2. For behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee.

"3. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.

"4. Lift up thine eyes round about, and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee; thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side.

"5. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee.

"6. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of



Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord.

"7. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory.

"8. Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?

"9. Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee.

"10. And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favor have I had mercy on thee.

"11. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought.

"12. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."

A great many similar passages may be found in the prophets, all pointing out the same relation of the Gentiles under the gospel to God's ancient covenant, the covenant of circumcision, into which Paul tells us, in Romans iv., the believing Gentiles are brought, and constituted the children of Abraham. How, I ask, are these prophecies to be explained, except upon the ground that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace in Christ Jesus, into which God intends to bring all those who receive the Lord Jesus Christ, thus constituting them the children of Abraham through faith in Christ Jesus.

We therefore come again to the conclusion, that as God, in the original organization of his church in the family of Abraham, by the covenant of circumcision, recognized infant children as belonging to his church, and admitted them into it by circumcision at eight days old, this relationship is in accordance with, and demanded by, the nature of the evangelical covenant, and therefore can not be contrary to the scriptures, but must be in harmony with them.

I close with the argument drawn from my first position, that infant baptism is founded in the nature of the evangelical covenant; and as Dr. Neander says, "is derived from that which is innermost in Christianity." Thus we show that infant baptism is sustained and justified by the highest authority that can be pleaded in support of anything. The nature of things: the nature and genius of the covenant, of grace.

This is placing infant baptism upon its proper ground, for here the right is based upon the relation the child sustains to the Lord Jesus Christ, in the economy of grace. This argument is of itself sufficient to establish the right of infant baptism; but I shall show during the discussion, that the Lord Jesus Christ recognized this relation through his ministry, and that the apostles recognized it also by baptizing the infant children of their converts along with their parents.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The explanation of the proposition given by the gentleman, I shall accept. It is what I should have given had I been called upon to give one. I wish, first, to call attention to the exact character of this practice we are discussing this morning. The proposition affirms, "Infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism." This includes all infants. If infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism, all parents should have their infant children baptized; for all should receive what properly belongs to them.

Can you conceive of a command or obligation more general and sweeping in its character than this? The children of all parents who have heard the gospel should be baptized. Can you suppose that an obligation so universal and so sweeping in its nature, would be left to mere inference, based on such indefinite and general ideas as the nature of things and the genius of Christianity? In the name of reason, would God, who is so clear and exact in giving his ordinances, leave so universal and important a duty as this to be inferred from such indefinite data as man's ideas of the genius of Christianity?

I can prove anything to be a Christian duty in that way. Worship of saints, images and pictures, purgatory, celibacy, the seven sacraments of papacy, confession to priests, penance and indulgences, had the same origin as this papal relic—infant sprinkling. They could be inferred, by those who wanted to practice them, from the genius and spirit of Christianity! As this is an ordinance of the church of Christ, we would naturally expect an argument in favor of precept or example from the Christian Scriptures or New Testament.

My opponent affirms this practice to be a universal duty, and a Christian ordinance, without a word from the New Testament for it. How does he prove it to be in accordance with the genius and spirit of Christianity? By examining the New Testament, where we find Christianity introduced, established and described, to learn what this genius and spirit is, and comparing infant baptism with it, as thus established? No; he goes away back to the book of Genesis and to God's covenant with Abraham concerning the land of Canaan and a Jewish nation, and attempts to find the genius of the Christian religion there. Why not go to the word of the Lord that went out of Zion, and the law that went forth from Jerusalem? There was the genius and spirit of the Christian religion developed.

His argument is this: Circumcision was a sign and a seal of faith to the Jews, hence infants are to be baptized. A more illogical conclusion I never heard. I never heard two propositions so dissimilar jumbled together before. But circumcision was the sign and a seal to Abraham alone; and has never been to any one since. Romans iv. 11. Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised. Circumcision was to him a seal of faith, and to no one else before or since. How can circumcision be a sign and seal of faith to one who, as in the case of infants, never had, and can not have, faith in any sense?

How do we prove any practice to be a duty incumbent on all men as a Christian duty? General duty thus:

1. God has so constituted man that he instinctively practices it. Marriage, parentage, social and governmental relations, are proved to be duties of all men in this way.

2. God has given a command which is obligatory on all men and in all time; or has made it a universal duty. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by wan shall his blood be shed," is of this class. These are duties of all men in all time. My opponent will not claim that infant sprinkling comes under either of these. It has no universal sanction, though he makes it a universal duty.

We can prove a practice to be a Christian duty in two ways:

1. Christ or his apostles enjoined it as such.
2. They practiced it as such.

We can accept no less than this to establish a practice as a Christian duty. We receive no inferences based on the genius of Christianity. Such inferences have opened the floodgates of human innovations and corruptions, and led to the abomination of Papal corruption.

We will now go one step further. If my opponent can show that Christians, in the days of Christ or his apostles, practiced any practice, and they did not condemn it, we will cease to oppose it, though it would be then but a matter of expediency, and of no obligatory force. The church at Jerusalem had a community of goods, but that has no obligatory force on us, for it has neither the precept nor example of the apostles to sustain it.

Now we appeal to you, is not this a fair test of any practice? Can anything have a scriptural warrant and be a Christian duty that has not apostolic precept or example? If so, where will you draw the dividing line? On what grounds would you reject any practice? Can anything be tolerated in the church that was not tolerated by them? If so, where will you stop in your toleration? On what principle will you reject anything? It will be claimed they are in accordance with the genius and spirit of Christianity. No, we must resolutely demand apostolic precept and example, or we will have to admit every papal innovation with this one—infant sprinkling.

But my opponent will yet tell you that there has been a substitution of baptism for circumcision. Circumcision in the Jewish Church and baptism in the Christian Church. I have been over this ground before, and could, were I disposed to do so, give you the whole line of argument the gentleman will pursue.

*Mr. Hughey*—The gentleman has obtained it from my manuscripts in the hands of his brother Sweeney, I suppose.

*Mr. Braden*—No, sir; I have never seen your manuscripts, nor do I directly or indirectly know a syllable that is in them. I have never talked with Bro. Sweeney a syllable concerning your arguments or course of argument. Let that settle the matter.

Should the gentleman claim that baptism has been substituted for circumcision, let him show that Christ or his apostles taught such a substitution, or that they practiced it. We will accept it on no less

grounds as a Christian duty. Or let him show that it was practiced with their knowledge and without their condemnation, and we will cease to oppose it, regarding it as a question of expediency.

Now here is a clear and fair issue. Let my opponent bring forward apostolic precept or example for the origin of infant baptism, or its being substituted for circumcision, or cease forever to contend for this papal corruption of God's ordinance. Let him produce apostolic toleration before he dares to ask us to tolerate this practice. If there is any in the word of God, produce it and we will accept. Let us have a "thus saith the Lord" for this practice which claims to be an universal ordinance of his house.

Suppose the gentleman could prove that circumcision was a sign and seal of faith to the Jews, and was obligatory on all Abraham's descendants, does that prove that baptism is a sign and seal of Christian faith, and obligatory on all parents who hear the gospel? The whole course of argument is a mere rope of sand.

The gentleman commenced by saying that infants, never having sinned, are graciously entitled to baptism. A most gratuitous and unfounded assumption. Infants, never having sinned, are graciously entitled to the Lord's Supper as well. Infants, never having sinned, are entitled to membership in the church, and all its privileges. They are entitled to preaching, holding office, voting, and all church privileges, and ceremonies. My friend will not claim any such nonsense, and yet why not? It is just as clear as his conclusion concerning infant baptism. I can prove it just as conclusively, and in precisely the same way.

Again, he says infants stand in the same relation in the economy of grace, to Christ, the second Adam, that they did in the kingdom of nature to the first Adam. There is not a word of truth in it; but suppose we admit, does it follow therefore your babes are to be sprinkled? What rite did their relation to the first Adam entitle our babes to? None. Then what rite does their relation to the second Adam in the economy of grace entitle them, arguing by analogy? None. The gentleman hopes, by many broad assertions, glittering generalities, and numerous quotations of irrelevant scriptures, to confuse you, and then vociferate that he has proved his position. But keep clearly before you the test we gave you, has he found apostolic precept or example for the practice, and you will cast aside his irrelevant jumbling of passages.

We will now take the subject of covenants, with which he started out, and as we want this matter clearly understood, we will examine the covenants in detail. We begin with Genesis xii. Here God told Abraham that if "he would depart into a land which he would show him, he would make him a great nation, and in him and his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed." Abraham complied with the conditions, and the covenant was established. In Genesis xiii. God made his first promise of a land inheritance, but there was no covenant. In Genesis xv. God made a covenant concerning an heir, a natural seed and a temporal inheritance, and deliverance from bondage, and ratified it by sacrifices. In Genesis xvii. he renewed the last

covenant, and placed circumcision as a token to mark all who were entitled to the blessings of this covenant.

In Genesis xxii., after Isaac had been removed from the altar, and the ram offered, he separated the promise concerning Christ from all others, and made a special covenant concerning the spiritual seed, or Christ, and confirmed it with an oath. This is called the 'covenant concerning Christ," and "the covenant with an oath." This Paul refers to in Galatians iii., Romans ix. 8., also Hebrews vi. 13. Zachariah speaks of it. Luke i. 72, 73. It forms also one of the "covenants of promise" spoken of. Ephesians ii. 12.

In Genesis xxiv. he renewed the covenants made to Abraham and to Isaac. In Genesis xxviii. he renews them also to Jacob. The part referring to the temporal inheritance in all these covenants is referred to in Psalm cv. 8.

In Exodus xix. a covenant was made with the Jewish nation. This was before the giving of the law. After the ten commandments and certain ordinances were given, in Exodus xxiv. the people renewed the covenant, and it was ratified with sacrifices and sprinkling with blood. This God, in Jeremiah xxxi. 31, calls the first covenant with the Jews. Paul refers to it, Hebrews viii. 9, 10, as the "first covenant" with the Jews. He calls it the law in Galatians iii. 17. Moses speaks of it in Deuteronomy iv. 5—16. He calls the covenant made at Horeb the covenant of the "two tables of stone," because they were the substance of the covenant. He rehearses it again in Deuteronomy xxviii., and in Deuteronomy xxix. the people again renewed the covenant. This was the first covenant made with Israel, and is called "the old covenant" and "the law."

In Jeremiah xxxi. 31 God declares he will make a new covenant with Israel, and describes what it shall be. Paul speaks of this in Hebrews viii. 9, 10, as the new covenant, and makes Christ the mediator, and his blood the seal of the covenant. This is the covenant concerning the Christian Church and its blessings. This covenant is the olive-tree spoken of in Romans ix., from which the Jews were cut off on account of unbelief, who rejected the gospel; and the Gentiles who accepted Christ grafted in.

In Daniel ix. 24, we read in seventy weeks, or 490 years after the going forth of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem, it should be destroyed. In the seventieth week Christ should come. In the middle of the week he should be cut off for the sins of the people, and should confirm the covenant with many, and should cause sacrifices to cease, and then should come those horrible scenes which attended the destruction of Jerusalem. On the day of Pentecost the new covenant was announced, and confirmed to all who accepted it till the destruction of the city. This covenant was the new covenant of Jeremiah and of Paul.

Now we have all the covenants. The covenant in Genesis xii., also Genesis xiii. and xv., had no reference to circumcision. The first covenant concerning Christ was in Genesis xii., but circumcision was not yet instituted. The other two had no reference to Christ. The covenants with Isaac and Jacob have no mention of circumcision. The Jewish national covenants had no reference to Christ. He is not

mentioned in one of them. They were earthly and temporal. Birth, and not faith, or any spiritual qualification, made one entitled to their privileges. Their commands were all temporal and the blessings all temporal.

We are only concerned then with the covenant in Genesis xvii. which Stephen, in Acts vii. 8, calls the covenant of circumcision; and the one in Genesis xxii. 15, which Paul calls "the covenant concerning Christ," Galatians iii. 17; one of "the covenants of promise," Ephesians ii. 13; the "covenant concerning a spiritual seed," Romans, ix. 8; and which Paul, in Hebrews vi. 13, and Zachariah, in Luke i. 73, call the "covenant with an oath." The question shall be, does circumcision have any connection with the spiritual seed, Christ and his saints, or is it connected alone with the temporal seed, temporal inheritance, and temporal blessings? If the latter prove to be the case, the gentleman's argument goes by the board as untenable.

We shall have occasion, before we are through, to use the old covenant and the new, or the covenant of Sinai, Horeb and Moab, in contrast with the covenant of Zion. The privileges of the first were the tabernacle of David that was broken down, and the privileges of the second were the rebuilding of the tabernacle. Acts xvi. We shall use the second covenant in explaining Romans ix.

We now say that the covenant of circumcision had no reference to the spiritual seed, or Christ—had no connection with him, and hence circumcision had nothing to do with him—no connection with the covenant of grace, and had no spiritual significance, and gave to its subjects no spiritual privilege, and was based on no spiritual qualification. It was all earthly, fleshly, and temporal. To sustain this we give two reasons:

1. In the covenant of circumcision there is not the slightest allusion to Christ, or any spiritual privilege, blessing, or qualification. Its objects had no spiritual significance, and no connection with Christ or any gracious or spiritual subject whatever. Let us examine this covenant, Genesis xvii.

"1. And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.

"2. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly."

"4. As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.

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

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

"7. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.

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

"9. And God said unto Abraham, thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations.

"10. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised.

"11. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin: and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.

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

"13. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.

"14. And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

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

"21. But my covenant will I establish with Isaac."

Now let us examine this covenant. The words which refer to Christ, "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," are not in it. The language is the same as is in Genesis xv., which all admit has no reference to Christ. The inheritance was temporal, the land of Canaan, in which Abraham was then a stranger; the seed that was to inhabit was his fleshly seed, not his spiritual. But, says my opponent, his name was changed to Abraham, therefore it refers to his spiritual seed. A strong reason truly. Sarai's name was changed to Sarah, therefore she was to bear a spiritual, not a fleshly seed.

But it was to be an everlasting covenant. Yes, it was to stand between God and Isaac's seed, so long as they kept his covenant. He was to be their God. That does not make it apply to the spiritual seed, for he promised the same to the fleshly seed as all Israel. "But Abraham never entered the land, hence it means the heavenly Canaan and an everlasting or eternal inheritance." There is a trouble in the way. "I will give it to thee and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art." It was to be the land of Canaan in which Abraham then was. That settles that matter. Every promise, blessing and stipulation of the covenant was temporal, and with and concerning the fleshly seed.

But what was circumcision given for? As a mark or token in the flesh, that one was of the fleshly seed of Abraham through Isaac, and entitled to all the temporal privileges of this covenant. It did not make one a descendant, nor was it a seal of anything whatever, but a token that one was a Jew or Israelite. He was born in the nation, but unless he received this mark in his flesh, he was cut off or lost his privileges as a descendant of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. That was its sole significance. All earthly and fleshly. Thus we prove that this covenant had no connection with the promise of Christ, or the spiritual seed, and circumcision has no connection with that seed, and no spiritual import whatever.

2. We next prove that this is not the covenant concerning the spiritual seed, because it is never referred to as such by the apostles, or any one in the New Testament. Paul and Zachariah refer to such a covenant, but the words which they quote as referring to Christ and the spiritual seed, and the covenant of grace, are not in this whole chapter. They give the express language of the covenant several times, but those words are not here, hence this is not the covenant.

Now a word about circumcision being a sign and seal of faith to all who are circumcised. Baptism is said, in our modern creeds, to be also a sign. Both ideas are false and unscriptural. Circumcision was to Abraham the sign and a seal of the faith, which he had before circumcision. It never was before and never has been since the sign and a seal of faith. It was to all others a token that they were of Abraham's fleshly seed and entitled to all the privileges of that seed. If they had not that token they forfeited them.

Baptism is not the sign of our faith. All our works are signs, says James, of our faith. The Holy Spirit is the seal of our faith. Eph. i. 13; iv. 30. This disposes, we hope, of that theological fiction.

We will now attend to another of like kind. "Circumcision made Abraham the father of the faithful." This is not taught by the Bible. In Romans iv. 11, we read: "Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the faith which he had when uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all that believe, though they be not circumcised; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who walk also in the steps of the faith which Abraham had when uncircumcised."

The question is now was it circumcision that made Abraham the father of the faithful, or his pre-eminent faith, of which circumcision was only a seal? Whatever makes the faithful, children of Abraham, makes Abraham their father. Galatians iii. 7: "Know ye therefore that they which are of the faith are the children of Abraham." Our faith makes us Abraham's children and Abraham our father. 26. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." 29. "If ye are Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." This settles that matter. He received a seal of the faith which he had, and all who have like faith are his children. He is the father of the faithful, and of those who have the circumcision spoken of in Romans ii. 28, 29: "That is not circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but that is circumcision, which is of the heart, in the spirit. Phil. iii. 3: "We are of the circumcision which worship God in the spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Col. ii. 11: "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." Abraham was a father of this kind of circumcision, to those who had not the fleshly circumcision, by his faith, and not by his fleshly circumcision. How could his mark in the flesh make him the father of those who had not this mark, but were his children because they had his faith. Faith made him father of the faithful, and of those who had this faith and the circumcision without hands.

By the way why did not my opponent make' the circumcision in



Gen. xvii. spiritual? The seed was spiritual, the inheritance was spiritual, why not the circumcision also? What right has he to spiritualize facts and literalize only one item, because his argument demands it?

We will now find the covenant of grace, the covenant concerning the spiritual seed, "the gospel preached to Abraham" in promise. "In thee and thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," are the words of this covenant. It was given with the other promises in Gen. xii., also to Isaac and to Jacob. It was given alone to Abraham. Gen. xxii. 15. Zachariah, in Luke, calls this the covenant with an oath. So does Paul. Heb. vi. 13. Then this is the covenant concerning Christ, concerning the spiritual seed, the covenant of grace, the covenant of promise, and the gospel preached to Abraham, and circumcision has nothing to do with this covenant, that is, fleshly circumcision.

We have then two kinds of covenants made with Abraham. One concerning a temporal seed and inheritance, and blessings all temporal, and applying only to seed after the flesh, through Isaac and Jacob. The other concerning the spiritual seed, spiritual blessings, and an eternal inheritance, and applying to Christ and his spiritual seed, through Christ. These were together in Gen. xii. The temporal is given separate from the spiritual in Genesis xiii., xv. and xvii. Circumcision was the token of this alone, and it was confirmed by sacrifice. The spiritual was given separate at Mount Moriah, Genesis xxii., and this was confirmed with an oath. This alone pertains to Christ and the spiritual seed exclusively.

There is another objection to circumcision being a sign and a seal of faith and connected with spiritual blessings. All Abraham's servants, and all whom he bought with money, all the servants of Isaac and Jacob, and all the Israelites bought with money, were to be circumcised. Servants bought of the heathen round about them, and heathens themselves, were circumcised. Here circumcision was not a sign and seal of faith. Some are so reckless as to assume that all these purchased servants were connected with the faith of Abraham and his descendants. What a bare assumption! The Jews never bought a slave till they converted him! Believe such stuff who will; I will not.

Nor will the claim that the servitude was voluntary, answer; for the very fact that they were bought with money, and from the nations round about them, where the severest bondage was common, disproves any such assumption. In this case the circumcision was a token that the slave belonged to a Jewish master. It denoted not even a fleshly relation or descent, but a property relation. Then circumcision was a token of fleshly descent on a child of Jewish parents, and a token of property relation and servitude, to the slave of a Jewish master.

My opponent next takes up the parable of the vineyard. Matthew xxi. 33. He tells us that the vineyard was the Jewish Church, afterward continued in the Christian Church. Then the Jews were not the church, but only tin: husbandmen who kept the vineyard. Could the vineyard be a church? What was the vineyard? What was given to the Jews? Paul tells us, Romans iii. 1, 2, "What advantage has the

Jew and what advantage is there of circumcision? Much every way and especially, that to them were committed the oracles of God." Rom. ix. 4: "To the Israelites pertains the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." This is what was given to the Jews and not a church or being a church.

I will here lay down this broad affirmation, "that God never had a church till the day of Pentecost." What is a church? A body of men who have the same religious faith, or faith in God, and are called out from all who have not, and distinguished from them by their religious faith, and on account of it. They obey also the law of God from the heart, or live in the obedience of faith. They have officers prescribed by God's law, who minister to them in spiritual affairs, and whose authority extends to these matters alone. They are recognized by God as his in a peculiar sense, solely on account of their spiritual qualifications, and are blessed with certain spiritual blessings. Now was there any Jewish Church in this sense? We can trace such an organization back to Pentecost but no further.

There was a Jewish nation over whom God was a civil ruler as well as their God; and to them he gave a religion, a national religion. The qualification of this membership was flesh or birth, and not faith. The token was in the flesh and not in the spirit. Those who had faith in God from the heart, and obeyed him from the heart, were never separated from those who did not, for the qualifications were not moral but fleshly.

Large numbers of the Jews kept neither the moral nor ceremonial law. They were never cut off but lost certain blessings. There were no officers peculiar to those who obeyed God from the heart. God had in the days of the patriarchs individual followers, but no nation or church. In the Jews he had a nation, but no church, for he never selected out, by any sign or organization, those who from the heart obeyed his law. We would ask were Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Nadab, Abihu, Phineas and Hophni and the sons of Belial members of the Jewish Church? The gentleman has either to cease calling the Jewish commonwealth a church, or recognize these wretches as members, and entitled to the privileges of the covenant he talks of as a covenant of grace.

There were seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, but they were never separated from those who had. My opponent will have it that there was a Jewish Church, and that circumcision was given to all members of it. Then every wicked Jew belonged to it, for all were circumcised.

My opponent's argument implies that the Jewish nation, or his Jewish Church, had the same covenant as the Christian Church. This covenant he finds in Abraham. It was made with Abraham in Genesis xv. Now we have already shown that the covenant concerning Christ had no connection with this. But there was a new and an old covenant. The first was given at Sinai, and ratified there, and at Horeb, and again in Moab. It is called the law by Paul. The new is first mentioned in Jeremiah xxi. 31. In Daniel ix., it is declared that Christ shall ratify it in the midst of the last week, or about thirty-five

years before the destruction of Jerusalem. In Matthew xxiv. 28, Christ calls his blood the blood of the new covenant. In Galatians iv. Paul speaks of two covenants, one from Sinai, and the other from Zion. In Hebrews, he speaks largely of the two, declaring one was done away, to establish the other. The new covenant was announced to the Jews at Pentecost. The middle wall of partition, or Jewish ordinances was broken down, and the Gentiles grafted into this covenant, or the olive-tree, or were made with the Jews, one new man, at the house of Cornelius. Hence they have not the same covenant.

It is implied also that they had the same faith or religion. They had not the same religion. Galatians i. 13, 14: "You have heard of my manner of life in times past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and profited in the Jews' religion above my equals." Acts xxvi. 5: "After the strictest sect of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." Then the Jews' religion was not the religion of the church of God.

The blessings of the Jewish covenant were all temporal. Turn to Deuteronomy xxviii. and read the blessings of the Jewish covenant, and the curses of disobedience. All are temporal and apply to a nation but not to a church. The blessings of the new covenant are all spiritual, or such as belong to a church covenant. Now do not understand me to say that there were no pious men before the day of Pentecost. I affirm there were no Christians, and that these good people were not a church.

God used the patriarchal dispensation to prepare the way for the Jewish. He used the Jewish dispensation to prepare the way for the Christian dispensation, or church of Christ, the first church ever organized. The Jewish teachers and prophets had been preparing the way for Christ's kingdom, but up till this time, it had not been established. The spiritual seed had not been selected out, and distinguished from other men, by an organization or church.

In conclusion I would renew my demand for some plain apostolic precept or example, for this practice which he urges us all to observe as a Christian duty. In the name of reason and common-sense, if infant sprinkling be obligatory, wherever the gospel is preached, on all parents, why has not the word of God told us so? The Holy Spirit was to guide the apostles into all truth. Why has he not left some record of this universal duty? Is there any practice that should be sanctioned in the church of God, for which there is no apostolic precept or example? I can find apostolic precept or example for all I practice as church or Christian duty in a moment's time. Why not present it, if there be one, and settle the matter immediately.

Henry Ward Beecher says there is no scriptural authority, but he practices it because it is a good thing. I think most of those here will conclude it is not a good thing, since there is a curse pronounced on those who take from or add to the word of God.

If infant sprinkling is obligatory on all, would God have left it to be so obscurely inferred; or would he not rather have stated so in plain and explicit terms? It should be in terms that the plainest and humblest could not mistake it. It would not be necessary for my

friend to labor four hours, and then tell you, you must infer it or let Mm draw the inference for you.

My opponent will no doubt do as he has done; talk of circumcision and covenants, and spiritual meanings, and the genius of Christianity, and clap his hands and shout "Don't you see it?" "Don't you see I have proved my point?" "Don't you see that is so?" I will venture to assert that if he left the words infant baptism out of his discourse, you would not know that it had any reference to that subject. His hearers would not know what he was talking about unless he told them.

We are not inquiring whether Jesus circumcised male infants, but if baptizing all infants be a Christian obligation on all men. If infant baptism be scriptural, where is the scriptural precept or example? Let us have an end of this loose irrelevant talk about covenants, signs, seals, and that indefinite myth, the genius of Christianity, and give us a plain scriptural command or precedent.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. HUGHEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—It has rarely been my misfortune during all the discussions that I have ever had, to listen to such a reply to an argument as I had to listen to this forenoon. I made an argument clear and forcible. My positions were plain, and easily understood. I brought forward arguments that could not be misunderstood, to prove the position that I started out with, and if the position was well taken, and the argument followed out logically, the conclusion was inevitable.

The first position taken in the development of my argument in favor of infant baptism was grounded on the nature of things—the nature of the evangelical covenant. That which is in accordance with the nature of things under the covenant of grace must be scriptural. I presented an argument to show that infant baptism was founded in the nature of the evangelical covenant, and was therefore scriptural. My opponent stated that that which the general instincts of mankind would perceive as proper and right must be scriptural. What is this but the same thing which is demanded by the nature of things? He here admitted the position that I took to be correct. This is an admission that if I prove my first position I establish my proposition. Then I proceeded to show that when God instituted the covenant of grace in the family of Abraham, in the covenant of circumcision, that he put infants into it at eight days old, showing that the relation recognized by infant baptism was established by the Almighty in the first organization of the evangelical covenant, thus proving that this relation is demanded by the nature of the covenant, God himself being judge. I then brought forward a number of arguments to prove my first position: that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace. In the first place I showed conclusively that the temporal covenant made with Abraham's literal seed, securing to them the temporal inheritance, is recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis. Then I showed that the covenant of circumcision, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, was the spiritual covenant made with

Abraham, and his spiritual seed through Christ Jesus. I showed that by this covenant Abraham was constituted "the father of ail them that believe, though they be not circumcised, and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision." I showed that circumcision constituted him the father of the faithful, but my opponent answered, "Not a whit of it, sir, not a whit of it." [Laughter.] "No, it was not his circumcision but his faith that constituted him the father of all them that believe." Well, now, let us see whether my opponent or Paul is right. The Apostle Paul tells us emphatically that it was circumcision that constituted Abraham the father of all them that believe. "Not a whit of it, Paul," says Mr. Braden. "It was not circumcision, but faith that constituted Abraham the father of all believers." Well, we will turn to Romans iv. 11, 12, and see what Paul says: "And he received the sign of the circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised." Now, Paul says that circumcision constituted Abraham the father of the faithful, but my friend, Mr. Braden, says it was Abraham's faith. You may believe which of these gentlemen you please. [Laughter.]

I showed by the third specification of the covenant of circumcision that the land of Canaan was spoken of typically, and that under this type the heavenly inheritance was secured to Abraham and his spiritual seed. "I will give unto thee, and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." I showed that this was a grant to Abraham and his spiritual seed jointly, and that neither he nor they ever possessed the literal Canaan as an inheritance. I proved also demonstrably that the literal Canaan is in the scriptures used as a type of the heavenly inheritance promised to Abraham and his spiritual seed, and that this specification contains under this type the only promise recorded in the Old Testament to Abraham of a heavenly inheritance. The only reply my opponent made to this was: "Not a whit of it, sir, not a whit of it." [Laughter.] "This is the literal Canaan and nothing else." He did not even deign to look at my argument here. This is the way the gentleman has replied to my argument.

My second argument to prove the evangelical character of the covenant of circumcision was drawn from the nature and character of circumcision, the sign and seal of that covenant. I showed from Moses, Jeremiah and Paul that circumcision was a sign of a new heart. Paul says, "Circumcision is not that of the flesh, but of the heart; in the spirit, and not in the letter." As the real circumcision is the circumcision of the heart, so the outward circumcision is but the sign of the inward, the spiritual circumcision, the new heart. But my opponent tells us that circumcision was only a seal of the righteousness of faith to Abraham, and that it was a seal to no one else. This I stated in my opening speech. But what did circumcision seal to Abraham? It sealed him the father of all them that believe, and the

father of circumcision to all them that believe. But how could this be if the covenant of circumcision was not the covenant of grace, the covenant into which all believers are brought by faith in Jesus Christ? But Mr. Braden wants to know if circumcision was the sign of a new heart to infants!! I proved by the word of God that it was the sign of a new heart, and that it was put upon infants; and if he wishes to quibble thus with God's appointments he can do so.

But my opponent tells us that circumcision was a national mark, and that it secured only temporal blessings. But, I ask, what nation of Abraham's descendants did it distinguish, and to which of these nations did it secure the temporal inheritance, the land of Canaan? The sons of Keturah were circumcised, the sons of Ishmael were circumcised, the sons of Esau were circumcised, and Abraham's servants were circumcised. If circumcision was a national mark, what nation among the descendants of Abraham did it distinguish, for all of Abraham's descendants circumcise to this day, and it was placed upon all of Abraham's posterity and servants by divine appointment? If circumcision secured the temporal inheritance, to whom did it secure it? Will the gentleman please inform us on these points? But in regard to Abraham's servants I stated the facts that Abraham's servitude was no slavery at all. It was a matter of contract between the parties; it was a relation into which the parties entered by mutual consent. God required that Abraham should "command his household after him, to keep the way of the Lord," and Abraham was not permitted to bring any one into his family, or household, who would not become a worshiper of the true God, and submit to circumcision. So far as the servitude of the Israelites was concerned, at the end of every forty-nine years, or in the year of jubilee, every man became free, and became a member of the Jewish state and church. Now, these are the simple facts in connection with this relationship, and they show at once that it was simply a matter of consent and agreement. According to my position, which views circumcision as the sign and seal of the spiritual covenant, all of Abraham's posterity and their servants might be properly circumcised, for the spiritual covenant included them all; but according to the position of my opponent none but the descendants of Abraham, through the line of Isaac and Jacob, could be properly circumcised, for the temporal inheritance was restricted to them alone.

But the gentleman tells us that I dodged or skipped over the real spiritual covenant, which he tells us is recorded in Genesis xxii. 15-18, where Abraham offered up Isaac on Mt. Moriah. But there is nothing like a covenant in this transaction, and the word covenant is not once named in the chapter. This was but the confirmation by the oath of the Almighty of the covenant recorded in Genesis xvii. He tells us that the four hundred and twenty years spoken of by the Apostle Paul, in Galatians iii. 17, dates back to the offering up of Isaac—to the giving of the covenant on Mt. Moriah, and that this fact fixes the truth of his position.

I once held a debate with a Mr. Cole, a real sharp man, who took the ground that the covenant of circumcision was twenty-four years too young to be the spiritual covenant made with Abraham; "For,"

said he, "Paul tells us that the law was given four hundred and thirty years after the covenant was confirmed, and this four hundred and thirty years dates back to the time the promise was made, which is recorded in Genesis xii. 1—3." In this way he sought to set aside my argument. I admitted that the four hundred and thirty years of Paul must date from the time of the promise made to Abraham in Haran; but I showed that as the four hundred and thirty years of Egyptian bondage did not date from the time the children of Israel actually went into bondage (for they were only in actual bondage two hundred and fifteen years), but from the time that Abraham left Haran; so the four hundred and thirty years of Paul do not date from the time the covenant was actually confirmed or made, but from the time the promise was made upon which the covenant was based. But my opponent's covenant in Genesis xxii. is about fifty years too young!! I am surprised that he would make such a statement, which is so easily disproved by the chronology of the Bible! The transaction on Mt Moriah, instead of being just four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law, was at most not exceeding three hundred and eighty years before that event, and this entirely sets aside Mr. Braden's attempt to fix the time of the establishment of the spiritual covenant when Abraham offered up Isaac on Mt. Moriah. I think I have now fully answered his argument on the covenant of circumcision.

But I want to press this question again upon my opponent: What was circumcision a token of? What was its import? What nation among Abraham's descendants did it designate? And to whom did it secure the earthly possession? Was it to Isaac's posterity, or to the sons of Keturah? Was it to Abraham's servants, or was it to the sons of Esau? If circumcision was a national mark, and only secured the temporal inheritance of the land of Canaan, then it was a perpetual falsehood whenever it was placed upon any of Abraham's posterity except the sons of Jacob, to whom the earthly inheritance was restricted! This even my opponent can see!

I will now pass to notice his remarks on the parable of the vineyard. I showed you clearly that this parable could not be explained upon the gentleman's hypothesis at all, for, according to the parable, there was something that existed before the coming of Christ which was given to the Jews, and which, in consequence of their sins was taken from them and given to the Gentiles. What was that something? It was the spiritual covenant—the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham, which had been given to the Jews on Sinai and which was now to be taken from them and given to the Gentiles. But "No," said my opponent, "the vineyard was God's promises made to Israel, which, under the gospel, are given to the Gentiles!" But God's promises are never represented by a vineyard, but his ancient church was represented by this identical figure in Isaiah v. 1-7. Who ever heard of such folly as representing the promises as a vineyard? The thing is wholly out of the question. A vineyard must represent an organization, and it is always so used in the scriptures.

The olive-tree in Romans xi. must also represent the promises made to God's ancient Israel, for the vineyard and olive-tree both evidently represent the same thing. Here, then, the olive-tree is the promises;

the Jews are the natural branches of the promises! The natural branches of the promises are broken off; the Gentiles are not grafted into the gospel covenant, but into the promises! And the unbelieving Jews, when converted, are not brought into the gospel covenant, but are grafted back again into the promises. Here we have a tree, the trunk of which is made of the promises, and the branches of men! Did you ever hear of such nonsense since the world began? I have here, in the parable of the vineyard, and of the olive-tree, a positive "Thus saith the Lord," for my position. I put my finger upon the very passages that directly and positively affirm that the spiritual covenant—the covenant of circumcision—is the same covenant which is given to the Gentiles under the gospel, and into which they are grafted by faith in Christ Jesus.

The gentleman's reply to my speech amounts to nothing; it does not even attempt to set aside my strongest positions. I have debated this proposition with a number of the opponents of infant baptism, but I have never found one that could reply to the argument I presented in my opening speech. Mr. Cole made the best effort at reply to it of any man I have ever met; but the fact is, no man can answer or set aside the argument contained in my opening speech. My opponent has utterly failed to set aside my argument to prove that "infant baptism is demanded by the nature of the evangelical covenant, and it therefore stands justified by the highest authority;" nor will he ever be able to answer that argument.

I expected him to bring up the passage in Daniel, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," and then take the position that this kingdom was "set up" or brought into existence on the day of Pentecost. But the phrase, "set up," does not mean "to create," but to raise up and put into proper repair something that had fallen into decay. This is precisely what the phrase "setup" means in Daniel, as you will see by turning to Acts xv. 13-17:

"13. And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me:

"14. Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.

"15. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written,

"16. After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up:

"17. That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

Here the phrase set up does not mean to bring into existence, but it means to raise up and restore "the tabernacle of David," which had fallen down; and this "tabernacle of David," into which the Gentiles are brought under the gospel, is the "kingdom of the God of heaven" spoken of by Daniel as being "set up."

But my opponent tells us that God never had a church in the world until the day of Pentecost! But this I have already proven to be untrue. God called Abraham and his family out from among the families of the earth, and established the covenant of grace with them



as we have already seen. He then selected the children of Israel from among the nations of the earth, and bestowed upon them the covenant of grace made with Abraham, represented by our Lord in the parable of the vineyard, as letting it out to husbandmen.

But my opponent says if this were a church, there were wicked men that belonged to it, such as Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Nadab and Abihu. Most assuredly there were; and there are wicked men in the church now. If the fact that there were wicked men in God's ancient church proves that it was not a church, then the fact that there are now wicked men in the church of Christ proves that it is not a church of Christ! God intended that his ancient church should be a holy church, a "peculiar people," but there were evil men mixed with the good. So it is in the church of Christ, and so it will be to the end of the world. But this does not prove that God has no church, because there are bad men in it. Such an objection only shows the straits into which my opponent has fallen.

My opponent admits that what the nature of things requires under the gospel of Jesus Christ can not be contrary to the New Testament scriptures. We have shown that infant baptism is demanded by the nature of the covenant of grace, and that it "is developed from that which is innermost in Christianity." In confirmation of this I further remark that Jesus Christ received infants, and recognized them as sustaining this relation to his kingdom. He took little children in his arms and blessed them, and treated them as belonging to his kingdom, and pronounces a blessing on those who receive them in his name. It does not matter how this relationship is recognised, or by what ordinance the child is recognised as belonging to Christ, so the relation is established; for if this be done we know that this relation under the gospel is always recognized by baptism. I am not here going to argue that baptism is substituted in the room or place of circumcision, but I will tell you how every believer and every infant is recognised as a child of Abraham under the gospel. Paul says, Galatians iii. 27-29;

"27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

"28. 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.

"29. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Here it is affirmed that every one who belongs to Christ is also of Abraham's seed, and that this relationship is recognized by baptism. Our adorable Redeemer not only received infants as belonging to his kingdom, and blessed them, but he held them up as the model to which the adult must conform, declaring that "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." He again declared, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God." Here the Lord Jesus himself emphatically declares that "little children" belong to his kingdom, that they have rights in his kingdom, and that they are not to be deprived of those rights. Now, I want to

know by what authority they are to be excluded from the kingdom or church of God? If the Lord Jesus holds up a little child as the model to which the adult must conform, I want to know by what principle, or by what authority, you will put the child out of the church? Now, just please give us the reason and authority for putting the child out in the face of such high authority as this for keeping him in?

If I am to be received into the kingdom or church of God because I am like my infant child, I want to know why my child is not to be received because it is just like itself? If I am to have the right of membership in the church because I am like my child, why is my child to be denied the right of membership? Jesus did hold up the child as the model to which we must conform in order to be admitted into his kingdom, into his church; and this very fact puts it beyond question that infant children have the right of membership in the church. Jesus never would have held up the child as the model to which adults must conform, in order to enter his kingdom, unless infant children belonged to his kingdom. By this the Lord Jesus did, in the most emphatic manner, declare that infants do belong to his kingdom, and are to be received into his church.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Were we to accept a tithe of what the gentleman so confidently asserts about his proving his position, we would have to conclude that no proposition was ever demonstrated half so clearly. Would it not be better to do more and spend less time in telling us what you have done, my good friend? This audience is capable of deciding how much you have done, without your telling them. Leaving that to their good sense would display a much better taste. It looks suspicious when a man has to spend so much time in telling his hearers what he had done. We naturally conclude that no one but himself can see it, or he has nothing else to say.

In looking over my notes I find not a single new argument. We have a most confident reiteration of what was said in the first speech. The only difference is that it is vociferated more loudly, and if possible more confidently, with a great many more, "Now don't you see it!" "That proves my position!" "That knocks the socks off him!" "That sends him up the spout!" He evidently has been acting on the old adage that confident assertions of a certain class well stuck to, are as good as the truth.

We will again review the covenants made with Abraham. *The* gentleman denies there were covenants. In Romans ix. 4 Paul tells us covenants were given to the Jews. In Acts vii. 8 Stephen speaks of a covenant of circumcision. In Galatians iii. 17 Paul speaks of a covenant concerning Christ. Here are two at least. But there was only one covenant of promise. In Ephesians ii. 13 Paul speaks of covenants of promise. There was a plurality of covenants of promise. These were two. A covenant of promise concerning a temporal seed, temporal inheritance, a temporal kingdom of which God was to be king, and temporal blessings. Also a covenant of promise of a spiritual

seed. Christ and all who had faith like Abraham, a spiritual inheritance, a spiritual kingdom, the church over which Christ was to be king, and spiritual blessings. The issue is, to which was circumcision attached? My opponent says the covenant of promise, concerning the spiritual seed. He claims that the covenant, in Genesis xvii., is the covenant concerning the spiritual seed. He must do so to make anything of his argument, for circumcision is connected with this alone.

His whole argument is based on the language of the covenant. He infers it first from "my" being used instead of "a." God says it is my covenant. All covenants he made were his covenants. He calls the covenant he made with the Israelites, at Horeb, his covenant, and no one claims that it was a spiritual covenant. Next his name should be changed to Abraham. Well, now, what argument is there in that? Jacob's name was changed to Israel, hence the conversation of the angel with him was a spiritual covenant. He should make him a father of many nations. So he was independent of his spiritual seed. Kings should proceed from him. So they did independent of his spiritual seed. The covenant was called an everlasting covenant. So it was. As long as the Israelites kept the covenant, they were to have its blessings, and the covenant at Horeb and Moab was to be forever. He was to be their God. So he was in a peculiar sense over all Israel, entirely independent of the spiritual seed. The inheritance was an everlasting inheritance. So was the inheritance spoken of in Genesis xiii. 15, and at Horeb and Moab.

But Abraham was a stranger in this inheritance, a mere sojourner. Did my opponent observe the force of this? Abraham a mere sojourner, a stranger in the eternal heavenly inheritance. Abraham was a stranger and a sojourner in the land of Canaan, where he then was. But God said he would give this land to Abraham, and Abraham never had possession of the land of Canaan. He had in promise. The prophets speak of the land of Canaan as the land God gave to Abraham. A man often buys for his children the right to a piece of land, and we say the land is his, though he never enters into possession, because he bought and paid for it. Thus have we found every item of this covenant to be temporal and fleshly, and to the fleshly seed.

We now present these objections to regarding this as the covenant concerning the spiritual seed.

1. It is nearly identical in language, and precisely the same in ideas, with Genesis xiii. and xv., and no one regards them as having any connection with the spiritual seed.

2. While the covenant concerning Christ is known by that name, Stephen calls this the covenant of circumcision, an entirely different name.

3. The inheritance spoken of here was an earthly inheritance, for it was the land of Canaan in which Abraham then was, and in which he ever remained a stranger and sojourner. All its items were earthly. It was a repetition of Genesis xiii. and xv., for the purpose of placing an external work on those who should be entitled to the privileges of the earthly inheritance, and to designate Isaac as the one through whom these blessings were to descend.

4. The gentleman spiritualizes everything but the circumcision; this he makes literal. He spiritualizes everything else, and things which are undeniably temporal and fleshly, because his theory demands it, and when he comes to circumcision he literalizes that, violating his own rule because his position demands it. An interpretation, so manifestly made to suit the emergency, and so contradictory, does not need a moment's consideration.

5. Lastly—and we call particular attention to this—the words, "In thee, and in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," which are always quoted in the New Testament as the words of the covenant concerning the spiritual seed, and which they call the covenant concerning Christ, are not in this entire chapter. Hence that covenant is not here, and circumcision has no connection with it whatever. Now, I hope that disposes of this talk about Genesis xvii. being the covenant concerning the spiritual seed. But when was that covenant given? What were the words of that covenant? Paul gives it in Galatians iii. In the eighth verse he calls it the gospel: "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In the sixteenth and seventeenth verses he calls this the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed. In Hebrews vi. 13 he repeats the entire language of the covenant. Zachariah, in Luke i. 72, 73, repeats the same language in substance, and calls it the covenant with Abraham, and concerning the spiritual seed by his language.

Where do we find this language? In Genesis xii. and xxii., to Abraham; and Genesis xxvi., to Isaac; and Genesis xxviii., to Jacob. In Psalms cv. the Psalmist speaks of the covenant concerning the temporal seed and inheritance contained in Genesis xii., xxvi., xxviii., and calls it a covenant with an oath to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But can not we limit it further? Is not the covenant concerning the spiritual seed ever separated from that concerning the temporal seed? In Galatians iii. Paul speaks of the covenant concerning the spiritual seed alone. Zachariah does so in Luke i. 72, 73, and calls it a covenant with an oath. In Hebrews vi. 13 Paul gives the entire language of the covenant concerning the spiritual seed, and calls it a covenant confirmed with an oath. Where do we find this language quoted by Paul on two occasions, and by Zachariah, and called the covenant concerning Christ, concerning the spiritual seed, and the covenant confirmed with an oath; and where do we find the language thus given and confirmed with an oath? It reads as given by Paul and Zachariah, "In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens, and the sand which is on the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Where do we find this, and confirmed with an oath? In Genesis xv.? No. In Genesis xxii. This, then, was the covenant concerning the spiritual 'seed, given when Isaac was sacrificed in a figure, typical of the sacrifice of Christ the spiritual seed, of whom Isaac was a type. Here is where Abraham was justified, as we read in James ii., by his faith and his works.

The gentleman says this was not a covenant. We have quoted from Paul and Zachariah. who call it a covenant, giving the very lan-

guage given here, and here alone. He says no covenant was confirmed with an oath. We read from Psalms cv. that God's promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are called a covenant confirmed with an oath, and from Paul and Zachariah that the covenant concerning the spiritual seed was confirmed in this manner. We have these plain declarations of God's word, affirming, in explicit and positive terms, what we have said. The gentleman denies what God's word says. You can believe whom you will, I will believe God, even though he should overturn my opponent's long-spun theory.

We submit these proofs that the covenant on Mt. Moriah is the covenant concerning the spiritual seed.

1. It alone contains the exact language given by Paul on two occasions, and Zachariah as the language of the covenant concerning the spiritual seed. They give the words of that covenant; we find them alone here, and nowhere else.

2. This covenant was confirmed with an oath; so was the covenant concerning the spiritual seed. The one in which circumcision is mentioned was not. God himself also speaks of this as the covenant he swore to Abraham, and in no place has he clearly stated, when making the oath, that he had done so. He formally repeats his oath, "By myself I have sworn." This, we think, should settle that matter.

Now, a word in reference to chronology. My opponent attempts to count back from Horeb, or the giving of the law at Sinai, and confirmed at Horeb, to the covenant of circumcision just 432 years. He goes to Galatians iii. 17 and learns that the law came 430 years after the covenant concerning Christ, hence the covenant of circumcision is the covenant concerning Christ. I said I could as easily count to Mt. Moriah eighteen years after. He objects, and gives a seemingly conclusive mathematical solution. He follows Usher's chronology, found in the margin of the Bible, which contradicts Josephus, and has been exploded long ago. Usher gives 428 years from the flood to the calling of Abraham. Infidels want to know how, in so short a time, such great empires, with armies of millions, like the Egyptian, and Assyrian, and Median, and Indian, could have sprung up. Josephus gives double that period, and modern research has led to the same conclusion. Usher makes the children of Israel stay in Egypt 215 years. They went in seventy souls and came out at least 3,000,000, for there were 600,000 warriors alone. Mankind doubles in twenty years. That would give them less than 150,000—less than one-twentieth what was given as their number God said to Abraham they should be in bondage in Egypt 400 years. In Exodus xii. we are told they were in Egypt 430 years to a day Making out chronologies from genealogies is very unsatisfactory and unreliable. In the genealogy of Christ Luke gives seven more generations in one place than Matthew, showing that there were different ways of giving genealogies.

We come now to the question: "What made Abraham father of the faithful?" Fleshly circumcision might make him father of those who had fleshly circumcision, but not of those who were never circumcised, and were like him only in having like faith. But does it not say, "He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the faith had when uncircumcised, that he might be the father of them that be-

lieved, though they were uncircumcised also?" Yes it does; but the question is, does circumcision make him the father of the faithful, or his faith of which circumcision was a seal? Now, it is as plain as two and two are four, that whatever makes us children of Abraham makes Abraham our father. In Galatians iii. 7, 26-29, we are positively told that faith makes the faithful children of Abraham; hence faith made Abraham father of the faithful. Circumcision was a seal to Abraham of his faith, which made him father of the faithful.

Let me illustrate. I purchase and pay for a piece of land. I receive a deed. It has to be stamped to be valid. The stamp gives validity to the document, and I say to the one giving it to me, it must be stamped to make me owner of the land. Does the stamp make me owner, or does the deed? The deed makes me owner, and the stamp gives validity to the deed. In like manner faith made Abraham father of the faithful, and circumcision was the seal of his faith. Circumcision did not make him father of the faithful. It gave prominence to his faith which made him father just as the seal to any document gives prominence to it, but the seal does not do what is done by the document.

Circumcision was a sign and seal of faith to those under the covenant of grace in the old dispensation, and was given to children; hence baptism, the sign and seal of faith, should be administered to children under the same covenant of grace in the new dispensation. So says sectarian theology.

In the first place, as we have shown, circumcision had nothing to do with the covenant of grace. It was connected solely with a temporal covenant.

Secondly. It was not a sign and a seal to any one but Abraham. The sign of circumcision was to him a seal of faith. How could it be a sign and seal of faith to babes who never had any faith? How could it be a sign and seal of faith to heathen servants bought from the heathen round about with money? God says it was a token that the person was entitled to the blessings of his covenant, the temporal blessings.

Thirdly. The two dispensations have not the same covenant. One had the old, the first, the law given at Sinai, which was done away. The other had the second, the new covenant, given at Sion, the gospel, which abides forever.

Fourthly. Baptism is not the sign of our faith. Jesus, Paul, John and James tell us that all acts of obedience to the law of Christ are signs that we are his, and are signs of our faith. Paul tells us that the Holy Spirit is our seal, the seal of our faith. Eph. i. 14 and iv. 30. That again disposes of that theological fiction which jingles so nicely in the hands of my opponent.

Next we have a mystical talk about circumcision as a type and spiritual circumcision. Circumcision in Genesis xvii. was a type of spiritual circumcision mentioned in Romans ii. 27, 28, Philippians iii. 3, and Colossians ii. 11. That is true, and we accept it gladly. It destroys all connection between circumcision and baptism. If circumcision is a type of cutting off the fleshly desires of the heart, it can not be a type of an entirely different thing, baptism, as the gentleman

has been contending. It has no connection with, and no reference to baptism. We are making progress.

But Abraham was a father of circumcision. Of what kind? Of both kinds; but in some only he is called father. Not of that mentioned in Genesis xvii., but of this spiritual circumcision, for the apostle is talking to those who are uncircumcised with that fleshly circumcision. What made him father of this circumcision." His fleshly circumcision? No. That made him father of all who had the fleshly circumcision. His faith, or his spiritual circumcision, of which his earthly circumcision was a seal only, made him father of the spiritual circumcision.

Again, if the circumcision was spiritual in Abraham's children it was in him, and if the circumcision which made him father of the spiritual circumcision was spiritual, either the circumcision in Genesis xvii. can not be that circumcision which made him father of the spiritual circumcision, or that was spiritual also, and babes were to be spiritually circumcised at eight days old. No; it was his faith, of which fleshly circumcision was only a seal, that made him father of the faithful, and his spiritual circumcision of which his fleshly circumcision was only a type, that made him father of the spiritual circumcision.

I am asked to prove that Abraham's servants, and all captives taken in war who became slaves of the Jews, and all slaves that they bought from the nations round about them, were not converted to the Israelitish faith. It is no part of my work to do so. He asserts circumcision was a sign and seal of faith to all who received it. I bring up these and ask him if it could be to them? To show that it could be he must show that they had this faith. Instead of doing so he asks me to show they had not this faith. He has produced one argument: Abraham commanded or governed his servants. Indeed! I think every slaveholder in the South commanded his slaves. Then of course all Methodist master's slaves belonged to the Methodist Church, for did not he command them? Out with such nonsense.

Now look at the reasonableness of his assumption, that it "was a sign and seal of faith to all Jewish slaves. When the Jews took captives in war they became their slaves, and they circumcised them before adding to their household or estate. Our opponent would have you believe that the Jew always went through a course of religious instruction, and converted his captives before he circumcised them and put them to service. Suppose they did not receive his instructions? What then? Did they go free? I fear but few would have been converted. Then when an Israelite bought slaves of the heathen round about him he held a protracted meeting and converted them before trying them? Who would believe such nonsense? And yet you must, to accept my friend's theory that circumcision was a sign and seal of faith to all who received it. God says it was to Abraham's fleshly seed, through Isaac and Jacob, a token that they were entitled to the temporal privileges of this earthly, temporal covenant. It was on the slave a token that he belonged to an Israelitish master, and was administered because he was in the Jewish nation, and of course enjoyed some of these temporal blessings, and should have the token God re-

quired of all who enjoyed them. The word of God is very plain, but my opponent makes it look through his spiritual discerning-stone like men as trees walking.

We come next to the good olive-tree in Romans ix. My opponent attempts to prove that this is the same as the vineyard mentioned in Matthew xxi. No, he merely asserts it. He does not condescend to prove it. The vineyard was the church. I know his object. Christ says I am the vine, and ye are the branches. The Jewish nation was called a vineyard. The Christian Church is called a vine, hence the Jewish nation was a church, and was identical with the Christian Church. They are the same church; under the same covenant children were entitled to the seal of faith in one, and they are to the seal of faith in the other.

Now, in the first place, the Jewish nation and the vineyard were not the same; therefore, if the church was the vineyard the Jews were not of it. Away goes that jingling analogy. The vineyard was something intrusted to the Jews. What was that? Paul tells us in Romans ii. 1-2, and in ix. 4, it was the oracles, covenants, promises, adoption and glory of being the peculiar nation over whom God ruled as a ruler. He tells the Ephesians, in Eph. ii. 13, that these were extended to them. He also says they were taken from the Jews who rejected them in Christ and given to the Gentiles.

Now, what was the good olive-tree? My friend has it the circumcised Jewish nation, or churches, as he calls it. What Jews were ever broken off from the old circumcision for unbelief? When were the believing Gentiles added or grafted into the circumcised Jewish nation? Such must have been the case, according to my opponent's theory.

Now, what was the olive-tree, and when were the Jews broken off, and when were the Gentiles grafted in? I know of no passage of scripture concerning which there has been more nonsense talked than this. In Jeremiah xxxi. 31, God promises to make a new covenant with the Jews. In Daniel ix. it is said Christ would confirm this covenant in the midst of the last week, or about thirty-five years before the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ, in Matthew xxvi. 28, says his blood is the blood of this covenant. In Ephesians ii. 13 Paul tells the Ephesians that they had been strangers to the covenants of promise, that is the one made with Abraham concerning Christ, and the one promised in Jeremiah, till Christ broke down the middle wall of partition and brought them into these covenants. The apostles were to offer the new covenant to the Jews first, and afterward to the Gentiles. They did so, and all Jews who accepted had the covenant ratified, and those who did not were rejected and broken off because of unbelief. The Gentiles were grafted in at the house of Cornelius, and wherever the gospel was offered to them and accepted.

But we have instances of the rejection or breaking off of the Jews on the grafting in of the Gentiles. Acts xiii. Paul preached the gospel or offered the new covenant to the Jews, and when they met a second time "the Jews, filled with envy when they saw the multitudes, spoke against those things that were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming." Then Paul and Barnabas waxed very bold and said: "It was necessary that the word of God should be first spoken



to you." Yes, the covenant belonged to them first. Now, we read of their being broken off and the grafting in of the Gentiles: "But seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, we turn to the Gentiles.'

Acts xviii 5. At Corinth "Paul was pressed in the spirit and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ, and when they opposed themselves and blasphemed he shook his raiment and said, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean." Here they were cut or broken off for unbelief. "From henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles." Here the Gentiles were grafted in.

Acts xxviii. Paul called all the Jews in Rome together, and reasoned from morning till evening that Jesus was the Messiah of the prophets. Some believed and some believed not. Paul then said: "Well spake the Holy Spirit by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say unto them, hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand; seeing ye shall see and not perceive: for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Thus the Jews were, by Paul, declared to be broken off because of unbelief.

"Be it known, therefore, unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and they will hear it." Here the Gentiles were grafted in. Then the good olive-tree was God's new covenant in Christ, which belonged to them. When they disbelieved they were broken off and the Gentiles grafted in.

My opponent denies that the Jews had one covenant and the Christian Church another.- One strong objection to all modern sectarianism is that it Judaizes Christianity. It subordinates the gospel to the law, makes the Son of God subordinate to Moses, and makes the glorious kingdom of Christ a sort of back-kitchen to what it calls a Jewish Church. We hope to expose that thoroughly before we are through with this proposition. We will now show that the Jewish nation had one covenant and the Christian Church another.

Jer. xxxi. 31-34: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a 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 all shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Here are two covenants, one made with the house of Israel at Sinai, and confirmed at Horeb and Moab. This was the covenant of the Jewish nation or church, as my opponent calls it. God promised a new and better covenant, different from the old. Let us see if we can

learn more of it. In Daniel ix. we learn that Christ shall confirm the covenant for one week with the people, or many of his people. This was not the Jewish covenant, for that was confirmed at Horeb, Sinai and Moab. Christ was to be cut off in the midst of the week, which places it near his crucifixion.

In Matthew xxvi. 28, Jesus calls his blood the blood of the new covenant; hence this new covenant confirmed or sealed by the blood of Christ in his crucifixion. In Galatians iv. Paul represents the old or first covenant given from Sinai by Hagar the bondwoman, and the new covenant given by the apostles from Sion on the day of Pentecost by Sarah the freewoman. He says: "The scriptures saith, Cast out the bondwoman, and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." The old covenant of the Jewish nation was cast out, and the new covenant has the inheritance, and yet my opponent says they have one covenant and are one church!

We can not read all that is said in Hebrews viii., ix., x., but the substance is that the old covenant was done away, and the new, which Paul quotes in the exact language of Jeremiah, was the covenant of the Christian Church, Christ's house, over which he was master. The covenant on Horeb and Sinai is called the old, is said to be done away. The covenant from Sion is the new, and abides forever. Paul also calls the old covenant or law the letter which kills, and the gospel the spirit which makes alive. If we have not shown that the Jewish nation and Christian Church have two entirely different covenants, how can it be done?

My opponent next introduced a quotation from Acts xv. 16, to anticipate, as he said, an argument, to set aside one that I would yet bring in, denying the identity of the Jewish and Christian Churches. My opponent had better pay more attention to his affirmative. It certainly needs all his time and efforts, judging from his success so far. Attend to your affirmative, my friend. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. I have already incidentally pretty much disposed of this church identity. I have shown that there never was a Jewish Church. He has made but one attempt to prove that there was one. He has quoted from Acts vii. 38, where the common version has "the church in the wilderness." The word translated here "church" means originally an assembly or concourse, without reference to character. In Acts xix. 37 it is applied to a city public meeting, or a town meeting, as we would call it. In Acts vii. 38 it means merely the congregation or organization in the wilderness, and has no reference to religious character. My opponent has not told me whether all the rebellious idolatrous Israelites in the wilderness were members of the church in the wilderness or not.

Now we will read Acts xv. 16. God says: "I will return and build up again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." The argument for identity is that the tabernacle of David is the Jewish Church, and when set up again it was the Christian Church, and they are identical. Now it does not follow that they are the same. When a man tears

down a log house and builds a brick, are they the same? They are his house, but a different house.

But the tabernacle of David was not the Jewish nation, or, as my opponent has it, the Jewish Church. Greenfield gives as a meaning of *skeenee*, translated here tabernacle, and he refers to this place, family, lineage, race. It was the family of David which had fallen from its position as rulers of Israel. Since Zedekiah there had been no prince on the throne of David. His family had fallen down When was it restored? Peter tells us, in Acts ii., "that God raised up Jesus and exalted him to sit on his (David's) throne," thus performing his promise to him, building again his tabernacle, or, as it should be, restoring again his lineage to his throne.

But at last my opponent has found a thus saith the Lord for infant sprinkling. Give ear, O heavens! and listen, O earth! while he reads it: "Jesus took little children in his arms and blessed them;" therefore you are all to have your babies sprinkled! "Jesus took a little child and set it in the midst of them, and said, Except ye become as a little child ye can not enter the kingdom of heaven;" therefore little children should be elders and preachers in our churches. When children cried "Hosanna," Jesus said to the Pharisees: "Have ye not read: Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise;" therefore children should lead our congregations in songs and prayer. Do you cry nonsense? Is it as gross as that which says: "Jesus took little children in his arms and blessed them; therefore babes, all babes, are to be sprinkled?"

Of such is the kingdom of heaven. Exactly. Babes are sprinkled in heaven; therefore babes are sprinkled on earth. No, of such will Christ's church be. What is Christ's church? Little babes? Oh, no; Christ's church is composed of those who are childlike, teachable, humble, meek and innocent in disposition. Exactly, then; those who have that disposition would be entitled to baptism. Then had this any connection with baptism, or was not baptism an ordinance belonging to those in the church?

But baptism does belong to those in the church, and infants having such a disposition as they are, to have and pure, are entitled to baptism. So reasons my opponent. Infants being such as those in the church must be, are graciously entitled to the Lord's Supper and membership, and all the privileges of the church. But who were in Christ in the apostles' day? How did they come in, and who were entitled to baptism? Gal. iii. 26-27:

"26. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

"27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

It seems it was only those who had faith, who were baptized, and by baptism they come into Christ, and put on Christ; hence baptism is not an ordinance for those in the church, but for those who are to be brought into the church. We will show in due time that the law prescribing how Christ's church should be organized, positively excludes infants from baptism.

Now let me ask you, in conclusion, where is the scripture, where is the example or precept for infant sprinkling? My opponent has

talked about types and covenants and the genius and spirit of Christianity, but what has that to do with the question? Has he shown any connection yet? Suppose circumcision was a sign and seal under the Abrahamic covenant, does it follow infants are to be baptized? The rites instituted in early ages, in Ur of the Chaldees, or in the heathen land of Canaan, have no binding force on us. Those were all abrogated by Christ. Why go back then, when he admits that baptism was not a duty till two thousand years after that remote period? No, it is a Christian duty, he says; then let him give us an apostolic precept or example, for I can find one for every Christian duty. Why not for a duty so universal as this?—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I think you must by this time have become convinced that my opponent, Mr. Braden, is a very wonderful man—and also a very singular man. He knows exactly what course of argument I ought to pursue in the affirmative. He knows that I have not presented a single argument in support of my proposition, and that I have not touched the question in debate! If I have not brought forward a single argument, then he has talked himself hoarse in replying to nothing! [Laughter.] I wish you to remember that in the outset he admitted that if I proved that infant baptism was demanded by the nature of things, I proved my proposition by the highest authority. I will not allow him to escape from that admission.

When I proved the evangelical character of the covenant of circumcision, which commanded and instituted the relation of infants to the visible church of God, which is recognized by baptism, I proved that infant baptism is demanded by the nature of the covenant of grace. This establishes my proposition, Mr. Braden being judge.

Let us now for a moment review the argument as far as presented, and see just how it stands. We must go back once more to the covenant of circumcision, just long enough to show that my opponent is indeed a wonderful genius. I knew he would get into trouble in attempting to reply to my argument here, for I knew he was sailing near a very rocky shore, and I expected to run his vessel on a reef, or strand it among the breakers, but his vessel has been run high and dry upon the shore for once. [Laughter.] God's eternal truth is too strong for the sophistry of its opponents.

The gentleman tells us the covenant of circumcision was a temporal covenant, and that there was nothing spiritual in it at all. But I proved by the Apostle Paul, that Abraham was constituted "the father of all them that believe," by that covenant. To prove this Paul quotes the exact language of that covenant: "I have made thee a father of many nations." No where else in the Old Testament is this language found, but in the covenant of circumcision.

Paul, in the fourth chapter of Romans, declares that all believers are the children of Abraham. Where does he go to get the proof of this? He goes to the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, and quotes the

exact language of the covenant of circumcision, "For a father of many nations have I made thee."

Now, if Abraham was constituted the father of believers under the gospel by the covenant of circumcision, then surely there must be something spiritual in it. I think even Mr. Braden can see a thing that is so plain as this.

I have not been able to get my opponent to look at the fact that Abraham received the seal of circumcision, for the especial purpose of constituting him "the father of all them that believe," and that, consequently, the spiritual seed was secured by the covenant of circumcision. I will read the passage once more for I wish the gentleman to look at it until he gets the film removed from his eyes, so that he can see the true teachings of Gad's word:

"And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also

"And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised."

Does this passage say that faith constituted Abraham "the father of all them that believe," or does it say that circumcision constituted him "the father of all them that believe?" Which, I ask, does it say? I will let the gentleman himself read the passage, and explain it for us, and tell us exactly what Paul here says! But I shall certainly follow Paul; those can follow Mr. Braden who choose.

There is another fact set forth by Paul in this passage, that I have been unable to get my opponent to look at, and that is: How did circumcision constitute Abraham the father of circumcision to them that believe under the gospel, unless the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace? The believer under the gospel has nothing to do with circumcision, and yet Abraham was constituted "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision." How is Abraham "the father of circumcision" to believers under the gospel? There is no way under heaven for Abraham to be "the father of circumcision" to believers under the gospel, but by bringing believers under the gospel into the covenant of circumcision; for circumcision was not given to believers under the gospel. Now I want my opponent to look at this passage, and see if he can not see something spiritual in the covenant of circumcision.

You remember that Abraham's name was changed from Abram to Abraham, at the giving of the covenant of circumcision; and this change of name indicated the new relation that Abraham was placed in by that covenant, for God says, "A father of many nations have I made thee," and Paul says that this refers to the believers under the gospel becoming the children of Abraham. These were the seed that were promised, and secured to Abraham by the covenant of circumcision. Was there nothing spiritual here? Just look at it, if you please. I want to know if all this could be the case, and yet there be nothing spiritual in the covenant of circumcision?

The gentleman made one admission in his last speech for which I

thank him. He admitted that circumcision was a type or sign of the cutting off of the evil and impure desires of the heart. He told us at first that circumcision was simply a national mark, and that "it secured only the temporal inheritance to Abraham's seed." But now he comes up like a man, and confesses that he was mistaken.

I showed you in my opening speech that circumcision was the sign of a new heart. My opponent now says "it was a sign of the cutting off of the evil and impure desires of the heart!" Now what is the difference between us? The gentleman has admitted that my position is correct. But circumcision was also "a seal of the righteousness of faith." My opponent tells us that it was a "seal of the righteousness of faith only to Abraham." This I admitted. But it sealed him "the father of all them that believe, and the father of circumcision to all them that believe." Now I ask, how under heaven it happened that God Almighty could make such a mistake as to put a sign and seal of spiritual blessings, regeneration, and the "righteousness of faith," to a covenant that only secured temporal blessings? Such a thing could not be. There must be an agreement between the covenant and its sign and seal.

But the gentleman told us that in the twenty-second chapter of Genesis, God made a covenant with Abraham, and that this was the spiritual covenant—the covenant of grace in Christ Jesus. But I ask how many covenants did God make with Abraham? How many kinds of seed did God promise and secure to Abraham? Abraham had a literal and a spiritual seed. The literal seed promised was the children of Israel, and the spiritual seed is all believers in Christ. To the literal seed was secured the earthly inheritance, and to the spiritual seed he promised and secured the heavenly inheritance. The two covenants made with Abraham, the one securing the earthly inheritance to the literal seed, recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis; and the other, with Abraham and his spiritual seed, securing the heavenly inheritance, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, are all the covenants that God ever made with Abraham. If there were a covenant made with Abraham on Mt. Moriah, recorded in the twenty-second chapter of Genesis, then God made three covenants with Abraham!

But the gentleman has not removed the chronological difficulty yet that I showed was in his way, in regard to the transactions on Mt. Moriah. It was but about 380, instead of 430, years from the offering up of Isaac, until the giving of the law. Why does he not remove this difficulty? The truth is, the gentleman has asserted what is wholly untrue in regard to this chronological period. He has got into a difficulty from which it is impossible for him to extricate himself.

My opponent next appealed to Psalm cv. 8—11:

"8. He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations.

"9. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac;

"10. And confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant:

"11. Saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance "

But this passage does not even speak of the making of a covenant at the time Abraham offered up Isaac. Indeed there is no allusion whatever to that transaction. Here it is simply declared that the covenant made with Abraham was confirmed by an oath to Isaac and Jacob, without intimating when the covenant was made with Abraham at all. As I showed before, there was no covenant made with Abraham on Moriah. The covenant which was made before, and recorded in Genesis xvii., was here confirmed with an oath. Gen. xxii.:

"15. And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time,

"16. And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son thine only son:

"17. That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies;

"18. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice."

Here is the whole transaction, and there is nothing of the nature of a covenant in it. This was simply a confirmation of the covenant by the oath of God to Abraham, which was afterward also confirmed by oath to Isaac and to Jacob. I hope my opponent will get some clear idea of the covenants yet before we get through with the discussion. If the transaction on Mt. Moriah was a covenant, then, as I have showed, God made three covenants with Abraham. But I have proved demonstrably that God made but two covenants with Abraham one in the fifteenth and the other in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis. The one concerning the earthly inheritance to the literal seed, and the other constituting Abraham "the father of all them that believe," and my opponent ought to know it, if he does not know it already.

The only objection that can be urged against my position on the covenant of circumcision is found in the third specification of that covenant:

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

But you remember that in my opening speech, I showed incontrovertibly that the earthly Canaan was the type of the heavenly inheritance; and that under this type was here promised to Abraham, and his spiritual seed, the heavenly inheritance. I showed, also, that the earthly Canaan was never given to Abraham, or his spiritual seed as an inheritance; but the Canaan here promised was given as a possession jointly to Abraham and his spiritual seed. I showed, also, that if the heavenly inheritance were not promised to Abraham under this type, he had no promise of a heavenly inheritance at all.

Then I showed that it is a universally established rule of interpretation that "that is often affirmed of the type, which is only true of the antitype, and *vice versa*." To this argument my opponent has made

no attempt at reply, for he knows perfectly that there can be no reply made to it; for when I prove that the Canaan here promised was secured as a possession jointly to Abraham and his spiritual seed, I prove that it is the heavenly inheritance, and not the earthly Canaan that is promised.

Now, again I ask, how many covenants did God make with Abraham? Two, and only two, one recorded in Genesis xv., concerning the temporal inheritance, the other recorded in Genesis xvii., which God styles "my covenant," and is declared to be "an everlasting covenant," securing the heavenly inheritance; and by which Abraham was constituted: 'the father of all them that believe, and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision.'" This I intend to keep before the gentleman, for I want him to understand the truth.

I asked my opponent if circumcision were a national mark, and only secured the temporal inheritance, why was it put upon Ishmael, the sons of Keturah, Esau, and the servants of Abraham? None of these belonged to the nation of Israel, nor did any of them have any part or lot in the earthly inheritance. Why then did they receive the sign and seal of the earthly inheritance? I press this question again upon the gentleman's attention. Why did God himself command that the sign and seal of the temporal covenant and inheritance should be put upon these persons, and yet they were never entitled to any part of it? Will my opponent tell me why? He will not for one moment contend that any of Abraham's posterity were included in the temporal covenant, and heirs of the temporal inheritance, but the children of Jacob, who went down into Egypt. None but this line of Abraham's posterity were included in the promise of the earthly Canaan, and yet all of Abraham's children and servants were circumcised by the divine command. If circumcision were only the sign of the temporal covenant, and the seal of the earthly inheritance whenever it was placed upon any of Abraham's posterity, except through the line of Isaac and Jacob, it was a perpetual falsehood by divine appointment. To such blasphemous conclusions does the gentleman's position lead us!

The covenant of circumcision was given to the house of Israel at Mt. Sinai, at the time of the giving of the law, and the law was added to that covenant, as Paul tells us, Gal. iii. 19. This is represented by Christ in the parable of the vineyard, as the letting out the vineyard to husbandmen, and by Paul by the parable of the olive-tree. The covenant of circumcision is the olive-tree, the Jews, the natural descendants of Abraham, or the natural branches.

But the gentleman told us that God said he would make a "new covenant with the house of Israel," and he would have us believe that the "old covenant" made with the house of Israel was the covenant of circumcision, and that this covenant was set aside by the "new covenant." Let us turn to the prophecy of Jeremiah xxxi. 31-3-1, and read what he says concerning this "new covenant: "

"31. 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:

"32. 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 a husband to them, saith the Lord:

"33. 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.

"34. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

This "new covenant" was to be made with the "house of Israel and the house of Judah," and the covenant it was to set aside was not the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham, and into which believers are brought under the gospel, but the covenant made with "the house of Israel at Mt. Sinai." My opponent will not contend that the "new covenant" here, never had an existence before, for he agrees with me that God made the covenant of grace with Abraham, and that the "new covenant" made with the house of Israel was the covenant of grace. It is here spoken of as "new" in contrast with the Sinaitic covenant, because it brought Israel into a new relation.

I proved that literal circumcision was a type of spiritual circumcision, or regeneration. Mr. Braden says "it was a type of the cutting off of the impure desires of the heart." What is the difference between us here? Circumcision was then the type of spiritual blessings. Mr. Braden being judge!

I come next to the question of Abrahamic and Hebrew servitude.

It is a well-known historical fact that slavery proper never existed in the family of Abraham, nor in the house of Israel. That servitude was a matter of contract, and of limited duration. The servants of Abraham did not descend to Isaac and Jacob, as Bible history shows. Hebrew servitude was limited at furthest by the year of jubilee, and the freed servant passed at once from the state of servitude to a citizen of the commonwealth. But Mr. Braden says they were property; but they were not absolute or hereditary property. But he tells us if a Hebrew smote his servant, and he died after a certain time, he was not punished. And is not this the law in every civilized land? But if a Hebrew smote his servant, and he died under his hand, he suffered death for it, just as in any other case of murder. The Hebrews were not allowed to bring any person into their families who would not submit to obey the law, and become a worshiper of the true God.

But I must take up the gentleman's exposition of the parable of the olive-tree. He told us the olive-tree was the "new covenant" made with the house of Israel. But how, I ask, did the unbelieving Jews become the natural branches of the "new covenant?" I want to know what relation they sustained to the "new covenant?" I want to know who are the natural branches of the new covenant? What is that new covenant? Is it the covenant of grace made with Abraham? If so, then it is the covenant of circumcision, for I

have demonstrably proved that the covenant of circumcision was the covenant of grace. If the new covenant, which the gentleman tells us is represented by the olive-tree, never had an existence before, then the unbelieving Jews could not be the natural branches, for this covenant, as the gentleman himself tells, was made only with believers, in whose heart the law of God is written. According to his exposition of the olive-tree, the Jews were the natural branches of a tree upon which they had never grown! But this is not all. The unbelieving Jews were broken off from a tree to which they never belonged, and of which they were never branches at all! His exposition of the olive-tree, makes the most infinite nonsense of the passage. The unbelieving Jews were the natural branches of the olive-tree, and these natural branches were broken off from their own olive-tree, and when they returned to God, they were grafted back again into the tree from which they had been broken off.

The gentleman also tells us that "the tabernacle of David" which had "fallen down" (Acts xv. 16), and which was again "setup," is the "new covenant." He substitutes "taken down," for "fallen down." But in this passage we have the positive assurance that the kingdom "set up" in Daniel is the "tabernacle of David"—the church in which David lived, which had "fallen down," in its purity of doctrine and spirituality of its worship, through the traditions of the elders and teachers of the Jews. This church or kingdom is "set up," and the Gentiles are gathered into it. There is no way to escape the truth here by talking about a new covenant for the new covenant is the "tabernacle of David," raised up and restored, into which Jews and Gentiles are gathered under the gospel.

I showed, also, that Christ received and treated infants as members of his kingdom, for he said:

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

He also held up the little child as the model to which the adult must conform, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. This proves clearly that little children are already members of the kingdom of Christ, and ought to be recognized as sustaining that relation to the church of Christ by baptism.

The phrase "kingdom of God," is used in three different significations in the New Testament:

1. It signifies the kingdom of grace in the heart or regeneration.
2. It signifies the church of Christ on earth.
3. It signifies the ultimate kingdom of bliss in the immortal state.

In the passage in Mark x. 14, it does not mean the kingdom of grace in the heart; this my opponent will not contend for a single moment. It can not mean the kingdom of the ultimate glory, for there was no doubt in the minds of the disciples of the salvation of the infants of the Jews; and hence, if he meant heaven proper, it would have been no reason why the children should be permitted to come to him, for they already fully believed they would go to heaven if they died in their infancy. The only meaning that can be attached to the phrase "kingdom of God" here, then, is the church of Christ. This

is unquestionably its meaning, and this passage becomes a positive declaration of Christ, that infants belong to his church. Here we have the positive precept for receiving children into the church by baptism, for Christ expressly declares that they belong to his church. My next argument in support of infant baptism is drawn from the great commission, Matt. xxviii. 19,20. I have shown—

1. That infant baptism is demanded by the nature of things, under the covenant of grace; and that when the covenant of grace was first established in the family of Abraham, infants at eight days old were put into it by divine appointment.

2. I have showed that Christ recognized children as belonging to his kingdom, that he received them, and treated them as belonging to his kingdom.

I shall now, in the third place, show that the great commission, when properly understood, amounts to a positive precept for the baptism of infants. Let us look at the circumstances under which the great commission was given, for a moment. The eleven apostles were all Jews; they had always been accustomed to have their children in church relationship with them. They had never known or heard of a church that had not infants in it. They had never seen a proselyte brought into the Jewish Church, without bringing his children with him, if he had any. Under the Jewish dispensation infant children had always been a part of the church, and the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the teachings of Christ in such passages as the parable of the vineyard, had shown that, under the gospel, all nations were to be gathered into the church in which the prophets and Old Testament saints lived. The Lord Jesus had received infants, and blessed them, and declared to his disciples that they belonged to his kingdom. He had held up the infant as the model to which they must conform, in order that they might enter the kingdom of God; thereby affirming in the most positive manner, that infants belonged to his kingdom or church. Now he commissions his disciples to go forth, and bring the nations into his church or kingdom. He says:

"Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

How, I ask, would the apostles have necessarily understood this command to disciple the nations, circumstanced as they were, and having received the instruction they had received from the Lord relative to the relation children sustained to his church? It would have been impossible for them, circumstanced as they were, to have understood the commission in any other way than to include infants. In the second place, the wording of the commission exactly agrees with the idea of infant baptism. Disciple the nations is the thing commanded to be done. This is to be done by baptizing and teaching them. Baptism stands first in order, and teaching follows after. This is the order in which these two things stand related to each Other in the great commission. Baptism first, and teaching second.

This corresponds exactly with infant baptism, and shows that infant baptism was designed to be perpetual in the church, while adult baptism was designed to be only temporary, just as was circumcision under the former dispensation. The wording of the commission could not have more fully set forth this idea, and, indeed, Alexander Campbell's exposition of the commission corresponds perfectly with the idea of infant baptism set forth in it.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—In my former speech I criticised my opponent's speech, and showed that he was not on the question before us. He retorts by suggesting that it is strange that I should talk myself hoarse in replying to nothing. It reminds me of the remark of the old farmer, who was urged to reply to a wordy assailant of more sound than sense. He replied that he should not, "for it wrenched a man awfully to kick at nothing." In like manner I have talked myself hoarse.

I have looked over my notes carefully, and I find that the notes of my opponent's second speech would answer for his third. There is nothing new. We have reiteration of the same stale irrelevant statements. He begins with a still worse, positive assertion, that circumcision made Abraham father of the faithful, and only strengthens it by a little more noise and slapping of hands. Now it is as clear as sunlight, that whatever made the faithful children of Abraham, made Abraham father of the faithful. In Galatians iii. 7, 26, 27, 28, 29, we are positively and clearly said to be children of Abraham by faith. Then faith made Abraham our father. The sign of circumcision was a seal of Abraham's faith, but faith made him our father. Formerly deeds had to be sealed to be recognized in courts of law. The seal did not make the man owner of the land. It gave validity to the deed, which made the man owner. In like manner, circumcision was a seal to Abraham's faith, but the faith, and not the seal, made him father of the faithful. Now I will notice this quibble no more.

The gentleman insinuates that I dare not notice Genesis xv., where he says we find the covenant concerning the temporal seed and inheritance. I have noticed it, and shown that Genesis xvii. is identical with Genesis xiii. and xv. He admits they speak only of the temporal inheritance and literal seed. Then Genesis xvii., which merely repeats the same language, also refers to the temporal inheritance and literal seed. He at last admits that the inheritance in Genesis xvii. was the earthly Canaan, but it was typical of the heavenly Canaan. Exactly. So the seed was the literal seed, and was only typical of the spiritual seed, and circumcision was connected with a covenant which had no reference to the spiritual seed, and was not a seal of the covenant of grace, but a token of a mere fleshly relation.

My opponent, with a hardihood that I am astonished at, says, that there was no covenant in Genesis xxii., that it is never called a covenant, nor a covenant confirmed with an oath.

Now, though it is a mere repetition of what has been already said, I will place this at rest. In Galatians iii. 9 Paul gives what he calls

the gospel preached to Abraham. We find this language in Genesis xii., where we have a covenant, also in Genesis xxii., where God confirmed it with an oath; also in Genesis xxvi., and in Genesis xxviii. In Genesis xii., xxvi. and xxviii., it is coupled with the promise of a temporal seed and inheritance. David, in Psalm cv., calls the promise of a temporal inheritance, confirmed with an oath to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a covenant confirmed with an oath.

In Galatians iii. 9 Paul gives the language of the covenant, which in the 17th and 18th verses he calls the covenant concerning Christ. In Hebrew vi. 14 he repeats the language and calls it the covenant confirmed with an oath. Zachariah repeats the same, and calls it the covenant confirmed with an oath, in Luke i. 72, 73. The language of this covenant is found alone only in Genesis xxii. It is nowhere else confirmed solemnly and formally with an oath. Hence we urge that this is the covenant specially concerning Christ and the spiritual seed for these reasons:

1. It was given when Isaac, the type of Christ, had been figuratively sacrificed.

2. It alone contains the precise language of the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed, unconnected with any other promise.

3. It alone was confirmed by a formal oath.

4. The Apostle Paul quotes the language of Genesis xxii. on two occasions, and calls it the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed, and the covenant confirmed with an oath. He must mean this, as this alone contains the language separate, and alone was confirmed with an oath.

5. Zachariah quotes this language and calls it the covenant confirmed with an oath, and applies it to Christ. If this does not make the transaction in Genesis xxii. a covenant—the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed, and a covenant confirmed with an oath—

I confess then human language can not do it. I hope now we shall have no more flat denials of the positive declarations of God's word.

We are told that Stephen called the Sinaitic covenant, the covenant of circumcision.

*Mr. Hughey*—I said that Stephen said it was given at Mt. Sinai.

*Mr. Braden*—The meaning is the same. I will now read from Acts vii. 8: "And God gave him (Abraham) the covenant of circumcision." He says nothing about Sinai. He refers to the covenant in Genesis xvii., for he says, "And Abraham begot Isaac, and circumcised him on the eighth day." If the gentleman is not spiked fast beyond caviling by that scripture, it can not be done.

*Mr. Hughey*—I will draw that spike mighty easy.

*Mr. Braden*—I will now for the last time present the arguments against the gentleman's position, that the covenant in Genesis xvii. was the covenant of grace.

1. It has not the name that the scriptures give to that covenant. Paul calls it the covenant concerning Christ. Stephen calls the covenant, in Genesis xvii., the covenant of circumcision.

2. No writer in the scriptures ever refers to the covenant in Genesis xvii. when speaking of the covenant concerning Christ, nor do they ever connect circumcision with the last covenant. They always

refer to Genesis xxii., or the covenant with an oath, when speaking of Christ.

3. The covenant in Genesis xvii. is a repetition of Genesis xiii. and xv., which my opponent admits had no reference to Christ. It is the same covenant repeated that there might be a token given which would mark all who were entitled to its privileges.

4. All the provisions and items were temporal. Abraham was to be a father of many nations; so he was after the flesh. God was to be their God; so he was the national ruler of the Israelites. He would give Abraham a numerous seed; so he did a numerous fleshly seed. He was to inherit the land he was then in, him and his seed; so they did. The token was a fleshly token based on birth, not faith. Faith had nothing to do with it.

5. My opponent's position makes the circumcision literal, admits that the inheritance was earthly, but stultifies itself in making the seed spiritual.

6. The words of the covenant concerning Christ are not in Genesis xvii. at all. The covenant is not there. Now, I hope to hear no more about Genesis xvii. being the covenant concerning Christ or Abraham's spiritual seed.

I know why my opponent has contended so long for this idea; it is the foundation of his whole argument. Circumcision was the sign and seal of the covenant of grace given to Abraham. Baptism is the sign and seal of the same covenant in the Christian Church. Children were proper subjects of the sign and seal of this covenant in the old dispensation; they are also of the sign and seal of the same covenant under the new dispensation. We have shown that circumcision was a sign of no faith, but a token that the person was entitled to the temporal privileges of a covenant that had no connection with the promise of Christ. We have shown that baptism is not the sign, but only one of a multitude of signs of our faith, and is not a seal, but that the Holy Spirit is our seal. The entire foundation has been removed, and the superstructure my opponent has been rearing has toppled about his ears.

The natural branches of the good olive-tree are spoken of again. Now the gentleman admits it is not the church that was represented by the olive-tree, but a covenant. He asserts, however, it was the old covenant, and denies that the Jews ever were in the new covenant, and hence they could not be broken off. As he has admitted that the olive-tree is not the church, his argument for church identity is gone, and we need not answer him further. But we will establish our position now once for all, that the Jews were broken off from the new covenant. Jeremiah xxxi. 31, God tells us he was going to establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, and one entirely different from the old one which they had broken. In Daniel ix. we are told Christ would confirm the covenant with his people (the Jews) for one week—the week before the destruction of Jerusalem. This would place the confirmation from the birth and mission of John the Baptist to the destruction of Jerusalem. This was the new covenant that Christ was to confirm, for the old was confirmed at Sinai, Horeb and Moab.

In Matthew xxvi. 28 Christ tells us that his blood is the blood of the New Testament. In Hebrews viii., ix., x. we are told that Christ is the mediator of the new covenant mentioned in Jeremiah, and that the old was abolished and done away. Christ commanded his disciples to begin at Jerusalem and offer the new covenant to the Jews; for, says Paul, in Romans ix. 4, it belonged to them.

In Acts xiii. 46, xviii. 6, xxviii. 28, we read that the apostles offered the gospel to the Jews first, because as they said the new covenant belonged to them, but when they refused the gospel they told them they had lost the gospel or were broken off from the new covenant, and they would now turn to the Gentiles, as the Gentiles were grafted in. In Acts xxviii. 28 Paul applies this to the whole Jewish people. This clearly shows what the Jews were broken off from. It was not a church, hence the argument for church identity falls to the ground.

My opponent says that because Christ and the language of such is the kingdom, children are members of the church or Christ's kingdom, and are entitled to its ordinances. Christ does not say that they are members, but that members should be such in disposition, humble, meek, innocent and teachable. If they are members, how did they become such? By birth? No, for flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom. If they are entitled to baptism, why not to all privileges of the church? But baptism is not a rite in the church. It is to induct one into Christ, and applies only to those who have faith. Infants do not need it, and it does not belong to them.

Again my opponent can cry, Eureka. He has found infant baptism in the commission! I would as soon look for fire in an iceberg. The disciples were to "go forth and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them (the disciples), into the name of the Father," etc. How were they to make disciples of the nations? By preaching the gospel. How many of the nations were to be discipled? As many as could hear the gospel, for faith comes by hearing the word of God. Who were to be baptized? All who had been discipled or who believed the gospel, and no others. Can the gentleman disciple infants? I will immerse all he can disciple, and refuse to baptize any who have not been discipled, for the Bible requires the baptism of only such as have been discipled.

He tells us that the Jews had never seen a church without infants, and as the disciples were twelve Jews, they would not think of discipling the nations without taking in their children. To this we reply, that the verb our Saviour employed forbids including infants in the act expressed by it. *Matheteuoo* means to instruct one, or impart the truth to him until you make him a believer or a disciple. Can infants be so discipled? Those thus discipled were to be baptized and no others.

Again, the Jews never saw any church. There never was a Jewish Church. There was a Jewish commonwealth, which had a national system of religion intermingled with civil rites and ceremonies, but there was no church. We repeat again, that God never had an organization based on faith and personal piety, which had officers peculiar to itself, and blessed with peculiar blessings, on account of faith and

piety, until the day of Pentecost. There were pious men among the Jews, but they were never separated from the rest of the nation. There was no organization based on piety or no church. The gentleman will have to abandon his church among the Jews, or admit that Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Nadab, Abihu, Phinehas, Hophni, Ahab, and all the sons of Belial were in full fellowship in this church, and there were no means of putting them out. There has been a vast deal of nonsense talked about what never existed, in talking about a Jewish Church.

When the gentleman tells me that the apostles never saw persons come into the church without bringing their children with them, we reply that they never saw persons join any church, for they never saw a church. Christ sent them out to organize the first church ever established, an organization based on an entirely new principle, faith and personal piety, one entirely separate from the world, and peculiar to itself in officers and discipline. In the patriarchal age God had individual followers, but no chosen people and no church. In the Jewish age he had a chosen nation, with a national religion, mixed with civil rites and laws, in which nation were his individual followers, but still not separated from the rest. In the Christian age God has a church, or an organization based on faith and personal piety, in which all his people are separated from the world, and have officers, laws and discipline peculiar to themselves.

We will now lay down this law, that the organic law of Christ's kingdom and its object excludes infants. "Go, disciple all nations, and then baptize the disciples, and teach them to obey all my commands." "He that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved." "Repentance and remission of sins shall be preached among all nations." Such are the three versions of the commission or the organic law of the church. The disciples were to preach the gospel, and by that make believers or disciples of those who heard them as they preached repentance and remission of sins in Christ's name. They were to baptize the disciples or believers, and them only, and then teach them to observe all things Christ had commanded. All this applies to persons who can hear and believe, and those only. You might as well talk of taking children into a Masonic Lodge as into the church of Christ. One requires reason and voluntary action as much as the other.

Again, the objects of the church exclude infants from its ordinances and membership. The new covenant mentioned in Jeremiah was to include only such as had God's law in their hearts, such as needed not to be taught the way of the Lord, for they already knew him. The mission of Christ was to save men from their sins. This he did by the gospel, and the saved were to be added to his church. The mission of the church is to save men from the practice, guilt and consequences of sin. It applies to men only in its ordinances and membership. Infants need neither. The duty of the church to infants is to rear them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. When they are old enough to choose to join the church, then they are entitled to its ordinances and membership, and not till then. They do not need them before.

But, says my friend, baptize, and then teach or make disciples by



baptizing, and then teach them. The word *matheteuoo* means to teach first principles, and make believers or disciples of them. *Didaskoo*, the word after baptism, means to teach morality, rules of conduct or life; hence the very words here employed forbid the use of the words attempted by my opponent

A better understanding of the mission of the church would save my opponent from a great many blunders. The church is not for infants, but persons who need salvation from sin. Christ's atonement removed all original sin, if there ever were such a thing, and infants need no church till they are responsible and can voluntarily join it. I would like to have my opponent tell me if infants are members of the church, why he baptizes them, for, as we have shown, baptism is for those who have faith and are not yet members, and is to bring them into Christ? If infants are in Christ, what do they need of baptism? If they are not members, what right has he to administer baptism to them, to induct them into the church, when they lack faith, the essential prerequisite of baptism?

Again, if infants are church members or are made such by baptism, why does he have them afterward go through a mourner's bench routine, and six months' probation to convert them and bring them into the church. If they were members, when did they cease to be members, or if they never ceased to be members, why does he have to convert them, the same as unbaptized sinners, and then admit them a second time into what they already belong to?

Again, if they are entitled to baptism, why not to the Lord's Supper? Cyprian, the father of infant baptism, and the apologist of sprinkling, did give the Lord's Supper to infants. He was consistent. My opponent is not. The whole practice is a jumble of contradictions and nonsense. It is a secularizing of God's church, and bases membership on flesh or birth, and not on faith and obedience, as God requires. My opponent and his school of theology need to study the object of Christ's church, and its organic law more thoroughly, and the traditions of men less.

We will now begin an argument against church identity, and show that the Christian Church is an entirely new organization, and distinct from the Jewish commonwealth. We will find its origin and show that it is new and different from anything that ever existed before. We do this because the gentleman's course of argument implies the identity of what he calls the Jewish Church and the Christian Church. In the second chapter of Isaiah we have the first prophetic declaration concerning the church: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." From this we learn that the Lord's house or church was yet future—that it was to be established at Jerusalem, and the law of the Lord was to go forth from Zion.

Jer. xxxi. 31-34, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I

will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a 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: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Here we learn that this new covenant was to be entirely different from the one which the Jewish nation or church, as my opponent calls it, had, and that no one should be in that covenant but those who knew the Lord, and were pardoned, or it was to penitent believers alone.

In Daniel ix. 26, 27: "After threescore and two weeks" (from the building of the second temple) "shall Messiah be cut off . . . and he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week . . . and he shall cause sacrifice and oblation to cease in the midst of the week." Here we learn that this new covenant was to be confirmed in the last week of the city of Jerusalem, or about the time of Christ's death, when he should cause Jewish sacrifice to cease by offering himself. Then he was to be anointed or crowned, and his kingdom or the church was to be set up.

David (Psalm ex.) says: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning; thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." Here we learn that a descendant of David or his Lord, the Messiah, was to rule over a willing people—none but willing subjects.

We will next examine the New Testament and show when the law of the Lord went forth from Zion, when this new covenant was confirmed, and when the Messiah was raised up to sit on the throne of David. We'll show that all this is distinct and separate from the Jewish nation.—[*Time expired.*]

*Mr. Hughey*—I am sorry to have to wait so long before I can reply to this position of the gentleman.

#### MR. HUGHEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Before entering upon a reply to the gentleman's speech, which he made on Saturday, in the afternoon, I want to give him credit for presenting one difficulty in the discussion that I am wholly unable to remove. Whenever my opponent presents a difficulty that I can not remove, I think I have candor and honesty enough to make an open confession

of it before the world. And I want this confession recorded to the credit of my friend, Mr. Braden.

You remember that he stated that there was "nothing so hard to do as to strike at nothing." Well, I have seen blind animals before now kick in the wrong direction, and blind men strike in the wrong direction. I can furnish objects to strike at—that is, I can give him facts, arguments and evidence; but intellectual eyesight to see where to strike, so as to meet them, I can not give him. This is a difficulty that he has presented me with that is altogether beyond my power to remove, and I want it recorded to the gentleman's credit. I wish to make but a remark or two in reply to the gentleman's speech, and then proceed with my argument.

You remember that my first position was that "a practice proved to be in accordance with the nature of things, must be scriptural; and that infant baptism rested first for its authority upon the nature of the evangelical covenant." This I proved by showing that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace, into which God put infants at eight days old; thus proving that "infant baptism is in accordance with the nature of things under the covenant of grace." In reply to my argument on the covenant of circumcision, Mr. Braden presented a passage in the twenty-second chapter of Genesis, where God said to Abraham:

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies:

"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

He argued that this was the covenant of grace in Christ Jesus, and that the covenant of circumcision was but a temporal covenant. But I showed that in Genesis xxii. God made no covenant with Abraham at all. In Luke i. 72, 73, where the covenant and oath are both spoken of, it does not say that oath is the covenant. I showed that the covenant was made with Abraham before Isaac was born; and after he had grown up to manhood it was confirmed by the oath of God. The last covenant made with Abraham was the covenant of circumcision recorded in Genesis xvii. This covenant was confirmed afterward by oath, both to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, and afterward to all Israel. Deuteronomy xxix. 10, 13. But my opponent tells us the language, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," is not found in the covenant of circumcision, and therefore it can not be the covenant of grace. But does not the covenant of circumcision contain the language: "I will make thee a father of many," and "a father of many nations have I made thee?" And does not Paul say that this embraces the blessing promised through Abraham's seed to all nations, by showing that this covenant constituted Abraham the father of all believers in all nations? This is expressly affirmed by Paul. Rom. iv. 11-17.

1. Paul here expressly declares that Abraham was sealed the father of all believers by circumcision. But Mr. Braden says Abraham was not sealed the father of all believers by circumcision, but by faith! Here we have Braden *versus* Paul!

2. Paul here expressly declares that Abraham was constituted and sealed "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision."

I have asked the gentleman again and again, how could circumcision constitute Abraham the father of circumcision to believers under the gospel, unless believers under the gospel are brought into the covenant of circumcision? I have been unable to get him to notice this question, and I do not expect him to notice it; for it demonstrably proves that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace, and he can not help but see it.

But the gentleman tells us that, in Acts vii. 8, Stephen does not say that "he gave them the covenant of circumcision," but that "he gave him," that is, Abraham; and then he told you he had me effectually spiked! But I will draw the spike easy enough, as it is a very small tack instead of a large spike. I understood him to read "them" instead of "him," and as I did not look at the passage, I supposed that he read it correctly, and I was thus led into the mistake about the reading of the passage. But this does not affect the argument in the least. Stephen is here relating the dealings of God with the house of Israel. He begins with the call of Abraham, and comes on down with the history of Abraham until he tells us: "And he gave to him the covenant of circumcision." But he does not tell us what he gave him the covenant of circumcision for, nor does he say anything about the nature of the covenant of circumcision. So you see how easily the gentleman's spike comes out. But there were several spikes which I put through the gentleman that he has not got out yet, and which he never will get out. Here is one: Abraham was constituted "the father of circumcision" to all believers under the gospel by circumcision. Let him get this spike out if he can. He can not show Abraham is "the father of circumcision to believers under the gospel," unless believers under the gospel are brought into the covenant of circumcision.

The gentleman tells us infants can not enter into covenant with God! But if you will turn to Deut. xxix. 10-13, you will see where God ratified and confirmed the covenant of circumcision to Israel, and infants were present and entered into the covenant. This must forever settle the question:

"10. Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel,

"11. Your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water:

"12. That thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day:

"13. That he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob."

Now here all Israel, with their "little ones," are brought into the covenant that was confirmed unto "Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob."

Now if the covenant that was confirmed with the oath of God to Abraham, on Mt. Moriah, recorded in Genesis xxii., was the covenant of grace, as my opponent contends it was, then as this same covenant was confirmed unto Israel in the plains of Moab, and their "little ones" were brought into it, are not children included in the covenant of grace, and are they not capable of entering into covenant with God? According to Mr. Braden's own argument, I thus prove that God put infants into the covenant of grace, for he says the covenant made with an oath was the covenant of grace in Christ Jesus, and I thus prove that all Israel, with their "little ones," were brought into this covenant, which was confirmed by the oath of God unto Abraham, which Mr. Braden says was the covenant of grace. This settles the matter, for it proves that infant church membership is in accordance with the nature of things under the covenant of grace, Mr. Braden being judge. Here I have put another spike through him that he will never be able to get out while the world stands. This is a final closing up of the argument on the covenants, in spite of all the gentleman's "turning and twisting." [Laughter.]

He told us that God made "a new covenant with the house of Israel." When did he make that covenant? Put your finger on the place where he made the new covenant with the house of Israel, spoken of in the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, and I am ready to attend to it, sir.

But the gentleman tells us that God never had a church till the setting up of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost. Did he never read in the eighth chapter of the Acts how that Stephen said: "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness?" Collate this passage with Hebrews iii. 5, 6:

"5. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after;

"6. But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end."

Here Christ is a son over his own house, and Moses is a servant in the house. The church of Christ is God's house, over which Christ reigns, and in which Moses, as a servant, lived. We have proved by Stephen that Christ had a church, and by Paul that this church was God's house, and that in this house Moses lived as a servant. Now there is another spike that goes right square through the gentleman.

But he says God only had a nation, not a church, and that holiness was not required as a condition of membership in that nation! But I have proved by Stephen that the house of Israel was a church, and by Paul that it was the church of Christ. Did not God require holiness of his ancient people? I am surprised to hear such a statement made by the gentleman. Did not God call Israel out from among the nations of the earth for the very especial purpose of making them a holy people, and did he not require holiness of every individual member of his ancient church? Read, if you please, Exodus xix. 5, 6:

"5. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine:

"6. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

Also, Leviticus xx. 26:

"26. And ye shall be holy unto me: for I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people, that ye should be mine."

Numerous other passages might be quoted to prove that God did require holiness of his ancient people, as much as he does now. It is true the external form of government and the worship of the ancient church were different from that which obtains under the gospel; but these could not affect the identity of the church in the least, while the scriptures, as we have seen, expressly declare that the church in which Abraham, David and the prophets lived, is the same church into which the Gentiles are brought under the gospel.

I believe I have noticed every thing in the gentleman's speech that deserves notice, and I will proceed with my affirmative argument.

I will take up the argument drawn from the great commission. I stated that under the circumstances the disciples could not have understood it in any other way than as a command to baptize infants. Here were eleven men that had not heard of a church without infants in it since the world began. They had never known a family to come into the church without bringing in their children with them. Jesus himself had received little children and blessed them, and declared that they belonged to his kingdom. He had held them up as the model to which adults must conform in order to enter into his kingdom. He had also expressly called them believers. Matt. xviii. 6. After such examples and such teaching, Jesus commands his chosen apostles to "Go, make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them and teaching them." The first thing here in the discipling process is baptism, and the second thing is teaching. This is precisely the way the apostles had always seen disciples or proselytes made—the infant was first circumcised and afterward taught, and how could they have understood the commission in any other way than to include infants? But my opponent quoted Mark's version of the commission: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;" and told us that here faith is shown to be a prerequisite of baptism, and that infants can not believe, and therefore they can not be baptized. But I deny his premises, and therefore reject his conclusion. Mark does not tell us which stands first in order, faith or baptism. He tells us two things are to be done, but the order in which they stand related to each other he does not tell us. But Matthew fixes the order in which these things stand related to each other: "Go disciple the nations, baptizing them and teaching them." This exactly suits the idea of infant baptism. But the gentleman tells us "a child can not believe, and therefore it can not be baptized." I reply, on the same principle, "infants can not believe, and therefore they must be damned, for he that believeth not shall be damned." If there is any force in the gentleman's objection, it as certainly excludes infants from salvation as it does from baptism. The human family are divided into two classes, believers and unbelievers. Now,

I ask, to which class do infants' belong? If they belong to the class of unbelievers they must be damned, and there is no way under heaven to prevent it, for "He that believeth not shall be damned." If they belong to the class of believers, then, even according to my opponent, they are to be baptized, for all believers, according to him, are entitled to baptism. Here is a dilemma from which the gentleman can never escape. Now, I ask again, to which class do infants belong? Jesus declares that they belong to the class of believers; he treats them as believers, and expressly calls them believers. I want my opponent to tell us, if he pleases, what is the moral relation of infants, according to his views? The truth is, according to the gentleman's argument, the moral relation of infants is, like Topsy's parents in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," "they never had none." [Laughter.] But Jesus says they sustain, the same moral relation to him that believers do—that they belong to his kingdom, that they belong to the class of believers.

Mr. Braden tells us there are two words in the commission translated teach. The first is *matheteuoo* and the second *didaskoo*; and he tells us *matheteuoo* signifies "to teach first principles," and that the apostles were to teach the first principles of the gospel to their hearers and then baptize them, and afterward teach them more fully "all things" commanded. But *matheteuoo* never has the signification of "to teach first principles." I defy him to bring a single instance in the New Testament where it has any such meaning. What word is used by Paul when he says: "Ye have need that we teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God." Heb. v. 12. Is it *matheteuoo* or *didaskoo*? If the gentleman will turn to the passage in his Greek Testament he will find *didaskoo*, and not *matheteuoo* used here. When *matheteuoo* signifies to teach, it always signifies not instruction in first principles, but perfect and complete instruction. In Matthew xiii. 52 we have an example:

"52. Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe which is instructed (*mathetentheis*) unto the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."

*Matheteuoo* here means perfect instruction, and so it does always when it has the signification of "to teach." The primary and the ordinary meaning of the word is "to make disciples;" to this all critics are agreed. Mr. Campbell's exposition of the commission in the *Christian Baptist*, page C30, and quoted in Campbell and Rice's Debate, page 372, is perhaps as good an exposition as has ever been given, and I will read it for the gentleman's edification, as Mr. Campbell here sets forth my views exactly:

"Have you, my dear brother, ever adverted to the import of the participle in the commission, Matt. xxviii., 'Disciple or convert the nations, immersing them?' I need not tell you that this is the exact translation. Let me ask you, then, does not the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed? Cleanse the room, washing it; clean the floor, sweeping it; cultivate the field, plowing it; sustain the hungry, feeding them; furnish the soldiers, arming them; convert the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the

same forms of speech. No person, I presume, will controvert this."

Here Mr. Campbell tells us the thing commanded to be done is "disciple the nations." The manner of doing this is by "baptizing and teaching them," and baptism is the first thing commanded in the discipling process. It is true, in the first introduction of the gospel into heathen lands, instruction in the first principles of the gospel preceded baptism in the first conversion of the nations to Christianity; but this instruction was not commanded nor embraced in the word *matheteuoo*, just as I showed that the mode of baptism was not determined by the word *baptizo*. The great commission was so framed and worded as to suit the idea of infant baptism. Infant baptism was designed to be perpetual; adult baptism was designed to be only temporary—to continue only until the nations were converted to Christianity, and then to cease, while infant baptism was designed to continue to the end of the world. Now let the gentleman meet my argument drawn from the commission, or confess he can not do it.

How did the apostles understand the commission? Did they understand it to exclude infants? This brings me to the third way in which a practice may be proven to be scripture—apostolic practice. How did the apostles carry out the commission? How did Peter understand the commission on the day of Pentecost, when he opened the doors of the kingdom of heaven, and invited the nations into it? Did he exclude the children? He excluded them by expressly inviting them into the kingdom. He said "The promise is to you and to your children." A right once secured by positive enactment remains intact until it is taken away by the repeal of the law or enactment conferring it. I have proved that infants were put into the covenant of grace by positive enactment, and their right to membership must remain intact until the law giving them this right is repealed by divine authority. We have seen Christ did not repeal it, but on the other hand he reaffirmed their right by declaring that they belong to his kingdom. Peter did not repeal it, but reaffirmed it, by expressly declaring that the promise of the gospel included the children. Their right, then, remains intact under the gospel, Peter being judge.

But perhaps my opponent will tell us that the word translated children, in this passage, is not the Greek word which properly signifies infant. There are three words in the Greek language which signify child. *Brephos*, properly an infant. *Pais* or *Paidos*, properly a child, and *Teknon*, properly, descendant or posterity, including the smallest infant. The difference of meaning of these terms are marked and clear. *Teknon* is the comprehensive term, and embraces the smallest infant, and sometimes signifies an infant before it is born. It is derived from *tiktoo*, to procreate, to bear or bring forth children. When Peter addressed the Jews and proselytes who listened to his sermon on the day of Pentecost, saying: "For the promise is to you and to your (*teknois*) children;" they could not have understood him in any other way than as including their smallest infants, for he used the exact language that conveyed this idea; and, secondly, they had always brought their children with them into the church. Many of Peter's audience were proselytes, who had brought their children with them into the Jewish Church, and now they are invited into the Christian



Church, and are assured that the promise includes their children. This is the way Peter understood and explained the commission on the day of Pentecost.

It was the uniform practice of the apostles, throughout the apostolic age, to baptize the households or families of their converts who were the heads of families. This is a fact that the New Testament history fully establishes. The word translated household, in all the instances of household baptism, is *oikos*, which means family proper, that is parents and children, by natural generation, adoption, or marriage, and excludes servants, domestics, and employes. The word *oikia* includes servants, domestics, etc.; but *oikos* never does. If Luke had intended to express the fact that the apostles baptized the families of their converts, including the smallest children, he would have used the word *oikos* to express it. If he had intended to have embraced servants, domestics, etc., he would have used *oikia*. You will find that wherever servants, domestics, etc., are included in the family, throughout the New Testament, *oikia* is always used, and *oikos* never. If family proper is meant, limiting to parents and children, *oikos* is always used, but *oikia* never. Where "the house of Israel," "the house of Judah," "the house of David," etc., is spoken of, *oikos* is always used. So is household baptism, *oikos* is always used, but *oikia* is never used in reference to household baptism. The rule that we have both agreed to adopt in determining the meaning of words is, "that words must be understood in their proper and most ordinary signification, unless good and sufficient reasons can be given for adopting a different meaning." Now the ordinary, the universal meaning of *oikos* in the New Testament, when it signifies family, is parents and children, to the exclusion of servants, domestics, etc. This one fact is of itself sufficient to establish the fact, that infant baptism was practiced by the apostles; for when we prove, as we have done here, that family baptism was the ordinary practice of the apostles, infant baptism follows as a matter of course. It is not necessary for me to prove that there were infants in all the families baptized by the apostles, for when I prove that the language used, properly understood, signifies that whole families were baptized as the ordinary practice of the apostles, I have established my proposition.

The gentleman will perhaps, however, say that I can not prove that there were infants in any of the families baptized by the apostles. This is not necessary to the establishment of my argument as I have shown, but it can be demonstrably proven that there were infants in some of the families baptized by the apostles, and that these infants were baptized. Now let us for a moment take up two examples of household baptism, both recorded in Acts xvi.: that of the Philippian jailer, and that of Lydia. The jailer was baptized "and all his," and "he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house;" here others besides himself believed. Some of his children doubtless were old enough to believe, and they embraced the gospel along with their father. But in the case of Lydia, no one believed but herself, yet she and her family were baptized. The Lord "opened her heart,"—"she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul," and "she was baptized and her family." Then she said, "If ye have judged me

(not us) faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there." Not a word is said about any one else's "heart being opened," or "attending to the things spoken," or "believing," but it is expressly said that her family were baptized. Why did Luke so particularly state the fact that the jailer's family believed, and then state so minutely the facts of Lydia's conversion, stating nothing concerning her children, only that they were baptized? The only reason that can be given is, in the one case others besides the jailer believed, while in the other none but Lydia believed, while her children were baptized along with her. This case fixes the fact beyond the possibility of a respectable cavil, that the practice of the apostles was to baptize the infant children of their converts along with their parents. In the Peshito or Syriac version of the New Testament, which is the oldest translation of the New Testament in existence, and was made during the first half of the second century, and by men who were, some of them, cotemporary with the Apostle John, and who were well acquainted with apostolic practice, this passage is translated: "When she was baptized, and the children of her house." (See Scott's Com. on the place.) This shows that these apostolic men understood that it was the practice of the apostles to baptize children along with their parents, or they would never have made such a translation. [*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—We have again this morning little but a rehash of what has already been said no less than four times. But as he leads I suppose I must follow.

My opponent's first law is, "If any practice be in accordance with the genius of the Christian religion, it will be right to practice it as a church ordinance." He has here merely a toleration of the practice as a question of expediency. He has no law or authority. But how are we to determine whether a practice be in accordance with the spirit of the Christian religion? How do we determine that spirit? In the first place, it must be in accordance with the principles of that religion:

1. Infant baptism is not, for the principles of the Christian religion are addressed to persons who can understand them, and not to infants:

2. It must be in accordance with the laws of that religion. I know of no way that a practice can be in accordance with those laws unless it be enjoined or permitted by them in expressed language. Infant baptism is not.

3. It must be in accordance with the design of that religion. The design of the gospel is to save men from the practice, guilt, and punishment of sin. Infant baptism does none of this. Hence it is not in accordance with the design of the Christian religion, nor in accordance with its spirit.

But we deny that we can foist into the church any practice on any such loose grounds. What is the Christian religion? It is a revelation from God on subjects concerning which man had no correct knowledge, and its laws are concerning matters on which man has no

right to legislate. All of the ordinances of the church are laid down in God's word. The subjects of those ordinances are also mentioned, and we are to accept them, and are not allowed to add to or take from them. Man has discretion as to mere agencies to be employed, and the expedients to be used; but as to ordinances, or their subjects, God has not left that to inference, and we have no right to take one step beyond what he has commanded or permitted. Hence infant baptism can not be proved by Mr. Hughey's first law.

We will have to go over the covenants again or say nothing; for my opponent has traveled the ground all over again without a single new idea. He has several times contradicted the word of God, and persists in his denial of its plain declarations.

In Genesis xii. we have a covenant concerning the numerous fleshly seed, a temporal inheritance, and the spiritual seed. It was a covenant, for God laid down certain conditions, and Abraham obeyed them, and hence he could claim what God promised. It was an agreement, or covenant, and included two covenants.

In Genesis xiii. the promise concerning the numerous seed according to the flesh, and the temporal inheritance, was separated from the covenant or promise concerning the spiritual seed.

In Genesis xv. these are again repeated, and confirmed by sacrifice, and the prophecy concerning the bondage in Egypt is given here. Both of these transactions have no reference to the spiritual seed, as my opponent has repeatedly admitted.

In Genesis xvii. we have the promise or covenant of Genesis xiii. and xv. repeated word for word almost, for the purpose of giving the mark or token which should show who was to be entitled to be regarded as one of the fleshly seed, and an heir of the temporal inheritance and temporal blessings. My opponent still contends that this is the covenant of grace, or concerning the spiritual seed, because he wants to connect circumcision with the covenant of grace, as he calls it, as a sign and seal of faith in that covenant. We have objected twice, and will the third, if not the fourth time.

1. It is a repetition of the promises and covenants, in Genesis xiii. and xv., which he admits have nothing to do with the spiritual seed.

2. It has not the name that the scriptures give to that covenant. Stephen calls this the covenant concerning circumcision. Paul calls the covenant of grace, the covenant concerning Christ, and Paul and Zachariah call it the covenant with an oath.

3. All the items of this covenant are fleshly. The token, circumcision, was in the flesh, and based on birth or flesh, irrespective of faith. The inheritance was temporal—the land of Canaan, where Abraham then was. Then the seed was temporal also, and was through Isaac and Jacob, which removes another quibble of my opponent. All the posterity of Abraham were circumcised, but to Isaac alone was the promise concerning the fleshly seed, and the temporal inheritance.

4. My opponent stultifies himself by spiritualizing the seed, and trying to spiritualize the inheritance, and insisting on. literalizing the circumcision. Evidently his positions are taken merely to sustain his point, and regardless of truth or consistency.

5. The scriptures nowhere refer to this covenant or quote a word from it when quoting the covenant concerning Christ. Most positively, then, it is not the covenant concerning Christ.

6. Lastly the language which the scriptures invariably quote as the covenant concerning Christ, is not in this chapter at all. If the language of that covenant is not here, this is not the covenant concerning Christ. My opponent would have you believe that God made a covenant concerning Christ in Genesis xvii., and never mentioned that item, the all-important and only item at all in the chapter.

In Psalm cv. we find the oath which God swore to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in Genesis xii., xiii., iv., xvii., xxvi. and xxviii., concerning a temporal inheritance called a covenant.

In Genesis xii., xxvi. and xxviii. the two promises, or covenants of promise, are together—the covenant concerning the temporal inheritance and the fleshly seed; and the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed.

In Genesis xiii., xv. and xvii. we have the covenant concerning the temporal seed and inheritance separated from the other, confirmed in Genesis xv., with sacrifice, and circumcision given as the token of all who were entitled to its privileges in Genesis xvii.

Did God never single out the covenant concerning Christ and separate it from the other, and give it special solemnity and prominence? In Galatians iii. 9 we are told that God said: "In thee and thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," when preaching the gospel to Abraham. This is the go-pel, and in the seventeenth verse is called the covenant concerning Christ.

In Hebrews vi. 14 more of the language of the covenant is given, and it is said this covenant was confirmed with an oath. Paul gives special prominence to the covenant because God gave it the highest sanction that he could give to it.

In Luke i. 72 Zachariah calls that covenant the oath he swore unto Abraham, or the covenant confirmed with an oath. He gives the substance of the covenant concerning Christ, as this covenant with an oath. Now, where shall we find this language called the covenant concerning Christ, separated out by itself, and confirmed by the awful sanction of the oath of Jehovah? In Genesis xxii., and nowhere else. Hence here we have the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed.

We urge these reasons why this is a covenant—the covenant concerning Christ, and the covenant with an oath:

1. God here made a promise to Abraham which contains the exact language always quoted as the covenant concerning Christ, and here it stands alone, and was confirmed by the awful oath of Jehovah. It was a covenant.

2. It was given just after Isaac, the type of Christ, had been figuratively offered, and when, as we read in James ii. 22, Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness, and exercised that faith that made him father of his spiritual seed, or the faithful. Hence the special propriety of making the covenant concerning Christ then.

3. Paul and Zachariah quote the language of this covenant—the

exact language—mention its being confirmed with an oath; they call it the covenant with an oath, and the covenant concerning Christ.

4. The exact language is found here which they call the covenant with an oath, and concerning Christ, and separately nowhere else, and nowhere else confirmed with an oath, hence this is the covenant concerning Christ, and confirmed with an oath to which they refer. I have placed the word of God in direct opposition to my opponent's assumptions and assertions. You can believe whom you will.

We are again told that circumcision made Abraham the father of the faithful. Paul does not say so. He says Abraham received the sign of circumcision—a seal of his faith—that he might be the father of them that believe. Now, was it circumcision, or was it faith that made him the father? He received circumcision as a seal of his faith, that he might be the father of the faithful, but circumcision is not said to make him father of them. Circumcision might make him father of those who had the same fleshly mark, but not father of those who were uncircumcised, but had such faith as he had. As we have already remarked, whatever makes us the children of Abraham, makes Abraham our father. Paul tells, in Galatians iii. 7 and 26-29, that faith makes us the children of Abraham; then faith makes Abraham the father of the faithful.

Circumcision was a seal to Abraham's faith, and was given that he might be the father of the faithful, just as we used to seal a deed to make one the owner of a piece of land. The deed, and not the seal, made one the owner of the land. The seal gave validity to the deed. So circumcision, as a seal, gave prominence to Abraham's faith, and faith made him father of the faithful.

But he received circumcision, a seal of his faith, that he might be the father of circumcision to us who are uncircumcised. What kind of circumcision was he the father of to us? Not fleshly circumcision, for we have never received that. What circumcision, then? Such as we read of in Romans ii. 28, 29, Phil. iii. 3, and Col. ii. 11, as the cutting off of the sinful desires of the flesh. Then, as we do this by our faith, so he becomes the father of such circumcision to us by his faith. Fleshly circumcision was to him a seal, which gave prominence to the faith which made him father of this spiritual circumcision.

But suppose we admit that the covenant in Genesis xvii. was the covenant of grace. Does it follow that infants are to be baptized? Suppose we admit that Abraham's circumcision made him father of the faithful. What then? Must you all sprinkle your babies? The gentleman has contended now for three mortal hours, and has not touched the proposition. He has been arguing questions entirely foreign to the point at issue. He makes no attempt to show any connection.

The gentleman's major premise is, God made a covenant concerning Christ in Genesis xvii. His minor is, circumcision was the sign and seal of that covenant. His conclusion, therefore infants should be baptized. His major and minor premises we have repeatedly shown to be false, but were they true, the conclusion has no more connection with them than the answer to a mathematical problem.

Circumcision made Abraham the father of the faithful. Therefore babes ought to be sprinkled. Logical, truly, and yet this man talked to me in our preliminary correspondence about my lack of logic.

He wants to know if God made a new covenant with the Jews when he made it. He offered it to them, Daniel says, in the last seventy years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and Christ confirmed it to all who accepted it, and those who did not were broken off or rejected.

But we have a new argument for church identity. Moses was faithful in his house, and Christ as a son over his own house. The house is the same as the church is, the same under Moses and Christ. We are told that God built a house and placed Moses over it as a servant, and it was called Moses' house; but Christ is as a son over his own house, not Moses' house. Hence they are not the same, and away goes another argument for identity.

We have said that there never was a church before the day of Pentecost. The peculiar code of laws of the Jews made them a peculiar nation, but not a church, any more than the Nazarenes were a church in the Jewish commonwealth. The descendants of Isaac and Jacob, the Jewish Church, as it is sometimes called, included all the idolaters, all the corrupt, all the abominable men of this rebellious people. But we have a Jewish Church in this nation. What separated it from the Jewish nation?

The gentleman can take which horn of the dilemma he pleases. He must include all the Jewish nation in his church, or he has a church without an organization, officers, laws or discipline. I know he feels the force of the dilemma from the way he writhes and twists, but he can not escape.

The gentleman speaks of the church in the wilderness, mentioned in Acts vii. 38. The gentleman knows very well that *ekklesia* means merely an assembly, or congregation, without reference to the character or qualifications of the individuals composing it. In Acts xix. 32 the word is applied to a mob; also in the thirty-ninth verse of the same chapter, it means merely a lawful assembly or town meeting. In Acts vii. 38, it means the assembly or congregation of Israelites in the wilderness, and should not be translated church.

We have been told that Jesus calls infants believers. I have not found the passage yet.

*Mr. Hughey*—In the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, and I think the sixth verse.

*Mr. Braden*—Indeed! You have been forced to that at last. You will remember that my opponent, in his first speech, said he meant only infants who could not exercise faith and repentance, and sneered at me for suggesting such a limitation. In our preliminary correspondence I suggested such a limitation, and he talked very insultingly about my lack of sense, in proposing such a restriction. I told him I had debated with Methodist preachers, who, when pressed, would insist on taking the legal definition, "one not of age." He virtually charged me with falsehood, saying I never had met such an one.

When Brother McCall first placed my proposition in his hands,

he sneered at the restriction, "those who can not believe and repent," and asked why it was there?

"Perhaps," said Brother McCall, "that you can not quote the passage, 'one of these little ones who believe in my name,'" and he sneered at the thought that he should stoop so low. Now here we have a Methodist preacher, and even my opponent, who was so insulted because I suggested that he might do so, doing the very thing he so indignantly repudiated! "Whosoever shall offend these little ones who believe in me." The very thing I predicted. Well, sir, I will baptize or immerse all infants who believe with the whole heart in Christ. If these are the infants you are talking about we will dispute no longer. The position I take is that penitent believers are proper subjects. If that is yours we will shake hands over it, and leave this proposition. But it is a mere trick, and I will let the gentleman's own language and sneers give it its proper character.

But to what class do infants belong? says the gentleman. Are they sinners? No, sir. Are they church members? No, sir. What are they, then? Infants, sir, are a class by themselves. They need neither faith, repentance nor baptism. Christ's atonement made them heirs of eternal life, as we read in Romans v., until they lose such position by actual transgression.

But we have a new argument at last. In Acts ii. 39 we are told that baptism and the Holy Spirit belong to children. "For the promise is to you and your children, and those that are afar off, even as many as the Lord your God shall call." These children are infants who can not believe or repent, says my opponent, and baptism belongs to them. Here he assumes the very point in debate, that children means infants. Do not our parents call us their children when we are gray-headed? Would not my mother say she had twelve children, though we are all men and women, and several of us heads of families? But what kind of children are these? What is the promise he speaks of that is to their children? The promise Peter quoted from Joel, "Your sons and daughters shall prophesy, and I will pour out my Spirit on my sons and on my handmaidens, and they shall prophesy." This is the promise that was to their children. What children? Their young men and maidens who should prophesy.

Again, repentance and baptism are inseparably connected and preceded by faith. Then it was only those who could believe and repent who could be baptized. Also, the promise was only to such as the Lord should call by the messages of the gospel. Hence the children were not infants, but penitent believers. So the entire language of Joel and Peter declares. So the argument is entirely against the gentleman's position.

But, says my opponent, *teknon* means posterity, hence it includes infants. Certainly it does, but not always. Our word child includes infant, but not always. We are the children of our parents, their posterity, as long as we live, but not always their infants. But when we speak of those children, who believe, repent, and are baptized, we do not mean infants.

We have next a long disquisition on *oikos* and *oikia*, and that they necessarily include infants, or we can not have an *oikia* or *oikos* without

infants. The position is too preposterous to need refutation. We will turn to the accounts and see whether infants, who could not believe and repent, were in the household of Lydia and the jailer. We will examine the case of Lydia first:

Lydia was a seller of purple, from the city of Thyatira, and was over three hundred miles from home, when they traveled by beast of burden. My friend assumes she was married. Secondly, she had children. Thirdly, her children were with her in Philippi. Fourthly, that they were with her out of the house, and at the river side. Fifthly, that they were too young to believe and repent. Sixthly, That these babies must have been baptized when her household were baptized. Let me make as many assumptions as that, and I will prove that Christ now reigns at Washington over all the earth, or any other preposterous fiction. How does my opponent know that Lydia was even married? How does he know she had children? How does he know these children were babes? How does he know her children were with her on a merchandising tour, three hundred miles from home? How does he know they were at the river side? How does he know that these babies were even then baptized, for we often say a man's whole family believes a certain story, when there are two or three too young to believe it. But the Holy Spirit seems to have anticipated my opponent, for he says Paul entered Lydia's house and comforted the "brethren" there. He comforted those who were baptized, and how could he comfort babes. He was not on a nursery tour. Lydia's household were all brethren, and could be comforted, and only such were baptized.

In the case of the Philippian jailer, we read that he took them out, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. This means children, of course, says my opponent. No, sir, it does not. There is many a household without children. But the Holy Spirit again cuts off my opponent's argument. "And he rejoiced in the Lord with all his house." All the house could then rejoice in the Lord as there were no infants there.

I confess I have been amused at the desperate efforts to find infant baptism. It would be amusing were it not degrading to human reason to recapitulate some of them, such as:

Cyprian, the inventor of the practice.—Because Elisha laid himself on the Shunamite child, thus showing that children are equal to men.

Augustin.—Because it removes original sin.

Dr. Taylor.—Because the command may have been among the parchments left at Troas!

Dr. Edwards.—Because the beloved of Solomon had a navel as round as a goblet!

Dr. Wilson.—Because children believed even before they were born. John leaped in his mother's womb at the salutation of Mary! Calvin.—Because the children of the Israelites were circumcised.

Dr. Wardlow.—Because of the faith of their parents.

Dr. Newman.—Because of the faith of their sponsors.



Dr. Nevins.—Because divine life flows through a church organization.

Dr. Bushnell.—Because divine life or salvation comes to the children through the organism of a pious family.

Bellarmin.—Because it is an apostolic tradition.

Dr. Bird.—Because the Saviour blessed them.

Dr. Yeager.—Because the scriptures do not forbid it.

Dr. Moran.—Because it increases the numbers, influences and resources of the church.

Neander and Dr. Hughey.—Because it is in accordance with the spirit of Christianity.

Wesley and Methodist Discipline, till the time it was last doctored.—Because it regenerates of the Holy Ghost.

There, gentlemen, "you takes which you likes." It is all of one piece and one price—excessive credulity.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I see I labor under the same difficulty I did before. I can not give my opponent intellectual vision, he continuing to strike against the wind in spite of everything that can be done. [Laughter.]

In the present speech I will review briefly a few points in the gentleman's speech, and then proceed with my final argument, leaving the remainder of the review for my closing speech. My opponent tells us that there were no infants in the jailer's house, because it is said, "And he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." But does this prove that there were no infants in his house? By no means. It does prove, however, as I stated before, that a portion, at least, of the jailer's family, believed, though there might have been infants in the family too small to believe, and still this language could have been used. In Deuteronomy xxix. 10, 11, we read:

"10. Ye stand this day, all of you, before the Lord your God, your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel,

"11. Your little ones," etc.

The whole congregation of Israel were there, from the old man to the infant. But, I might say, there were no infants in the congregation, for the whole congregation were to stand; but infants can not stand, therefore there were no infants in the congregation!

There is just as much sense and logic in this as in the gentleman's argument by which he tried to prove there were no infants in the jailer's family, which was: "All the jailer's family believed: infants can not believe; therefore there were no infants in the jailer's family." But the point in my argument was not that there were infants baptized in the jailer's family, but the contrast between the history of the baptism of the jailer's household and that of the household of Lydia, showing demonstrably that Lydia's infant children were baptized along with her. In reply to this, he tried to get up a laugh about Lydia being a married woman, widow, or old maid! I have no time

to spend in such trifling. I stated a fact which the gentleman can not set aside, that *oikos*, when it signifies family, means parents and children, either by blood, marriage, or adoption, and excludes servants, domestics, etc. To this he replies by telling you that I went into a learned disquisition in Greek! Well, I thought I had a scholar for my opponent, and I expected he would meet my arguments in a scholarly manner, and not spend his time in attempting to divert your attention from the argument; but I was mistaken in the man. It is a fact, and I now call his attention to it again, that *oikos*, when it signifies family, means parents and children, and excludes servants, etc.; and that this word is always used in reference to household baptism. I showed also that Lydia only believed; yet her family (*oikos*) were baptized. In the case of the jailer's household, some others believed, rejoiced, etc.; but in the case of Lydia's household none believed but herself. Mr. Braden may attempt to make light of the argument drawn from household baptisms, and from the meaning and force of *oikos*, as much as he pleases; but the argument is there, and it is unanswerable, and every man of intelligence knows it, and his attempts to ridicule what he can not answer, only manifests his conscious inability to meet my argument. I do not ask him to admit that Lydia was a married woman, or a widow, or that she had a family of children, etc., for I prove by the primary and ordinary meanings of *oikos* that she had a family of children, and that they were baptized along with her. Now I want him to look into the Greek Testament and reply to my argument if he can, and if he can not, let him like a man admit that he can not do it. But this he will not do, for he knows he can not answer my argument here. No man can answer it, and the opponents of infant baptism have never attempted to answer this argument, only by vain and feeble attempts to turn it into ridicule, thereby admitting that they can not answer it. I have proved that *oikos*, in the New Testament, when it means family, always includes children, and excludes servants, etc.; and my opponent must show that in this case it does not have this meaning, or he must admit that Lydia's children were baptized. He must show that my premises are false, or else he must admit that my conclusions are true; and I will hold him to it, though he may laugh as much as he pleases. I do not know whether you were laughing at the smartness of the gentleman, or at his want of it; but I suspect the latter. [Laughter.]

He wanted to know if *teknon* always includes babes? I answer, it signifies posterity, and includes the smallest infant. If there were any infants in any of the families of the thousands that listened to Peter's sermon on the Pentecost, they were included in the invitation; for wherever there are infants *teknon* includes them. Peter's audience could not have understood the word *teknon* in any other sense, as I showed you before, but to include their infant children. The promise referred to by Peter is not simply the prophecy of Joel concerning the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, but it is God's great promise to Abraham which was confirmed unto Israel, and embraces the promises of the gospel through Jesus Christ, with all its blessings and privileges, and which now, at the opening of the gospel dispensation, began to be realized. This was the promise upon which Israel had

been waiting for centuries, and nothing but this great promise could be referred to by Peter on the occasion when Israel's hopes were for the first time fully realized, and the promise fulfilled in the gospel of Christ; and Peter declares that children are included in this promise.

But Mr. Braden tells us the word *ekklesia* (church) means an assembly. But the word means "an assembly called out," "a congregation called out," etc. Now what is the church but an "assembly called out?" And if God called out the Jewish nation from the nations of the earth to be his nation, his assembly, what were they but his church, as they are expressly called by inspiration? The house of Israel was God's *ekklesia*—God's congregation—God's church, called out from the world, separated from the nations, to be unto him "a holy people," "a peculiar treasure." It is a mistake, and a very gross one, to state that there was no separation required in God's ancient church "between the holy and Sic profane." God's law required that sinners should be cut off from the congregation of the Lord; and the heaviest judgments of God were visited upon Israel for their backslidings and rebellions against him.

I was very much amused at the gentleman's position that the house of Israel, God's ancient church, was Moses' house. I told you that Moses was in the church, and that the church in which Moses lived was God's house, and that this house is God's church into which believers are gathered. But my opponent says it was not God's house at all, but it was Moses' house! I will read from Hebrews iii:

"1. Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus:

"2. Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house.

"3. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded a house, hath more honor than the house.

"4. For every house was builded by some man; but he that built all things is God.

"5. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after:

"6. But Christ as a Son over his own house: whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end."

Now, if God's ancient church was Moses' house, I want to know how he could be a servant in his own house? If it were Moses' house, was he not master there, and not a servant? How can I be a servant in my own house? God says Moses was a servant in the house over which Christ reigns as a Son. Christ hath more glory than Moses, "inasmuch as he who hath builded the house, hath more honor than the house." It was God's house that Moses was a servant in, and the house over which Christ reigns as a Son. This is as clear as anything can possibly be made. In this passage the contrast is between Moses as a servant and Christ as a Son, both exercising authority in their respective spheres in the same house. Here, then, I proved that God's ancient church was an *ekklesia*, a congregation called out from the world, and that this church was the "tabernacle of David," into

which the Gentile believers are gathered under the glorious reign of the Sun of Righteousness.

The gentleman tells us that the new covenant was made with the house of Israel when Christ caused the daily sacrifice to cease by the offering up of his own body on the cross. This is an entirely new, and I think it is an original position. When Jesus offered up his own body for sins, he broke down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and by this very sacrifice the enmity was slain, all distinctions were removed, and he made "of the twain one new man, so making peace." This was no covenant with the Jews, for "by the blood of the cross those who were afar off *were* brought nigh," and "the Gentiles were made fellow-heirs" with the Jews, and "became fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." This new covenant made with the house of Israel, every reader of the Bible knows, is the setting up of the gospel kingdom, into which Jews and Gentiles are alike invited. It is the covenant made with God's spiritual Israel—all believers, by which the law of the Lord is "written in their hearts," and they become new creatures in Christ Jesus.

Having said so much in reply to the gentleman's speech, I must proceed with my final affirmative argument, for I see if I spend longer time in replying to his speech, I shall fail to get my affirmative argument in my speech.

My final argument in support of infant baptism is drawn from the universal practice of the church, from the earliest ages. While the practice of the church in post-apostolic time can not of itself prove a practice to be scriptural, yet it may come in as strong collateral proof in favor of apostolic practice. Infant baptism has ever been practiced by the whole church, from the earliest ages, with but a few exceptions in the twelfth century, and the anti-pedobaptists, since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. This fact is susceptible of the clearest demonstration by the records of ecclesiastical history.

The first evidence from ecclesiastical history I shall adduce, is the fact that the old Peshito or Syriac version of the New Testament, made during the first half of the second century, translates the passage concerning the baptism of Lydia's household: "And when she was baptized, and the children of her house." This proves that in the first half of the second century, a few years after the death of the Apostle John, it was the custom to baptize the children of the converts to Christianity along with their parents, or these translators would never have so translated this passage. This testimony is invaluable when we remember that this translation was made by men who were familiar with the practice of the apostles.

The second evidence drawn from ecclesiastical history in favor of infant baptism, I shall present in the fact that it was the unanimous opinion of the early Christian writers that baptism takes the place of circumcision among God's ancient Israel—that it is the Christian circumcision. Justin Martyr, who flourished in the next age immediately after the apostles, says:

"And we, who have approached God through Him, have received not carnal but spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him

observed. And we have received it through baptism, since we were sinners, by God's mercy, and all men may equally obtain it."—Justin and Athenagoras, p. 140.

Again, in questions and answers ascribed to Justin, he says:

"Why, if circumcision were a good thing, do we not use it as well as the Jews did?" The answer is: "We are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision."—Chapman on Infant Baptism, p. 66.

Irenaeus held the same views as Justin in regard to baptism and circumcision, as may be seen in his book against heresies, especially page 422. So held also Cyprian, and the Council of Carthage, A. D. 254, expressly styling baptism "the spiritual circumcision," as may be seen in Cyprian's Epistle to Fidus.—Lord King's Primitive Church, pp. 198-202.

Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustin, all held and spoke of baptism as "the Christian circumcision." Chrysostom says:

"But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, and procures a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the Spirit; and it has no determinate time as that had, but one that is in the very beginning of his age, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in old age, may receive this circumcision made without hands."—Chapman on Infant Baptism, pp. 68, 69.

These early Christian writers all held to the identity of the church just as we do; and when I prove that they held that baptism comes in the room of circumcision—that it is the Christian circumcision, I prove that they practiced infant baptism, for no person ever held the one without practicing the other.

The next writer I shall bring forward in favor of infant baptism is Irenaeus, who was the disciple or pupil of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John, and who flourished as a writer from A. D. 170 to 202. He says:

"Being a master, therefore, He also possessed the age of a master, not despising or evading any condition of humanity, nor setting aside in himself that law which he had appointed for the human race, but sanctifying every age, by that period corresponding to it which belonged to himself. For he came to save all through means of himself—all, I say, who through him are born again to God—infants and children, and boys, and youths, and old men."—Irenaeus against Heresies, Book ii., vol. 1 of his writings, pp. 199, 200.

That by the words, *Renascuntur in Deum*, here translated, "born again to God," Irenaeus means baptism, is certain, for he calls baptism "the regeneration into God."

In his first book against heresies, page 81, he says: "And when we come to refute them, we shall show in its fitting place, that this class of men have been instigated by Satan to a denial of that baptism which is regeneration to God, and thus to a renunciation of the whole (Christian) faith."

Again, in his third book against heresies, page 334, he says: "And again, giving to the disciples the power of regeneration unto God, He said to them, 'Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"

Here it is demonstrable that Irenaeus calls baptism "regeneration to God," and under this name he undeniably speaks of infant baptism in the passage above. Irenaeus also here speaks of infant baptism as a general practice in his day; and such indirect testimony to the general practice of infant baptism is the more valuable as it shows, without any direct attempt, what was the common practice of the church.

Immediately after Irenaeus, Tertullian testifies that infant baptism was practiced in his day. Our opponent tells us Tertullian opposed infant baptism; but this is a great mistake. Tertullian did not oppose infant baptism, he simply advised the delay of it, as well as that of the baptism of widows and unmarried persons. But the very fact that he advised the delay of infant baptism, proves that it was generally practiced; for if it were not, why advise the delay of it? Here is what Tertullian says:

"Therefore according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there that the god-fathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be mistaken by a child's proving of a wicked disposition. Our Lord says, indeed, 'Do not forbid them to come to me.' Therefore, let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand, when they are instructed whither it is they come: let them be made Christians when they know Christ."

\* \* \* \* \*

"For no less reason, unmarried persons ought to be kept off, who are likely to come into temptation, as well as those that were never married, upon the account of their coming to ripeness, as those in widowhood, for the ruin of their partners; until they either marry or be confirmed in continence. They that understand the weight of baptism will rather dread the receiving of it, than the delaying of it. An entire faith is secure of salvation."—Campbell and Rice's Debate, pp. 389, 390.

Tertullian was as much opposed to the baptism of widows and unmarried persons, as he was to the baptism of infants, and for the same reason. But Tertullian never opposed infant baptism as an innovation; and yet, if it were an innovation, it was introduced between the death of John, A. D. 100, and Tertullian's time, A. D. 120; and he must have known when, and by whom it was introduced. But not one word does he utter intimating that it was an innovation. This proves that he knew it was not an innovation, any more than the baptism of widows and unmarried persons was an innovation.

Origen, the most learned of all the Greek fathers, and whose father and grandfather before him were Christians, was born about A. D. 185, and suffered death under the Dacian persecution about A. D. 250. He knew what the doctrines and practice of the church were as well as any man who lived during the first four centuries of the Christian era. In his homily on Leviticus he says:

"Hear David speaking: 'I was,' says he, "conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth.' Showing that every soul that is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity; and that, therefore, that was said which we mentioned before, that none

is clear from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day. Beside all this, let it be considered what is the reason that, whereas, the baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins, infants also are, by the usage of the church, baptized; when, if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."

Again, in his commentary on Romans, he says:

"For this also it was, that the church had from the apostles a tradition (or order) to give baptism even to infants. For they to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit; by reason of which the body itself is called the body of sin."

Here Origen testifies that the church, that is, the whole church, practiced infant baptism in his day, and not only so, but that the church had a command, or order (for this is the meaning of the word tradition in this passage) from the apostles, to baptize infants. To the testimony of Origen I might add that of Jerome, Chrysostom, and other of the fathers, but I must pass these by and take up the testimony of Augustin, the greatest of the Latin fathers, who lived in the latter part of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries. He says:

"So that many persons, increasing in knowledge, after their baptism, and especially those who have been baptized either when they were infants, or when they were youths; as their understanding is cleared and enlightened, and their inward man renewed day by day, do themselves deride, and with abhorrence and confession renounce their former opinions which they had of God, when they were imposed on by their imaginations. And yet they are not, therefore, accounted either not to have received baptism, or to have received a baptism of that nature that their error was," etc.—Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 403.

Again he says:

"And as the thief, who by necessity went without baptism, was saved; because by his piety he had it spiritually; so where baptism is had, though the party by necessity go without that (faith) which the thief had, yet he is saved. Which the whole body of the church holds as delivered to them, in the case of little infants baptized: who certainly can not yet believe with the heart to righteousness, or confess with the mouth to salvation, as the thief could," etc.

\* \* \* \* \*

"And if any one do ask for divine authority in this matter: though that which the whole church practices, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use, is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing delivered (or ordered) by authority of the apostles: yet we may besides take a true estimate how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants, by the circumcision which God's former people received."—Ibid.

Here Augustin declares that "the whole church practiced infant baptism in his day, and that it was not ordained by councils, but was

ever in use. Again Augustin says, after quoting some passages from Jerome:

"And now some people, by the boldness of I know not what disputing humor, go about to represent that as uncertain which our ancestors made use of as a most certain thing, whereby to resolve some things that seemed uncertain. For, when this began first to be disputed, I know not; but this I know, that holy Hierome, whose pains and fame for excellent learning in ecclesiastical matters is at this day so great, does also make use of this as a thing most certain, to resolve some questions in his books," etc.

"Then, having quoted some passages out of St. Hierome on Jonah, he proceeds:

"If we could with convenience come to ask that most learned man, how many writers of Christian dissertations and interpreters of Holy Scripture in both languages could he recount, who from the time that Christ's church has been founded, have held no otherwise, have received no other doctrine from their predecessors, nor left any other to their successors? For my part (though my reading is much less than his), I do not remember that I ever heard any other thing from any Christians that have received the Old and New Testaments, *non solum in Catholica ecclesia verum etiam in qualibet hoeresi vel schismate constitit*: neither from such as were of the Catholic Church, nor from such as belonged to any sect or schism. *Non memini me aliud legisse, etc.* I do not remember that I ever read otherwise in any writer that I could ever find treating of these matters, that followed the canonical scriptures, or did mean or did pretend to do so."—Ibid.

Such is the testimony of Augustin, and he was as competent to testify concerning the practice of the church in his time, as any man who ever lived. He was extensively acquainted, personally, with a good portion of Europe and Africa; was not only conversant with the theology and practice of the Catholic Church, but was well acquainted with all the leading sects and heresies of his day. He spent near fifteen years of his life in controversy with the Donatists; and yet he testifies that he never heard or read of any persons who received the scriptures, and followed them, who were opposed to infant baptism, or who ever had been so opposed, either among the Catholics, Schismatics, or Heretics! If any one ever had opposed infant baptism up to the time of Augustin, this learned father had never heard of them!

I shall next read the testimony of Pelagius. He says:

"Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise the kingdom of heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ: which is a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked heretic say. For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even have such a thought."—Ibid, p. 404.

Pelagius was cotemporary with Augustin. He was born and raised in Great Britain, and traveled extensively in Europe, Asia, and Africa. He was a very learned man, and yet he testifies he had "never heard, no not even a wicked heretic," say it was wrong to baptize infants! Opposition to infant baptism was unknown for the first



four and a half centuries of the Christian era. Now I ask my opponent, if infant baptism is an innovation, when was it introduced, and in what way? Will the gentleman please tell us? If it is an innovation, how is it that not a single voice was ever lifted against it by any of the early fathers? I press this question upon his attention. I have many other passages from the fathers, showing the universality of the practice of infant baptism, but I have not time to present them, and those I have presented are abundantly sufficient.

The Waldenses and Albigenses, those noble witnesses of the truth, who maintained the pure doctrine and life of Christianity during the dark ages of Papal persecution, are claimed by the opponents of infant baptism as anti-Pedobaptists; but this is a great mistake. Their own writings prove beyond question that they practiced infant baptism through every period of their history, as may be seen in Perrin's "History of the Waldenses;" but I have not time to go into detail here, nor is it necessary. I will close up the argument from church history with Dr. Wall's summary of the historical evidence of infant baptism: He says:

"Lastly, as these evidences are for the first four hundred years, in which there appears one man, Tertullian, that advised the delay of infant baptism in some cases; and one Gregory that did, perhaps, practice such delay in the case of his children, but no society of men so thinking, or so practicing; nor no one man saying it was unlawful to baptize infants: so in the next seven hundred years, there is not so much as one man to be found, that either spoke for, or practiced any such delay. But all the contrary. And when, about the year 1130, one sect among the Albigenses declared against the baptizing of infants, as being incapable of salvation, the main body of that people rejected their opinion; and they of them that held that opinion, quickly dwindled away and disappeared; there being no more heard of holding that tenet, till the rising of the German anti-Pedobaptists, anno, 1522."—Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 414.

Such is the testimony of Dr. Wall, who probably spent more time in examining the records of Christian antiquity on the subject of infant baptism, than any other man ever did. He has left us the largest history of infant baptism that has ever been compiled; and he was as well qualified to testify concerning the practice of the church in this respect, as any man who has lived in modern times.

But I must notice the gentleman's remarks about infants believing. I did not say that infants could exercise faith, and my opponent could not have so understood me. I said that the Lord Jesus always treated them as believers, and that he recognized them as sustaining the same relation to him that believers do; and that in Matthew xviii. 6, he calls them believers. But my opponent says Christ meant, "such as little children, or little children in a spiritual sense," in this passage. But that he here means little children, and not believers who are like little children, is evident from the passage itself. The Saviour here had the little child before him, and was speaking both of the "little child" and of "one such;" and when he says, "these little ones," he does not mean persons like them, but he means the "little ones" themselves. This is proven by the tenth verse, where he says:

"Take heed that ye despise (or more properly neglect) not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," still having the little one before him.

The angels who are sent "to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation," watch over infants, and therefore God's ministers must not neglect them. This is evidently the meaning of the Saviour's language; and it proves that infants belong to the class of believers; they are so treated by Christ, and so styled.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S FIFTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I shall be obliged to pass very briefly over what new matter the gentleman has presented in his last speech, for this is my last opportunity to present new arguments; hence I ask your close attention for I have much to present. The gentleman seems to be very much taken back by our rejoinder in regard to the baptism of the jailer's household. We showed that all his household rejoiced, hence there could have been no infants. To avoid this he retorts, "The infants in his house were not necessarily included in the rejoicing." Nor were they in the baptism. As many as were baptized rejoiced. The gentleman has destroyed his argument. He is like the Irishman who cut a piece off of the top of his blanket, and sewed it on to the bottom to make up the deficiency at the bottom. So my opponent, in his eagerness to cover the conclusion of his argument, cuts off the starting point.

My opponent rather questions my scholarship. I have been annoyed before by a half-educated opponent who was always airing his smattering of Greek and Latin, and who could not see how I could know anything of these things, without acting as silly as himself. No man of sense will do so. I leave my work in this debate to vindicate my scholarship. I have no boasting to rival that of my opponent.

It is reiterated that *oikos* and *oikia* necessarily include infants. A more preposterous assertion was never made. They do not necessarily include children even of any age. A household may have a man, his wife and servants, and no children. A maiden lady may have a household of many persons, and not a child among them. So may an unmarried man. A man and his wife may have a large family, and not an infant among them.

Greenfield gives as the definition, a house, dwelling, home, household, posterity, lineage, family, those who dwell in the same house. If that necessarily includes infants I am so blind as to be unable to see it. The staff and servants of a general were called his *oikos* often.

But Lydia and her children were baptized because the Peshito-Syriac version says so, and I have quoted that as authority. It says Lydia and her children, not infants. Besides we can tell just as well what the Greek term translated household means as the Syriac translator.

*Ekklesia* means an assembly called out. Sometimes it docs, and sometimes it does not. In Acts xix. 32 it means a mob, and not a

called assembly. In the thirty-ninth verse it means an assembly lawfully called, but has no reference to a church. So in the congregation in the wilderness we have a national assembly, but no church.

We are told again Moses was a servant in Christ's house, and Christ is master over the same house; hence the Jewish and the Christian Churches were the same. We have already shown that it says, Heb. iii., Moses was faithful in all his house, as a servant, but Christ was faithful as a son over his own house. God built the house and placed Moses over it as a servant, hence it is called Moses' house. God built a house for his Son which was Christ's own house. The two houses, as well as the two owners, are contrasted with each other, which could not be were they the same. Now we shall have, probably, to beat the gentleman off this ground half a dozen times, as we have had to about the covenants, and circumcision making Abraham father of the faithful, before he will abandon it. Noble will bark whether there is any game or not.

He attempts to prove infant baptism from Irenaeus. Irenaeus speaks of those "who are regenerated unto God in infancy." My opponent says Irenaeus means baptism, for he calls baptism regeneration unto God. Irenaeus speaks of several things by which we are regenerated unto God. In this passage he does not say we are regenerated unto God by baptism, but by Christ. But does he not say Christ does this in baptism or by baptism? No, he says Christ performed it in an entirely different manner.

He affirms Christ passed through all ages of human life, and sanctified them, and thus ho regenerated all in each period of human life unto God. He regenerated infants not by baptism, but by living the life of an infant. He says, as I translate the passage: "For he came to save all by himself—all I say, since by him they are regenerated unto God—infants, little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he came through the several periods, and for infants was made an infant, sanctifying infants; among little ones, a little one, thus sanctifying those of that age, and being at the same time an example of piety, uprightness, and obedience; among the youths, a youth becoming an example to the youths, sanctifying them to the Lord; thus, also, an elderly person among elderly persons, that he might be a perfect master among all, not only in presentation of the truth, but also in respect to age, sanctifying elderly persons, and becoming to them an example."

Nothing can be plainer than that Irenaeus had not the slightest reference to baptism. Christ regenerated all unto God by living in their age of life and sanctifying it.

In another place Irenaeus says: "And giving the disciples power of regeneration unto God, he says, 'Go, make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them,'" etc. Here he confines baptism to those who can believe. He has no reference to any others. In the only place where he speaks of the regeneration of infants he shows that it was not baptism that he referred to at all. Hence there is no proof from Irenaeus.

My opponent anticipates an argument by quoting from Campbell and Rice's Debate an animadversion of Rice impeaching Jones, an

English church historian. Jones says the Waldenses, in a confession presented to the French court, professed to be immersionists, and opposed to the baptism of infants. Rice quotes from the historian that Jones chiefly follows, Du Pin, to show that they did not say any such thing, but the reverse. Jones has since shown that Rice did not quote him correctly. What Rice quoted referred to the confession of followers of John Huss, who came out of the Romish Church, and retained many of its superstitions; but that the Waldenses did make just such a confession as he ascribed to them. They baptized only believing adults, and only by immersion. Orchard's History of Baptists proves the same thing.

*Mr. Hughey*—I have Orchard's History of Baptists, and can furnish it.

*Mr. Braden*—The whole quotation from Justin Martyr I will now read, and show you who Justin said should be baptized.

*Mr. Hughey*—I was speaking of the fact that Justin calls baptism the Christian circumcision, and, as a matter of course, infants were to be baptized as they were circumcised. I did not quote the passage at all.

*Mr. Braden*—"As many, therefore, as are persuaded, and believe that the things taught by us are true, and take upon them the vow to live accordingly, are taught to pray and ask God with fastings the forgiveness of their former sins, we uniting with them in these exercises. Then they are brought to a place of water, and there are regenerated after the same manner with ourselves."

In looking back, I see that Justin does not say, as my opponent says, that baptism is the Christian circumcision, nor anything like it. He says we receive the "spiritual circumcision (putting off our evil desires) in baptism." Hence the gentleman's inference is utterly unfounded, and, indeed, contradicted, for none but persons who can receive this spiritual circumcision are to be baptized, according to Justin. Hence all Justin's language is against infant baptism as clearly as can be.

We will next read Tertullian. If any one can find an indorsement of infant baptism in his language he must be hard pushed for help. He says:

"The delay of baptism may be more advantageous either on account of the disposition or age of any person, especially in reference to little children. The Lord, indeed, says let them come. Let them, therefore, come when they are grown up, when they can understand—when they are taught to what they are to come. Let them become Christians when they can know Christ. Let them know how to seek salvation that you may appear to give to one that asketh."

Origen is next quoted. His expression, "babes in Christ" is taken to mean infants. In the context he speaks of the same babes as desiring the sincere milk of the word. He means new converts, the same as Peter and Paul do by the same expression. He borrows it from them. The other passage is an interpolation by Rufinus, who pretended to translate the Greek into Latin. We have the original Greek, and there is no such language in it.

Besides Origen, Basil, Chrysostom, and the fathers, speak of *cate-*

*chumenai*, or those who were instructed somewhat, as we do now in our Sunday schools, and when old enough to make a public profession they are baptized. These are the children of the fathers. Basil upbraids such in a letter, because now being young men and women they delayed to put on Christ. The whole strength of my opponent's argument is in assuming that children always means infants.

Augustin is next mentioned. Yes, he had a council called and pronounced such as opposed infant baptism accursed. He resorted to persecution in his zeal; and right here we can find celibacy of the priests, nunneries, the confessional, transubstantiation, purgatory, worship of saints, sprinkling, and every Romish innovation. Infant baptism and sprinkling both sprang from the prolific bosom of the Mother of Harlots.

We will now call your attention for a short time to the setting up of Christ's kingdom, and to the organic law of that kingdom. In Isaiah ii. we read that the Lord's house was to be built in Jerusalem, and the law should go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

In Jeremiah xxxi. we read that God would establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and Judah, entirely different from the old covenant of the Jewish nation, and that all under this covenant should know the Lord. It would include no infants.

In Daniel ii. 44 we read that in the time of the Roman Empire, God would set up a kingdom, which should never be destroyed, and that it should destroy all other kingdoms, and should stand for ever. In the ninth chapter he tells us that Christ should confirm this new covenant of Jeremiah, for seventy years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and should be cut off in the midst of the week, and should cause sacrifice to cease by an offering of himself.

In Joel ii. 38 we read that in the last days of Jerusalem, God would pour out his Spirit on all flesh, and young men and maidens should prophesy, and old men see visions. When John the Baptist came, he preached that Christ's kingdom was approaching, was near at hand. So did Jesus himself. It was still future. There are two expressions that are quoted against this, and to show that the kingdom existed in John's time.

In Matthew xi. 12 we read: "From the days of John the Baptist till now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent taketh it by force." It is wrongly translated. It should read, "From the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of heaven is eagerly desired, and those who eagerly desire it take it by force." In the last case using the present for the future. Luke. xvi. 16 should also read, "Since the time of John the kingdom of God is preached, and all men eagerly desire it." This agrees with our Saviour's declaration that the least in the kingdom should be greater than John. How could John be the greatest of men, and be in the kingdom, and be less than any one in the kingdom?

In Matthew xvi. 19 Christ declares he will build his church on the great truth declared by Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God," and that he would give the keys to Peter, or the power to preach this truth first, to Jew and Gentile, and thus open to them

his kingdom. Then his kingdom was yet future, for he declared I will build my church.

In Matthew xxvi. 28 Christ says his blood is the blood of the new covenant, which Jeremiah prophesied of, and which Daniel said he should confirm with many during the last week of the city.

In Psalm cxviii. 22 and in Isaiah xxviii. 16, God declares he will lay the sure foundation-stone in Zion, the corner-stone of his church or kingdom. In Matthew xxi. 42 Christ applies this to himself. So do the apostles apply it to Christ in Acts iv. 11; and in Mark xii. 10 Christ again uses the language as applying to himself. So also in Luke xx. 17. Peter in his first letter (ii. 6. 7) applies it to Christ. Paul in Ephesians ii. 20 declares that the church is laid on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus being the chief corner-stone.

God promised to David (Psalm cv.) to raise up Christ to sit on his throne. Now, when was the Lord's house set up in Zion? When did the law go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem? When did God make a covenant with Judah and Israel? When did he set up the kingdom that Daniel speaks of? When did he pour out his Spirit on all flesh? When did he raise up Christ and set him on his throne? When did he rebuild the tabernacle of David? When did he lay the corner-stone of his church in Zion? When was the rock first laid down that Christ speaks of in Matthew, and when was Jesus laid as the corner-stone, and the apostles and prophets placed as the foundation? When was the new covenant confirmed?

Luke tells us "that repentance and remission of sins were preached, beginning at Jerusalem." Here the law was to go from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. Jesus told them to tarry in Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high, or till Joel's prophecy was fulfilled. In Acts ii. we read that the Holy Ghost was poured out, and they were baptized in the Spirit. Peter tells us that now Joel's prophecy is fulfilled, and the promise to David is now fulfilled, in the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. Now Peter lays down the rock, preaches that Jesus is Lord and Christ; he unlocks the kingdom to the Jews; Jesus, the chief corner-stone, is laid; the apostles and Christian prophets are laid on the rock; the covenant is offered and confirmed to all who accept it; the kingdom is set up, and the blood of the covenant is applied for remission of sins. Here, then, and not till then, were all these prophecies fulfilled.

A kingdom must have a king, subjects, and laws. Jesus was not king till after his ascension. Eph. i. Col. i. Heb. ix. He had no subjects, for his law did not go forth, nor did men accept him till Pentecost. Then the kingdom was set up on the day of Pentecost, and not before, and there was no church till then.

We have said that the Jewish nation and the Christian Church were entirely distinct. We will prove it by showing that they had nothing in common.

The Christian Church is a new man of which Christ is the head and believers in him the body. Eph. ii. 15. Col. i. 18.

We have a new name. Isaiah lxii. 2. Acts xi. 26. Acts xxvi. 28, 29, 1 Peter iv. 14-16. James ii. 7.

We have a new and better covenant. Jer. xxxi. Matt. xxvi. 28. Gal. iv. Heb. viii. ix., x.

We have a new religion. Gal. i. 13. Acts xvi. 5.

We have a new mediator. Gal. iii. 19. Heb. x. 14.

The church is a new kingdom, has a new law, new king, new house, new and better promises, new and better hope, new and living way of access to the Father, new high priest, new and better sacrifice, in short all new throughout.

The Jewish nation is never called the body of Christ, a new man, temple of the Holy Spirit, pillar and support of the truth, spiritual seed, royal priesthood, priests and kings unto God, spiritual brethren of Christ, Christians, the bride or spouse of Christ.

We have shown, also, that the Jewish nation had no church offices, no qualifications based on faith and piety, but only on flesh; had no separation of pious and wicked, no discipline. In short it was a nation. The Christian Church has all these, or is a church. Then there can be no common item mentioned. They differed *in toto*. The Christian Church was new throughout.

If the Jewish Church and the Christian Church were identical, why had Nicodemus, an officer of the Jewish Church, as my opponent calls it, to be born again, or to believe and be baptized to enter the Christian Church? Why had all Jews to believe, repent, and be baptized to enter the Christian Church? If they were members of the Jewish Church, and these churches were identical, why did they not remain in this identical church?

Again, after the day of Pentecost, there was an organization numbering several thousands, with the apostles at their head. This was the Christian Church. It continued and spread all over Judea and Jerusalem, until the destruction of Jerusalem. For thirty-five years there was an organization at Mt. Moriah, with its sacrifices, and all the ceremonies that my opponent says made it the Jewish Church. It was the Jewish Church before Pentecost. The Christian Church was then set up, and these two rival institutions existed side by side for thirty-five years. Were they identical? If not, when did the one at Moriah cease to be a church? What had it last? What did it ever have that it had not now?

It reminds me of an anecdote Daniel Webster used to tell of a classmate of his. The class was studying logic, and the professor was arguing that substitution of parts did not destroy the identity of the original whole, even if it extended to a substitution of every part of the original whole. There was a genius named Tom in the class, who was whittling. He looked up and exclaimed, "See here, professor, substitution, even if it extend to a substitution of every individual part, will not destroy the identity of the original whole?" "No, sir," said the professor, promptly. "Well," said Tom, "suppose I break out, and lose the blade of my knife, and put in a new blade, will it be the same knife?" "Yes, sir," said the professor. "Suppose I break it again, and lose the handle, and get a new one, will it be the

same knife?" "Yes, sir." "Well, suppose some one finds the old blade and handle and puts them together, what knife will that be?" The professor's answer was never given.

So in this case we have a new organization, new in every particular, and we are told it is identical with the Jewish organization. We find on Mt. Moriah the old Jewish organization, complete in every particular. Mr. Hughey, what is that up on Mt. Moriah? Is it not your Jewish Church? What is this down here? Is it not the Christian Church? Are they not different in every particular? Are they identical? Away with such nonsense. My opponent should read Christ's parables of the new wine and old bottles, the new piece of cloth and the old garment. He can not put the new wine of Christianity into the old bottles of Judaism. He can not sew the new cloth of Christianity on to the old castaway garment of Judaism. It will tear all, and destroy his Jewish Church.

The argument of my opponent implies that baptism is substituted for circumcision. He does not boldly affirm this, but his position implies it. We will call your attention to seventeen objections to baptism being used instead of circumcision:

1. Circumcision was limited to males; baptism embraces men and women.

2. Circumcision was based on birth or flesh, and required no previous profession of faith and repentance. Baptism requires faith and repentance without exception, in regard to age, circumstances, or parentage.

3. Circumcision was not a figurative representation of the birth, resurrection and burial of Christ. Baptism was a figurative representation of these facts.

4. Circumcision belonged to Abraham's seed, either natural or adopted. Baptism belongs to penitent believers of all nations, and is not like circumcision a wall of partition.

5. Circumcision was always performed on the eighth day. Baptism is performed when men believe and repent.

6. Infants were commanded to be circumcised. Infants were never commanded to be baptized.

7. The Bible never calls circumcision a substitute for baptism, nor baptism a substitute for circumcision.

8. A male person bought with money was circumcised. Baptism is never given to such, but only to those who believe and repent.

9. Circumcision was a bloody, painful rite, and never performed in the face or forehead. Baptism is neither, and is immersion in water.

10. Circumcision was administered by priests or heads of families. Baptism by any Christian who has induced a soul to believe and repent.

11. The uncircumcised were not permitted to attend the ministrations of the law. Baptism makes no such distinction. The gospel is preached to all.

12. Circumcision forbade its subjects to extend the usual civilities of life to the uncircumcised. Baptism does not forbid but encourages them.



13. Circumcision was the duty of the parent, and not the subject. It was an act of the parent. The child or subject was neutral. Baptism is binding on the subject. He is not neutral. He must believe, repent, and then be baptized.

14. Circumcision gave one all the privileges of the Jewish organization. Baptism of infants does not, for its subjects are required to believe, repent, and be a second time admitted.

15. Circumcision was not a religious act performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit, but merely a token of a fleshly relation or earthly covenant. Baptism is a religious act, and performed in the name of Father, Son, and Spirit.

16. All who were circumcised were required to be baptized again before they were received into the Christian Church. This would never have been done had baptism come in room of circumcision.

17. The circumcised was a debtor to the whole law. Baptism freed the Jews from the law.

Now let me ask you if two things so repugnant and different can be used one as a substitute for another. Where did men find this absurd idea of substitution in the face of such glaring differences and contrasts? This we hope will end this idea of substitution.

Again, the apostles practiced both. Paul circumcised and baptized Timothy. In Acts xxii. 24 the apostles exhorted Paul to prove to the Jews that he observed the whole law. The Christian Jews were, as the apostles said, zealous for the law, and some believed that Jews should circumcise till the end of time. Would Paul practice circumcision and baptism both on the same person, if one were the substitute for the other?

Again, when the question arose whether the Gentiles should be circumcised, why did not the apostles dispose of it by showing that baptism was substituted for circumcision. If such were the case their silence is unaccountable.

My opponent has brought forward 1 Peter iii. 21. Baptism saves us from sin. Did circumcision? Does baptism save infants from sin? Baptism is the seeking of a good conscience, or we seek a good conscience in baptism. Can infants seek a good conscience in baptism? Is baptism the answer of a good conscience to an infant? The passage is fatal to the whole idea of infant baptism. I would as soon think of going to the first commandment to sustain idolatry, as to this language of Peter to sustain infant baptism. Peter's language limits baptism to penitent believers alone.

But we are told baptism is a positive ordinance of Christ's kingdom, and asked why we deny it to infants? Because the conditions the law of baptism requires can never exist in infants. But why deny them the other positive ordinance? Why not let them eat the Lord's Supper?

Cyprian, the father of infant baptism, was more consistent. He gave them both, and tells a marvelous tale of a girl too small to talk, who had by her nurse been given meat offered to idols. When she came to the Lord's Supper, the bread and wine were miraculously rejected by this infant because she had eaten of heathen sacrifices! He

was consistent, even if he were silly. The whole plea is a tissue of folly.

My opponent has not yet told us why he makes all baptized infants, when they become adults, go through a mourner's bench process to convert them, and then keep them on six months' probation before they join. Converting church members! Members joining, and on probation first, what they already belong to! There is no end to these absurdities.

We object to infant baptism that it secularizes the church, and breaks down the dividing line between the church and world. The members of Christ's church are called out of the world. Infant baptism brings the whole world in with them regardless of faith or piety.

Infant baptism is denounced by our Saviour when he quoted the prophet's language, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." The gentleman has not found a single apostolic precept or example yet. It is a human invention, and as much will-worship as the strange fire of Nadab and Abihu. The only passage which will sustain my opponent's practice is in Peter: "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." Infant baptism is clearly an ordinance of man.

In Colossians ii. 20: "Therefore if ye be dead with Christ from the elements of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances after the commandments of men, which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship."

Titus i. 13: "Rebuke them sharply that they may be saved in faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men, which turn from the truth."

Now I appeal to any unprejudiced mind if my opponent has not given heed entirely to what are now Jewish fables for they are done away entirely. He has found no apostolic command or example for his practice, hence it is a commandment of men.

Now let me ask you in all kindness, if my opponent has advanced one scriptural argument, that you can mention in support of his practice? Can any one arise and mention one single passage of scripture that has been adduced, that teaches infant baptism? Let me, in all kindness, ask my opponent to give an apostolic precept or example, or abandon this most unscriptural position. Can you mention any ordinance or duty that God has left to such loose inference, as that it accords with that nondescript something,- called the genius of Christianity?

<sup>1</sup> If you will allow me such grounds I will introduce every superstition that started in the great apostasy of the Man of Sin. My opponent first found infant baptism in the same age when infant communion, real presence, celibacy, purgatory, worship of saints and images, and confession to priests began. Cyprian was appealed to in regard to infant baptism. Does he and his council of bishops appeal to apostolic precept or example to sustain this practice, that my opponent says was practiced by the apostles? No, like my opponent they appeal to the genius of the Christian religion. How do they find that genius? Why Elisha stretched himself on the Shunamite child, showing that

infants are equal to men, therefore they should be baptized. There is the argument of the first authority my opponent found for infant baptism.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I arise before you to close the discussion on this proposition so far as my part of the discussion is concerned. I am sorry that my friend kept back his great—his all-powerful argument, as he esteemed it, until his last speech, and has thus prevented me from replying to it, as I should be glad to do. I have no right to attribute any improper motive to him, but, at the same time, I think this is rather a singular way of conducting a discussion. We have been debating this proposition for nearly two days. When the gentleman knew that this was the last speech that I had to make, he hurls his great argument against me, knowing that I should not have time to reply to it as I should certainly do, if there were more time at my disposal. This is, to say the least, an unfair manner of conducting a discussion. He should have presented the arguments upon which he relied to support his position in time for me to have examined them fully; but this he has not seen fit to do, and his course has betrayed his conscious weakness, by keeping back his arguments, until he knows I can have but one opportunity to reply, and that that reply must necessarily be brief. I will never adopt such a course to cover a conscious weakness.

I now propose to review the gentleman's speech as fully as my short space will allow, and then I shall proceed to the recapitulation of my own argument.

You remember his remarks in regard to household baptism. Nearly one-half of the baptisms recorded in the New Testament, as performed by the apostles, were household baptisms, which shows that this was their common practice. But I confined my argument on household baptism to two examples—the baptism of the jailer's household, and that of Lydia's household. I showed you that in the account of the baptism of the jailer's family, that others beside the jailer believed; but in the case of Lydia's family, she alone believed, while she and her family were baptized. Why, in the same chapter, should there be such a difference in the account of the historian, unless it was to show that Lydia's children were baptized upon her faith? I showed again that the word *oikos*, used always in reference to household baptism, when it signifies family, always includes parents and children, and excludes servants, domestics, employes, etc.; and that this word is always used to signify the house of Israel, the house of Judah, the house of David, when family descent is spoken of. What did my opponent say in reply to this? Why he read to you the definition of *oikos* from Greenfield to prove that it literally means house! This is true. The literal meaning of *oikos* is house, and the literal meaning of *oikia* is house also, with this distinction, *oikos* means the family residence proper, never including the out-houses or servants' apartments; while *oikia* always includes the out-houses, servants' apartments, etc. So when these terms are used in a metaphorical sense, to

signify family, *oikos* means the family proper, that is, parents and children, to the exclusion of servants, etc.; while *oikia* embraces servants, domestics, and all connected in any way with the family. *Oikos* is a masculine name, and *oikia* a feminine, and in the Greek language the feminine is the comprehensive term, and includes the masculine. Greenfield, Parkhurst, Robinson, Liddell and Scott, all define *oikos* when it means family, "a house, race or family, posterity, lineage, a nation sprung from a common progenitor," etc., etc.; while Robinson defines *oikia*, when it means family, as including "attendants, servants, domestics." *Oikos*, used literally, sometimes means a room or a part of a house, hence we have the "*oikos* of the *oikia*," that is, "the room in the house." We have an illustration of the same usage of the Greek language in regard to masculine and feminine nouns in Matt. xvi. 18, in the usage of *petros* and *petra*. *Petros* signifies a stone or fragment of a rock, while *petra* signifies a great mass of rock. Here is my "Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament," in which the gentleman can find all the examples of the use of *oikos* and *oikia* in the New Testament, and he can examine and see for himself, that whenever the house of David, the house of Israel, etc., is spoken of, *oikos* is always used, and *oikia* never. So when the church of God is called a house, *oikos* is always used, but *oikia* never. This demonstrably proves that *oikos* is limited to parents and children, and that it never includes servants, domestics, or employees.

In the account of the jailer's conversion, we are told: "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." *Oikia* is here used, showing that all connected with the jailer's house, whether members of his family or not, heard the gospel, but when the baptism is spoken, it is "he and all his," that is, "he and his family," who were baptized, for the promise was: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." *Oikos* is here used, which means family proper. This distinction between these words is kept up everywhere in the New Testament. So when Lydia only believed, and her family also were baptized, *oikos* is used, which necessarily includes children, and excludes servants, domestics, etc. Here it is demonstrably proved that Paul baptized Lydia's infant children upon her faith; and there is no act that can evade the force of this argument. Here we have apostolic example for the practice of infant baptism.

But the gentleman asked me who were the brethren spoken of in the fortieth verse? I answer, they were the jailer and those who were converted when he was, and other persons who were converted during the sojourn of Paul and Silas at Philippi, for they had been in that city for a considerable time, and he must conclude that they were not idle, nor their labor unfruitful. The gentleman would fain have us believe that "the brethren" were only those who constituted Lydia's family! But no such an idea is contained in the passage. Luke says: "And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed." After Paul and Silas were let out of prison, they went to Lydia's house, and those who had been converted in Philippi were gathered together at her house. This is the plain import of the pas-

sage; and the gentleman's attempt to limit "the brethren" to the household of Lydia, only shows the straits into which he has fallen.

I do not contend that in every case of household or family baptism practiced by the apostles, that infants were necessarily included. Probably in some of these families there were no infants; but in some of them, as in the case of Lydia's family, we do positively know that there were infants baptized by the apostles; for, in this case, no one of her family "heard the word"—no one of them had their "heart opened"—no one of them "believed"—all this is said of her alone, yet she and "her family were baptized." This could be the case only by her children, who were baptized along with her, being infants. There is no way of getting around this argument. My opponent can not deny the facts in the case; and the fact here is undeniable, that we have a plain and clear apostolic example of infant baptism. This one single example is sufficient to put an end to the controversy in all reflecting minds who are not hopelessly under the power of prejudice.

I will, for a moment, notice the gentleman's remarks on the word *ekklesia*. He told us God never had a church before the day of Pentecost; but he had a nation "called out" from the nations of the earth; but that nation was not a church! But, I ask him if that nation is not frequently in the scriptures, called God's "congregation?" Now, is not "congregation" the word in scripture which means church? That nation is also called by Stephen "the church which was in the wilderness." The house of Israel is called in the scriptures "God's congregation." His *ekklesia* or church called out from the nations of the earth, to be a holy people unto the Lord. But again, the gentleman tells us that this was not God's house at all, it was Moses' house! The scriptures tell us the house of Israel was God's congregation, God's church, God's house; but my opponent tells us this is a mistake; it was Moses' congregation, Moses' church, Moses' house! You can believe the word of God, or Mr. Braden, which ever you may think is the best authority in the case before us. As for myself, I prefer to believe the word of God. But I ask again, how could Moses be a servant in his own house? If the "church in the wilderness" was Moses' house, certainly he was master there and not a servant. Yet Paul expressly states that Moses was a servant in the same house over which Christ reigns as a Son, and that this house is the church of the Redeemer.

The gentleman told you that I knew that the word translated infant in the passage quoted from Irenaeus, is not the Latin word which properly means infant.

*Mr. Braden*—I said the word did not necessarily mean infant in that passage.

*Mr. Hughey*—But I happen to know that it necessarily means infant in that passage. The gentleman has been telling us if I would produce the original, he would translate for us, you remember. Now I happen to have the original Latin of this entire passage from Irenaeus, Schaff's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 402. Here it is. Will Mr. Braden read it? Head it if you can, sir; and if you can not read it, call on some of your friends who can read Latin, to read the passage

for you! As the gentleman will not read it for you, I will read it myself:

*"Omnes venit per sanctissimum salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per enim, resuscitantes in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit aetatem, et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes; in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans lave ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiae et subjectionis, in juvenilibus juvenis," etc.*

If *infantes* does not necessarily mean infant in this passage what does it mean? *Infantes* means a child who can not yet speak. *Parvulos* means a "little child," the next step from the unspeaking infant. *Pueros* means a boy, a child. *Juvenes* means a youth, a young man, and *seniores*, an old man. In this connection, *infantes* being followed by *parvulos*, and *parvulos* by *pueros*, and *pueros* by *juvenes*, it is demonstrable, that *infantes* means infant proper, the very first stage of human life. There is not a scholar in the world who does not know that *infantes* means infants, in this passage from Irenaeus. I here furnish the gentleman with the original, and he can examine it for himself. If the connection here, as well as the force and meaning of the word itself, does not show that *infantes* in this passage necessarily means infants, then, I confess, I do not know what would make it necessary. I confess I was not expecting that the gentleman would commit such a blunder as this, and suffer himself to be so completely vanquished on a question of scholarship, as to assert that the word *infantes*, in the passage from Irenaeus, does not necessarily mean infants. It means infants and nothing else; and can have no other meaning. Irenaeus, you must remember, flourished as a writer from A. D. 170 to 205; that is, he lived from seventy to one hundred and five years after the death of the apostle John; and he was the disciple, or pupil of Polycarp, who was the disciple or pupil of the apostle John; and he speaks of infant baptism as a common practice in his day.

But my opponent tells us that by "regeneration unto God," Irenaeus does not mean baptism in this passage; but that Christ regenerated those persons by his example! This is a new method of regeneration, and one purely of Mr. Braden's invention. I gave you two examples from Irenaeus in which he calls baptism "regeneration unto God," and this is sufficient to prove what Irenaeus meant by this language.

But Mr. Braden stands squarely against Mr. Campbell on this question. Mr. Campbell says:

"Prop. XL—All the apostolical fathers, as they are called, all the pupils of the apostles, and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four Christian centuries, whose writings have come down to us, allude to, and speak of, Christian baptism, as the regeneration and remission of sins spoken of in the New Testament."—Christian System, p. 218.

Again, on page 220, of the same work, in questions asked by Dr. Wall, and answers taken from his History of Infant Baptism, Mr. Campbell says:

"Did all the Christians, public and private, and all the Christian writers from Barnabas to the times of Pelagius (410), as far as you

know, continue to use the term regenerate as only applicable to immersion?

"Dr. Wall.—The Christians did, in all ancient times continue the use of this name regeneration, for baptism; so that they never use the word regenerate, or born again, but they mean or denote by it baptism. And almost all the quotations which I shall bring in this book shall be instances of it."

Mr. Campbell then gives us some examples from the fathers; but he strangely forgets to mention Irenaeus among his witnesses, for that would interfere with his position on infant baptism. You can take the word of Mr. Campbell on this question or Mr. Braden, just which you please; but I presume Mr. Campbell was, at least, as well qualified to testify as to the usage of the fathers as my opponent. The truth is, every one at all acquainted with the writings of the fathers know<sup>3</sup> that they called baptism regeneration, and that this was the common name for baptism among them; and I am sorry to see my opponent attempt to deny so plain a fact of ecclesiastical history.

I have not read Jones' Church History; but I have read Perrin carefully; and I do know that the charge brought by Mr. Rice, in his debate with Mr. Campbell, against Jones for changing the extract which he takes from Perrin, so as to suppress Perrin's testimony, or rather the testimony of the Waldenses as quoted by Perrin, in favor of infant baptism, is true. Jones quotes confessedly from Perrin, and I have compared the extract quoted by Mr. Rice from Jones, with the passage in Perrin, and the case is just precisely as Mr. Rice states it. This I know to be true. Jones shamefully perverted the very passage he quoted from Perrin. That the Waldenses practiced infant baptism. Perrin, their own historian, abundantly proves by their own confessions of faith, and other authentic writings. My opponent stated that if he had "Orchard's History of the Baptists," he could prove that, in a confession of faith which the Waldenses presented to the King of France, they declared themselves Baptists. I informed the gentleman that I had "Orchard's History of the Baptists," and that he could have the use of it, but he did not call on me for the work. I have examined Orchard, and I do not find any such confession; but I do find a confession of faith in Orchard, p. 288, the 4th article of which reads as follows:

"We believe that there is one holy church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful, that has existed from the beginning of the world, and shall be to the end thereof."

This does not sound much like my opponent's teachings, who says that God had no church until the day of Pentecost! The very fact that the Waldenses believed in the unity of the church, proves that they were not opposed to infant baptism, for all who hold to the unity of the church under the old and the new dispensations practice infant baptism.

The gentleman tells us that Dr. Gill called in question one of the passages in Origen on infant baptism; but it was only one passage that Gill questioned. But the fact that infant baptism was practiced by the church, in Origen's time, is so fully set forth in his writings, that Mr. Campbell, and all the learned opponents of infant baptism

admit it. I will give one more extract from the writings of Origen, which is found in his homily on Luke. He says :

"Having occasion given in this place, I will mention a thing that causes frequent inquiries among the brethren. Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins ? or when have they sinned? or how can any reason of the law in their case hold good? But according to that sense we mentioned even now, none are free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day upon the earth! And it is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized."—Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 391.

This, with the passages before quoted from Origen, proves that infant baptism was generally practiced in his day, and practiced too, on the authority of the apostles, or claimed to be an apostolical institution.

But the gentleman tells us that Tertullian opposed infant baptism. But I showed in my last speech that Tertullian did no such thing. He simply advised the duty of baptism in the case of infants, as he also did in that of unmarried persons and widows. Tertullian never opposed infant baptism as an innovation, or as unscriptural; and yet if it were an innovation he must have known it, for it must have been introduced within the lifetime of those who lived in his day, for he flourished from one hundred to one hundred and twenty years after the death of the apostle John. But his advising the delay of baptism in the case of infants, proves that it was not common for such delay to be made in his time.

But my opponent told us that there is no account of infant baptism until the Council of Carthage, three hundred year? after Christ! The Council of Carthage was held A. D. 253, just one hundred and fifty-three years after the death of the apostle John. That council did not decide whether children ought to be baptized or not; there was question, as to the lawfulness of infant baptism—all admitted that; but the question was, whether infants should be baptized before they were eight days old or not, that being the day on which circumcision was anciently administered. This shows that they all understood baptism to occupy the same place under the gospel, that circumcision did under the former dispensation—that baptism is the Christian circumcision. The council decided that it was not necessary to delay the baptism of infants until the eighth day; but that they might be baptized immediately after birth. This proves that infant baptism was generally practiced at the time of this council.

My opponent says that here commenced all the superstitious practices of the Church of Rome, such as the "anointing with oil," "signing with the cross," etc., etc. But was not every one of these superstitious practices observed in the baptism of adults as well as infants? If this proves that infant baptism is an innovation—that it is one of the superstitions of Rome—it proves also that adult baptism is an innovation ; for every superstition, immersion, trine immersion, the baptism of persons naked, etc., was practiced in adult baptism, just as well as in infant baptism. If these things prove that infant baptism is "a human institution," they also prove that adult baptism is "a hu-



man institution." I am ashamed for a man that will attempt to argue in such a manner as this.

I will now briefly notice the gentleman's new—his great argument. He told us "the kingdom" was not "set up" until the day of Pentecost; and that the kingdom then "set up" was a new institution, something that never had an existence before. Here he assumes the very point in controversy as the foundation of his argument. He quoted the passage of Daniel: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," to prove that the kingdom never had an existence before. But Daniel does not tell us what kingdom it was that should be "set up." You must also bear in mind, that the phrase "set up," as I showed you, does not mean to create, or to bring into existence something that did not exist before; but it means to raise up something that has fallen down, and restore it to its original condition. The prophet Amos, and the apostle James, as I showed you before, tell us what kingdom it was that should be "set up," that it was the "Tabernacle of David which had fallen down;" and after it had been "set up," and restored, the Gentiles should be gathered into it. Here I prove that the kingdom "set up" in Daniel, is "the Tabernacle of David" in Amos and James, into which all believers are gathered; that it is the church in which David lived.

The gentleman told us that this kingdom "set up," had a new name given to it, and that this new name was never given to God's ancient church. I will read from Isaiah lxii. 1-4, and we will see that the new name was promised to God's ancient church:

"For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah: for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married."

Here is an address made to God's ancient Zion—his church—in which the promise is given to her that she shall wear the "new name;" and the Gentiles shall see her glory, and be gathered into her fold, under the glorious reign of the Sun of righteousness. God threatens the rebellious Hebrews, Isa. lxx.,- that he will "slay them and call his servants by another name," but this does not deprive the faithful Zion of her promises, but only foretells what took place when the unbelieving Jews were broken off from the good olive-tree in consequence of their unbelief; while the believing Jews remained in their own olive-tree under the gospel.

Again, the gentleman told us that the church of Christ is "a kingdom of priests," and that the privilege was never promised to God's ancient church. Now if he will turn to Exodus xix. 3-6, he will see that this promise was emphatically made to God's ancient Israel:

"And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob,

and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

The house of Israel were thus promised, if they would obey the voice of the Lord, they should be unto him "a kingdom of priests." This of course was to take place under the glorious reign of the Messiah. When God elected his ancient people, he did not elect them to cast them off again. If they had been faithful, they would have remained the favored people of the Lord; it was their sin and unbelief that procured their rejection and destruction. It is true the ceremonial law would have been abolished, for it was typical, and only designed to be temporary in its existence, and to give place to the anti-type when he should appear; but this would not have effected the relation of God's people to him. Thus we see how the gentleman's great arguments fail him, and dissipate before the touch of truth.

Again, he told us the "new institution," was to be built upon a new foundation. Matt. xvi. 16-18. Who is the rock, upon which the church of Christ is built? This rock is not Peter, nor Peter and the other apostles combined; but it is Christ "the Son of God," confessed by Peter. But my opponent tells us that Paul, in Ephesians ii. 20, says that the church is built upon the apostles and Christian prophets!

This is but an extension of the Roman Catholic foundation. They take Peter alone, but Mr. Braden takes Peter and all the apostles and Christian prophets as the foundation of the church of Christ! When Paul, in Ephesians ii. 20, says: "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone;" he does not mean that the apostles and prophets constitute the foundation, but that the apostles and the prophets (not Christian prophets)—the Old Testament prophets—were builders, and Christ was the common foundation upon which they both built. That this is his meaning here is certain, for in a parallel passage, in 1 Corinthians iii., he compares the church to a house or building, and the apostles and their fellow-laborers to builders, and he expressly declares: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Paul does not contradict himself in these two passages by affirming in the one that Christ is the only foundation of the church, and in the other that the apostles and Christian prophets are the foundation. The prophets built upon the same foundation that the apostles did, according to Paul. Did the old prophets build upon Jesus Christ? Most assuredly they did. Upon him they built their hopes of heaven; upon him they built their doctrine—they preached Christ, and were builders upon him—the only foundation which was laid in Zion. Isaiah xxviii. 16. Go and read the eleventh chapter of Hebrews if you do not believe that the prophets built upon Christ, the only foundation, and you will see your error. This passage proves the unity of the church of Jesus Christ, beyond the possibility of contra-

diction. A new order of things obtain under the gospel—types give place to antitypes; the ritualism of the old dispensation gives place to the spirituality of the new, but the foundation remains the same—the doctrine remains the same, and sinners are saved by the same faith in the same atoning blood.

Thus I have shown that the church of Christ is not "a new institution," which never had an existence until the day of Pentecost, but that it is "the tabernacle" or church in which David lived, and the house or building in which the prophets were builders, built upon the one foundation—Christ Jesus.

But the gentleman tells us that as baptism is the answer of a good conscience, it can not be applied to children, for it can not be the answer of a good conscience to them! But I have in the former proposition showed you that "the answer of a good conscience" here, means "the sign of a good conscience," or that the conscience has been made good through a risen Saviour. New infants stand justified before God, through Jesus Christ; therefore the answer of a good conscience, baptism, may be placed upon them. Circumcision was the sign of a new heart, just as baptism is, and yet God adjudged it applicable to infants by putting it upon them. But according to my opponent's argument God was mistaken—circumcision was not applicable to infants!

But the gentleman asks: "If infants are to be baptized, then why not admit them to the Lord's Supper?" I answer, while baptism applies to infants, the Lord's Supper does not, and can not. Circumcision applied to infants under the former dispensation; but they were not allowed to partake of the passover until they came to the years of accountability.

Dr. Gill, a learned Baptist writer, says :

"According to the maxims of the Jews, persons were not obliged to the duties of the law, or subject to the penalties of it, in case of non-performance, until they were, a female, at the age of twelve years and one day, and a male at the age of thirteen years and one day." "They were not reckoned adult members till then ; nor then, either, unless worthy persons," for so it is said, "He that is worthy is called at thirteen years of age a son of the congregation of Israel, that is, a member of the church."—Wood on Baptism, pp. 136, 137.

To this testimony of Dr. Gill might be added that of the great body of learned commentators, but this is unnecessary.

There are several things in the gentleman's speech that I will not have time to reply to. But there is nothing that he has advanced but might be fully answered if I had time to spend in replying to them, but this I have not; but nothing the gentleman has advanced can affect my argument. In his last speech he brought a number of objections against infant baptism, but his objections come too late, for when once a proposition is established by sufficient evidence, no objections can set it aside, unless they show the position against which they are brought involves an absurdity or an impossibility. I have proved my proposition by the scriptures, and no objection can have any force against it. There is no truth but you may bring objections against; but what do such objections amount to? There is not a

single objection which the gentleman has brought, or can bring against infant baptism, but bears with equal force against infant circumcision; yet we know that God commanded the Jews to circumcise their children at eight days old. A Jew might have said, with as much sense and reason as my opponent now does in regard to infant baptism, "What good will it do to circumcise my child? It will only make him cry! He cannot understand its import! He may not like it when he grows up! It can not be a sign of a new heart to him!" and a thousand other questions as irreverent as senseless. But what would God Almighty have said to such a caviler at his commandments? And what will he say to my opponent, and such objectors against his ordinance, now? There is a fearful reckoning awaiting those who cavil at the plain teachings of God's word. It was not for us to bring objections against the requirements of God's word; but it was ours to learn and obey. The only question for us to determine is, "Does God require it?" And if this can be answered in the affirmative, every mouth must be hushed in silence whether we can understand the reason of the requirement or not.

I shall now proceed to a brief recapitulation of my argument, though I shall not be able to get entirely through with it in the twenty-three minutes of time remaining to me yet.

I started out with the proposition that if a practice could be shown to be in accordance with the nature of things under the evangelical covenant, it must be scriptural. I then proved that infant baptism is in accordance with the nature of the evangelical covenant, and demanded by the genius of the covenant of grace. This I proved by showing that when God first visibly established the covenant of grace in the family of Abraham, he put infants into it at eight days old; thereby showing that the relation recognized by infant baptism was instituted by God himself, in the first visible organization of the covenant of grace.

In presenting this argument, I showed, first, that God made a general promise to Abraham, recorded in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, embracing two particulars: A literal seed and an earthly inheritance; and a spiritual seed and a heavenly inheritance. I showed, secondly, that upon this general promise God made two covenants with Abraham. One securing the earthly inheritance to the literal seed, recorded in Genesis xv.; the other with Abraham and his spiritual seed, securing to them the heavenly inheritance, and recorded in Genesis xvii.; and that these were the only covenants that God made with Abraham. The temporal covenant, securing the earthly inheritance, was ratified by sacrifice, the ancient method of ratifying covenants among all nations, and the spiritual covenant was ratified by circumcision.

I proved that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace. First, by the specification of that covenant. The first specification of the covenant was that Abraham should "be a father of many nations." This I proved by Paul is fulfilled under the gospel, by all believers being constituted the children of Abraham. Paul declares, first, that by circumcision Abraham was constituted the father of all believers under the gospel; and, second, that he was con-

stituted by circumcision the father of circumcision to all believers. This I showed could only be the case by believers under the gospel coming into the covenant of circumcision, for circumcision is not given to believers under the gospel. Here the argument was conclusive. The second specification of this covenant: "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," etc., I showed embraced the highest spiritual blessings. The third specification: "I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, I showed was to be understood typically, and that under the type of the literal Canaan was here revealed the promise of the heavenly inheritance. This you remember I proved demonstrably, for this was a promise to Abraham and his spiritual seed jointly for a possession and an inheritance; but neither Abraham nor his spiritual seed ever had the promise of the earthly Canaan as a possession and an inheritance, as I showed you.

What was the gentleman's reply to my argument here? He said that "the spiritual covenant made with Abraham was 430 years before the giving of the law; and dating back from the giving of the law to the offering up of Isaac on Mount Moriah, we have just 430 years, and, therefore, the spiritual covenant made with Abraham, by which all believers were constituted his children, was made on Mount Moriah at least thirty or forty years after the covenant of circumcision." But I showed you that this transaction took place only about 380 years before the giving of the law, and, therefore, as it fell short of the 430 years some fifty years, it could not be the covenant of grace. I showed again that God made no covenant with Abraham on Mount Moriah, but that this was simply a confirmation of the covenant by an oath, which was made when God constituted Abraham "the father of many nations."

Secondly, I proved that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace, by the nature and character of the sign and seal of that covenant. I showed that circumcision, the sign and seal of the covenant, was a sign of a new heart, and "a seal of the righteousness of faith." My opponent admitted that circumcision was "a sign of the cutting off of the evil desires of the heart." He thus admitted that it was the sign of a new heart. This proves clearly that the covenant, of which circumcision was the sign and seal, was the covenant which secures the blessings of a new heart, and the righteousness of faith, and therefore the general covenant of grace. I showed also that the parable of the vineyard and of the olive-tree can be explained on no other ground, than by admitting the evangelical character of the covenant of circumcision. And, finally, I showed that the Old Testament prophets always represent the conversion of the Gentiles as their being gathered into God's ancient Zion—"the tabernacle of David," etc., showing the essential unity of the church under every dispensation. As God put infants into his visible church at eight days old, when he first organized it, therefore, the relation which is recognized by infant baptism is sanctioned and demanded by the nature of the covenant of grace. Thus I showed that infant baptism is sustained by the highest authority—the nature of things. The only possible way to answer my argument here is to show that the

covenant of circumcision was not the covenant of grace. My opponent has tried this, and has failed; and, therefore, my proposition is established by my first general argument.

My second general argument in support of my proposition was founded on the great commission. I showed that the circumstances under which the apostles were placed were such as to make it impossible for them to have understood the commission in any other way than as an express command to baptize infants. They had never seen or heard of a church that did not have infants in it. Throughout the Jewish dispensation, when proselytes were brought into the church, their infant children were brought in with them. Jesus had taught them that little children belonged to his kingdom or church, and had taught them that except they "were converted, and became as little children, they could not enter into the kingdom of heaven." He thus made the infant the model to which adults must conform in order to enter his kingdom, showing that infants already had the right to enter his kingdom—that they were already accepted by him. He thus received and treated children as belonging to his kingdom—and even styled them believers. After three years of such instruction as this, when he commissioned his apostles to go out and bring the nations into his church, he said: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them," etc. Under these circumstances I say it was impossible for the apostles to have understood the commission in any other way than to include infants. I showed here that "disciple the nations" is the thing to be done, while baptizing and teaching is the manner of doing it; and that baptism stands first in the discipling process, and this accords exactly with the practice of infant baptism.

In reply to this the gentleman told us that the word *matheteuoo*, rendered teach in Matthew xxviii. 19, and which properly signifies to "make disciples," as all critics are agreed, means "to teach first principles." But I showed you that it had no such meaning, and is never used in such a sense in the New Testament. Then he quoted Mark xvi. 16 to prove that faith necessarily precedes baptism; but I showed in the first place that Mark does not give the order in which baptism and teaching stand related to each other, nor the relation faith and baptism sustain to each other; but that Matthew does give the order in which these things stand related, and he places baptism first, and teaching, and consequently faith, second in order, which Drove that infant baptism was designed to be perpetual, and adult baptism only temporary in the church. Secondly, I showed that if the passage in Mark xvi. 16 excludes infants from baptism, it also excludes them from salvation; that the human family is divided into two classes—believers and unbelievers—and that to one of these classes infants must belong. If they belong to the class of unbelievers, they must be damned, for "he that believeth not shall be damned." If they belong to the class of believers, then they must be baptized. Then I showed that they do belong to the class of believers, for Christ did so receive them and treat them; and he styled them believers; so that if even believers only are to be baptized, then infants must be baptized, because they belong to the class of believers, and are so recognized, treated and styled by

Christ himself. Here the argument was conclusive again; and my proposition stands established by the great commission, which, when properly understood, is a positive precept for infant baptism.

My third general argument, in support of infant baptism, is drawn from the teaching and practice of the apostles. Here I showed that they understood the great commission to include infants; for when Peter opened the doors of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost, he included the children in the promise made to the fathers, which was fulfilled and realized under the gospel. "He said: "For the promise is unto you and to your children." I showed that the word *teknon* here used by Peter means posterity, and embraces the smallest infant. My opponent said it does not necessarily mean infants, but I showed that it necessarily means infants, if there be any infants in the posterity; and that if there were any infants in any of the families of the thousands who heard the language of Peter, those infants were embraced in the word *teknois*. The gentleman tells us that his parents have ten *teknois*, and he wants to know if they are infants? I answer, if any of these *teknois* are infants, they are embraced in the word, for it means posterity, and includes the smallest infants, and when this language of Peter was addressed to the multitude on the day of Pentecost, they understood it to include their smallest infants, and could have understood it in no other way.

Then my opponent undertook to prove that the promise referred to by Peter was the promise of the Spirit, set forth in Joel's prophecy, and not the promise made to Abraham, upon which Israel had been "waiting night and day." But it is most manifest, that when "the promise" was referred to by Peter, on this memorable occasion, it could be no other promise than that promise upon which Israel had been waiting since the days of their fathers; and which they expected to receive under Messiah, their prince; and Peter here declares that their children were embraced in this promise.

I showed also that it was the practice of the apostles to baptize households—families—that is the children of their converts along with them. Nearly one-half of the baptisms recorded in the New Testament after the day of Pentecost were family baptisms, showing that this was the ordinary practice of the apostles.

Again, I showed that the word *oikos*, which is uniformly used in reference to household baptism, is limited in its application to parents and children, and that it never includes servants, domestics, etc. In some of the examples of household baptism I admitted that it was possible that there might have been no infants in the families, but in others I showed that there were infants baptized, as in the case of Lydia's family. But my opponent said that I must prove that Lydia was married, or had been, and that she had a family of children, and that they were infants! But I showed that as we must take words in their ordinary meaning, and that as I proved that the ordinary—the uniform meaning of *oikos*, in the New Testament, is parents and children. this, of itself, proves that Lydia's household was her children, and this every intelligent man knows is true, and so does my opponent. None of Lydia's family "believed," none of their "hearts were opened," none of them attended "to the things spoken of Paul,"

and yet she and her family were baptized. If any of her family had believed, it would have been mentioned by Luke, as in the case of the jailer's family in the same chapter. Here I prove demonstrably that the apostles baptized infants, for if this does not amount to demonstration, then nothing can be demonstrated. Here we have a positive apostolic example for infant baptism, as we have for keeping the first day of the week for Sabbath, instead of the seventh.

What was Mr. Braden's reply to my argument here? Why he said that "Paul and Silas went into Lydia's house, and when they had seen the brethren they comforted them and departed." This he said showed that there were brethren in Lydia's house! But I showed that as Lydia's house was the place where Paul and Silas "abode" at Philippi, that it was at her house that their converts met, after they were liberated from prison, for there were many converts in the city, including the jailer and his family, who were gathered to take a farewell of Paul and Silas at Lydia's house. The gentleman's reply here only showed the weakness of his cause.

Here was my argument drawn from the practice of the apostles—from household baptisms—and my opponent's reply to it has only shown his utter inability to meet it. I would be ashamed to make such a reply to an argument of an opponent, before an intelligent audience, much less to send it out to the world in a book.

Finally, I showed that infant baptism was the uniform practice of the church from the days of the apostles down to the establishment of the great apostasy. Not a single passage from the fathers of the first five centuries of the Christian era has ever yet been produced condemning infant baptism as an innovation, or denying the fact that it was generally practiced. Tertullian is the only writer, in the early ages of Christianity, who even advised the delay of infant baptism, and' this proceeded from his false views in regard to the efficacy of baptism, and not because he regarded it as an innovation, as I proved to you from his own writings. I showed, also, that the Waldenses, those witnesses for the truth during the dark ages, practiced infant baptism.

To all my arguments the gentleman has replied that the church of Jesus Christ never had an existence until the day of Pentecost. Thus he assumed the very point in controversy, and built his argument upon this assumption. His whole argument upon this proposition has been a complete "begging of the question," and nothing else. I proved incontrovertibly that the church of Jesus Christ was visibly organized in the family of Abraham—that the covenant of circumcision was the general covenant of grace in Christ Jesus; and that everywhere, throughout the Old Testament prophets, the Gentiles, under the gospel, are represented as coming into God's ancient church, and that this also is the representation of the New Testament writers, as James in Acts xv. 15, 17, and Paul, Rom. xi. 16, 24. I showed, also, that the church is God's house, in which Moses lived as a servant, and over which Christ reigns as a Son. Again, I showed that the apostles and prophets were builders of the church of Christ, and that they both built upon the one foundation, Christ Jesus; and that "the prophets" here spoken of were not the New Testament prophets,



but "the prophets," that is the Old Testament prophets, whom I showed built upon Christ Jesus, the only foundation. Thus I established the unity of the church beyond the possibility of successful controversy.

So I have thus fully presented to you the arguments in support of my proposition. My opponent will get up, I presume, and reaffirm that God never had a church until the day of Pentecost; that "a new covenant was made with the house of Israel," etc., just as he has been doing throughout the discussion. But I ask him for the proof of his assertions, and also to set aside my arguments. If the church of Christ is a new institution, which never had an existence until the day of Pentecost, I want him to tell us how the Gentiles under the gospel could be represented as coming into the house—the church, in which Moses and the prophets lived? I want him also to tell us how the Gentiles are to be grafted into the place where the unbelieving Jews were broken off, and how the unbelieving Jews, who repent and accept of Christ, are to be grafted back again into the same olive-tree from which they had been broken off, if the Christian olive-tree had no existence until the day of Pentecost?

The gentleman told us that the Jewish Church still existed after the day of Pentecost, and he wanted to know if God had two churches

---

one on Mount Moriah and the other on Mount Zion. I pity the man who is reduced to such a pitiable condition in debate as to ask such a question. The gentleman knows that when Christ came the typical dispensation passed away, and that when the Jewish people rejected Christ, they were rejected of God, and their organization ceased to be the church of God by their rejection of Christ, while those among them who received Christ constituted the true church to which the Gentiles were united, while the unbelieving Jewish people were broken off from their own good olive-tree, as Paul tells us in Romans xi.

In the conclusion of my argument, I might, if I were inclined, spend a few moments in exhortation, but I will leave that to my opponent, as he seems to be better gifted in exhortation than argument [Laughter]; besides I do not think this is the place for exhortation, but for sound and logical argument.

I have presented the argument before you, and, in conclusion, allow me to say, that this is a question that I have been studying carefully for at least fifteen years; and whatever claims my opponent may have to superior ability, he can lay no higher claim to honesty of purpose than I can; and I here can say that every time I review the argument in support of infant baptism, the stronger is my conviction that it is sustained by the word of God. And every time I discuss this question, I become more fully convinced that no man can make a sensible argument against infant baptism, or make anything like a logical reply to the arguments in support of it. I have never found one yet that can do so, and I never expect to.

I have proved that infant baptism is demanded by the nature of the covenant of grace. That it is sanctioned by the express teachings of Christ, and embraced in the great commission; that it was practiced by the apostles, and that it was the uniform practice of the

church from the days of the apostles down to the full establishment of the great apostasy, and that it was also practiced by the Waldenses, those faithful witnesses of the truth during the dark ages.

During this entire discussion I have been scarcely able to stand upon my feet while making my speeches, but I am thankful to God that I have been able to endure the labor so far.

Ladies and gentlemen, I leave the argument with you, praying that God may guide us into all truth.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My opponent began by complaining that I kept my great argument to the last. I have the right to introduce it where I please, except in my closing speech. But had he stopped the tedious rehash of his stale talk about the covenants, and circumcision making Abraham the father of the faithful, he would have heard it long before. But he very complacently informs us that it would take him but a moment to kick it all over. What odds does it make then, when it is introduced? Could he not spare one minute to demolish it? It seems he took many, and has not touched it.

We have the stale repetition of the assertion that there can not be an *oikos* without children. A more preposterous assumption was never made. Greenfield gives as its meaning a house, a dwelling, a home, place of abode, place where several persons live together; by metonymy, those who live together, household, family. Are there not in this land thousands of households without infants? Are there not married people who have households and no children? Are there not many households where there are no infants, but only adult children? Are there not unmarried men and women who have large households?

*Oikos* never included servants! I can not sufficiently admire the assurance of a man who has the "cheek" to make such an assertion. Any one who has read Grecian and Roman history knows that a general's staff and servants are often called an *oikos*. Since there are thousands of households where there are no infants, it devolves on my opponent to show there were infants in the households in question. The facts are all against him. The Holy Spirit fell on those in the house of Cornelius, and Peter only commanded those to be baptized who had received him. Lydia was over three hundred miles from home, and none are spoken of in her house but brethren. The whole jailer's house rejoiced. The household of Stephanus addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. Thus the Holy Spirit adds some items concerning every household that excludes infants.

The gentleman puts on his spiritual discerning-stone, and discovers that Lydia was near home. The account says that she was a seller of purple, and from Thyatira, over three hundred miles from Philippi. Nobody but Lydia believed, he says. In the latter part of the chapter we are told there were brethren in her house, and as she was baptized and all her house, these brethren were baptized, and must have believed. But, says my opponent, all the Christians in town—the

church—were in her house. Who told him so? Not the word of God. The gentleman will make the most unfounded assertions as coolly as though he were reading them from the scriptures.

Ufa piece with this is his assertion that nobody but Lydia believed of those who were baptized, hence the rest must have been unbelievers, or infants! Those who were baptized with her were the brethren of her house, whom Paul comforted. But then he again coolly asserts that all the Christians of the town were in her house, and these were the brethren, and not they of her household. How did he know? There is not a syllable in the history that even suggests it.

Now let me here ask him a question. Suppose Lydia was what was, in common parlance, an old maid (and such are almost universally the merchants and milliners among women), and suppose that she, like many wealthy persons of her class, had in her house several servants, and perhaps adult relatives living with her, and they had all believed and been immersed. In speaking of it what would the Holy Spirit have said? "Lydia, and all her"—what—"were baptized." Now what Greek word shall I insert? *Oikos*, and no other, and you know it.

I have known in one meeting four whole households immersed, and not one infant among them. There were four persons in the least and eight in the largest. So in the case of the jailer's household. It was the fortune of Bro. Calvin Smith, formerly living in Bazetta, Trumbull County, Ohio, to immerse three jailers' households—three entire households, and not an infant among them.

*Next*, as we prophesied, we have the assertion repeated that Moses was a servant in Christ's house, and of course the Jewish Church was the same with the Christian Church, or Christ's house. We are told also, that Moses was not a mediator of the old covenant, and a denial that the apostle contrasted him with Christ in any sense. Paul is contrasting Moses and Christ. Moses was a lawgiver, a prophet, and the mediator of the old covenant. Christ was a lawgiver, a prophet, and the mediator of the new covenant. Moses was faithful as a servant of God over his (Moses') house, Christ as a son of his (Christ's) house.

The gentleman, true to his policy, repeats again his assertions that Irenaeus says children are regenerated to God in baptism. That he calls baptism regeneration unto (rod. Irenaeus speaks of eight different things as regeneration unto God. The gentleman assumes that he here means baptism in this extract, though there are seven other things he might mean. But he clearly declares, as we showed by the translation of the passage, that he had no reference to baptism at all, but positively declares that he (Christ) regenerated all ages of life and sanctified them to God by living them, and he regenerated infancy in this way, and there is no reference to baptism, even the most remote.

He quotes from Origen again. We have already read what Origen says of the persons my opponent calls infants. They were youths, babes in Christ. Tertullian condemns infant baptism, appealing to the commission to sustain him. He speaks of infant baptism as an innovation, something unsupported by scriptural precept or example. The Council of Carthage was appealed to in regard to infant baptism. How did they sustain it? By an appeal to apostolic example or pre-

cept? No; they prove that infants are entitled to all that men are entitled to, because Elisha stretched himself down to the dimensions of the Shunamite child, thus proving the equality of children and men. A suitable set of men to hatch this tradition of men, this old wives' fable, infant sprinkling. And right here we find celibacy of priests and nuns, confession, purgatory, worship of saints, and all kindred superstitions. The gentleman can come no nearer than two hundred years of Christ, and right in the age that originated all the abominations of the man of sin. His historical argument is peculiarly unfortunate.

The gentleman returns to his church identity argument, and attempts to bolster it up by reasserting that the tabernacle of David was the Jewish Church, and as God promised to set it up again in the Christian Church, they are identical. By referring to the definitions of *skeenee*, here translated tabernacle, we find it also means family, lineage, race, and the lexicographer refers to this passage as a place where it should be so rendered. What did God promise to David? "That one of his lineage should reign over the spiritual Israel." This, Peter tells us, was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth. Then the lineage of David was restored to the throne, or God set up again the family of David.

My opponent again exhibits his recklessness in assertions, by saying that the church is nowhere said to be built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets. His assurance or ignorance is very great. In Ephesians ii. 19, 20, we read:

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

" 20. And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

But, it is said, these were the prophets of the Old Testament, hence that would make the church extend back into the Jewish nation. Not at all. The prophets here spoken of are the same as in the fourth chapter of this epistle, and the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of 1st Corinthians—the Christian prophets. The church could not have been built on these apostles and prophets till they existed, hence the Christian Church was not established till the day of Pentecost.

Of a piece with this is his assertion that the Jews did not eat the passover till they were twelve years old. Where did he learn that? Not from the Bible. In Exodus xii. 13 we read that the Jews were to eat the passover seven days, and to have no bread but unleavened bread in their houses all that time. Did their children under twelve starve seven days? The gentleman seems ready to assert anything to bolster his argument.

I stated circumcision was a type of cutting off the sinful desires of the flesh. The gentleman seems to think I have made a fatal concession. Will he answer two questions? If it were a type of this, was it, as he says, a type of baptism? Was it to infants a sign of the cutting off of the sinful desires of the flesh? It was a type of the spiritual circumcision Paul speaks of, and that applied only to believers, and never to infants.

The gentleman has a great deal to say about chronology. It has no bearing on the question. I said I could as easily count back to Genesis xxii. as he could to Genesis xvii., and I still say so. The gentleman hopes to make a point on this chronology that will cover his defeat on the main proposition. The whole question of chronology is very unsettled yet. Stephen says the Israelites were in bondage in Egypt four hundred years. God told Abraham they should be in bondage four hundred years "in the land from which he would bring them back into Canaan." In Exodus xiii. it is said they were in Egypt four hundred and thirty years to a day. The gentleman contradicts all this and says they were there only two hundred and fifty-three years. Usher's chronology is not taken now at all.

*Mr. Hughey*—I do not rely on Usher's chronology. I showed from Prideaux, a most learned writer, that it was precisely four hundred and thirty years from the giving of the covenant to Abraham to its confirmation at Sinai. You will remember I went all through this, but he has brought it up now when I have no chance to reply.

*Mr. Braden*—I have a right to reply to all new matter the gentleman brought up in his last speech. I have shown that the time from the giving of the covenant to Abraham to the covenant at Sinai, was over six hundred years—nearly or quite seven hundred years. This chronology is not now accepted.

*Mr. Hughey*—The gentleman asserts that the children of Israel were four hundred years in bondage in Egypt. If time were allowed I could easily show that they were in bondage two hundred and fifty years. From the calling of Abraham to the going down into Egypt was one hundred and eighty years. From that to the giving of the law was two hundred and fifty years, making in all only four hundred and thirty years.

*Mr. Braden*—God told Abraham they should be in bondage in Egypt four hundred years. Stephen says they were in bondage four hundred years. Moses, in Exodus xii., says they were in Egypt four hundred and thirty years to a day. The gentleman says God, Stephen, and Moses, his inspired servants, do not tell the truth. His controversy is with them.

The gentleman refers again to Christ's blessing little children. Is there the slightest reference to baptism here? Christ said his followers must be childlike in disposition, and that is all that can be deduced from the account. But when Jesus spoke of little ones believing he asserted infants can believe! What preposterous nonsense! The Son of God asserted infants of two or three weeks, such as are generally sprinkled, can believe. He spoke of his followers as little ones, on account of their weakness and helplessness in the world; but they were men. He meant his disciples. They were those who could believe. I will baptize all such. The gentleman knows there is no controversy about such persons. He is stultifying himself to befog the issue. He pledged himself in the correspondence and opening speech to be above such a trick.

The last new idea of the gentleman is certainly a model of logic and consistency. He reasserts that the olive-tree was the Jewish nation, or church, as he calls it. The Jewish Church, he says, was

rejected, and the Gentiles grafted in, and became the Christian Church hence they are identical. The Jewish Church was rejected. The Gentiles were grafted in. Into what? The olive-tree, or rejected Jewish Church, and then constituted one church with the rejected Jewish Church! The rejected Jewish Church and God's chosen Christian Church one and the same! What a jumble of inconsistency.

The olive-tree was the new covenant. It belonged to the Jews by promise and the word of God. It would have been theirs, had they believed and accepted it in reality; for Christ confirmed this covenant with all who believed, till Jerusalem was destroyed. But they rejected it and were cut off from the covenant for unbelief. It was given to the Gentiles instead, or they were grafted into the new covenant, and became with believing Jews, "one new man," or the Christian Church. So say reason and scripture.

We will now review the gentleman's course of argument to sustain his position. Let us first inquire, What is this infant baptism? An ordinance of the church of Christ. How shall we determine what are the ordinances of the church of Christ. By the New Testament scriptures. How shall we decide whether they make it an ordinance of the church of Christ? If they declare that Christ or his apostles commanded it as an ordinance of the church, or practiced it as an ordinance in the church, we can and must accept it as an ordinance. If it has neither apostolic precept nor example we must reject it, or open the floodgates of innovation and corruption. We will go further. If it can be shown that it was practiced, with the knowledge of the apostles, as an ordinance, and they have left no expressed condemnation, we will cease to oppose it as evil, but will only regard it as a matter of expediency. Is not this fair and reasonable? Should not any practice, tolerated in the church, have at least one of these three sanctions:

1. Apostolic precept.
2. Apostolic example.
3. Apostolic toleration.

Can we take an ordinance on less authority? The Bible is the Christian's only, all-sufficient, and perfect rule of faith and practice. It is given to man to legislate for him on matters concerning which he has neither power, right, nor wisdom to legislate. Hence he can go as far as it goes, and no further. Is not this the true Protestant scriptural ground? Has the gentleman sustained, or attempted to sustain, his position by either of the three sanctions we have mentioned? What are his arguments?

1. It is in accordance with the genius and spirit of Christianity.
2. Children sustain, in the economy of grace, the same relation to Christ they did in the economy of nature to Adam.
3. Children received circumcision, the sign and seal of the covenant of grace in the Jewish Church, hence they should receive baptism, the sign and seal of the same covenant in the Christian Church.
4. He inferred apostolic example from household baptisms.
5. He appealed to history.

We will examine these in order:

1. It is in accordance with the genius and spirit of Christianity.

What does he mean by that nondescript thing called the genius of Christianity? How does he determine the genius of Christianity? How does he show that a practice is in accordance with that genius? He has made no attempt to explain how he would do this, or to do it. We will, however, show (hat it is not in accordance with this genius. To be in accordance with the genius of the Christian religion, a practice must be in accordance with the principles, laws, objects, and agencies of that religion. Infant baptism is not in accordance with the principles of the Christian religion; for they are addressed and apply only to such as can believe, repent, and serve Cod. The covenant was to be to those who knew the Lord. The commission was to those alone who could believe and repent. The rule of Christ is in the hearts of intelligent, willing subjects. Christian religion is a rule of life, and can apply only to those who can comprehend the facts, laws, and promises of the gospel. Infant baptism is not in accordance with the laws of the Christian religion, for they know no more of it than they do of high mass. It is in direct opposition to the laws of this religion, for they severely and sternly forbid all traditions and ordinances of men—all additions to the ordinances of the church of Christ. It is not in accordance with the objects of this religion, for they are to save men from the practice, guilt, and punishment of sin, by faith, repentance, and obedience to the Lord Jesus. Infant baptism has nothing to do with either faith, repentance, or obedience on the part of the infant, and saves no one from the practice, guilt, or punishment of sin, and can have no connection with this object

It is not in accordance with the agencies of the Christian religion, for they are the truth presented in the word of God and the words of his people, assisted by his Spirit; and the actions of obedience on the part of persons who believe and obey this truth. Infant baptism can have no connection with the truth, nor with the faith and obedience it induces, for infants can neither hear, believe, nor obey. Now, let me ask, will you accept an ordinance on such vague and perfectly intangible grounds, as in accordance with that myth, the genius of Christianity, and with no attempt to define what he means by that genius, or to show such accordance? What innovation could you exclude on such grounds? Celibacy, purgatory, worship of saints, monkery, nunneries, priestcraft, mass, confession, papal infallibility, and every other abomination came in under such a plea. The Council of Carthage, the gentleman's first authority, proved infant baptism in that way. They determined the genius of Christianity, by appealing to Elisha's stretching himself down to the dimensions of the Shunamite child, and thus showing that children were equal to men, and entitled to all that belonged to men! No, let us demand apostolic precept or example for every ordinance claiming to be an ordinance of the church the apostles established.

We will now examine his second proof that children sustain the same relation in the economy of grace, to Christ the second Adam, that they did in the economy of nature to the first Adam. Our first objection is, that this is all mere assumption, and not true at that. They sustain, in the economy of nature, the relation of natural de-

scent to Adam, and are affected by his conduct morally, only so Jar as they inherit a vitiated and corrupted nature; but in moral character they are not affected by him or his conduct. They sustain to our Saviour the relation of persons he has died to save, should they ever become guilty by actual transgression. Hence the relation is not the same morally or religiously. But were it so, does that entitle them to baptism? What rite, or ceremony, or ordinance did their relation to Adam entitle them to? How, then, can a similar relation to Christ entitle them to any rite from similarity? All mere fancy.

We come now to his third position on the argument based on circumcision. The gentleman assumes in this argument:

1. That the covenant God made with Abraham in Genesis xvii., was the covenant of grace, the covenant concerning Christ, and the spiritual seed.

2. This covenant made the descendants of Abraham with whom it was made a church.

3. That circumcision was the seal of this covenant and the sign and seal of the faith of those in this covenant and church.

4. That infants received the sign and seal of this covenant, and were members of the Jewish Church, and entitled to all its privileges.

5. That the Christian Church is identical with the Jewish, being a continuation of it, and has the same faith, covenant, and is called the same.

6. That baptism is the sign and seal of the covenant, and the faith of the covenant, in the Christian Church.

7. That as children were proper subjects of circumcision, the sign and seal of faith in the Jewish Church, they are proper subjects of baptism, the sign and seal of the same faith and the same covenant, in the Christian Church, the continuation of the Jewish Church and identical with it.

I have presented the gentleman's argument much clearer and better than he has himself, and have helped his cause in so doing. We will now examine it, item by item, and show that the whole seven are false in every particular.

1. The covenant God made with Abraham in Genesis xvii. was the covenant concerning Christ and the spiritual seed which the gentleman calls the covenant of grace. To refute this we examined that covenant, and showed every argument that the gentleman brought forward to sustain it was false.

1. " God called it his covenant." So he did the covenant that he made at Sinai, which the gentleman acknowledged had nothing to do with the spiritual seed.

2. " He would be their God." So he was the God and civil ruler of the natural seed.

3. " It was an everlasting covenant." He said the covenant he made at Sinai should be forever. That did not make that the covenant concerning Christ.

4. " His name was changed to Abraham." That does not prove that the seed here promised was a spiritual seed, any more than Sarai's name being changed to Sarah, proves that she should bear a spiritual seed, instead of Isaac, a fleshly heir.



5. "He should be a father of many nations." So he was according to the flesh of some twelve nations.

6. "Kings should proceed from him." So they did according to the flesh.

7. "The inheritance was the heavenly inheritance or a spiritual possession." It was not. It was the land of Canaan, the land in which Abraham was then sojourning—in which he was then a stranger.

*Mr. Hughey*—Do you not know you are misrepresenting me? I said that the inheritance spoken of was a type of the inheritance in heaven; and when (rod said "I will give it to thee and thy seed," he did not mean the temporal inheritance, but the spiritual inheritance of which it was a type.

*Mr. Braden*—I do not misrepresent you. In your first, second, and third speeches, you repeatedly, most explicitly and unequivocally stated the inheritance was the heavenly Canaan, the spiritual inheritance of the glorified saints. I refuted this by showing that it was the land of Canaan, in which Abraham then was; in which he was sojourning then; in which he was then a stranger; something he never was in heaven. God said "I will give thee the land in which thou now art—in which thou now art sojourning—in which thou now art a stranger."

To avoid this the gentleman tried his favorite mystifying dodge. "But it was a type of the heavenly Canaan." Well, what of it—does that make the seed here spoken of the spiritual seed? Not at all. The seed was the natural seed typical of the spiritual. The circumcision was typical of the spiritual circumcision, the token of the spiritual covenant. The covenant was a national covenant with a natural seed, typical of the spiritual covenant concerning the spiritual seed; and as the type and antitype are always entirely different things, the covenant here was entirely distinct from the covenant of grace, of which it was a type, and the seed was entirely distinct from the spiritual seed of which it was a type. Thus we have disposed of every effort to make the covenant of Genesis xvii. the covenant concerning Christ, or the covenant of grace.

We next took up the subject of covenants and gave an analysis of them. In Genesis xii. God made a covenant concerning the fleshly seed and inheritance, on the spiritual seed. He repeated these two promises or covenants to Isaac in Genesis xxvi., and to Jacob xxviii. These Paul calls the covenants of promise in Ephesians ii. and Romans ix., for there were two covenants or promises, a temporal seed and inheritance, and a spiritual seed. David, Ps. cv., calls the one concerning the inheritance, the covenant and oath with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In Genesis xiii., xv. and xvii. God separated the covenant concerning the temporal seed and inheritance from the one concerning the spiritual seed, and gave in Genesis xvii. circumcision as the token of this covenant concerning the natural seed and temporal inheritance and blessings.

In Genesis xxii. he separated the covenant concerning the spiritual seed from all others and confirmed it with the awful sanction of his oath. We affirm that the covenant in Genesis xvii. was concerning the

natural seed, and was not the covenant of grace. To prove this we submit the following reasons:

1. Stephen calls it "the covenant of circumcision," and it nowhere has the names given to the covenant of grace, "the covenant concerning the spiritual seed" "the covenant concerning Christ" "the covenant with an oath," "the gospel preached to Abraham."

2. No scriptural writer ever refers to it or quotes a word from it when speaking of the covenant concerning Christ.

3. All its provisions, stipulations and promises are temporal. There is not the vaguest allusion to the spiritual seed or anything spiritual. It is national, fleshly and temporal.

4. It was ratified with sacrifice and not with an oath, as Paul and Zachariah tell us the covenant concerning Christ was.

5. It is precisely like the promise in Genesis xiii. and the covenant in Genesis xv., which the gentleman admits had no reference to the spiritual seed. They were here repeated for the purpose of giving circumcision as the token of the covenant, or marking in the flesh those who were entitled to the earthly blessings of this temporal covenant.

6. The gentleman spiritualizes all in the covenant except circumcision that he makes the literal rite. If the seed were spiritual, why not the circumcision be "that circumcision made without hands," that was the token of that seed. An argument that thus stultifies and contradicts itself, assumes such contradictory positions to meet emergencies, is as untenable as the house built on the sand.

7. Lastly, and this alone is sufficient; the words of the covenant concerning Christ "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" are not in this chapter or even dimly referred to! Is this the covenant, when the very stipulation is not in it? We might stop here but we will follow the gentleman through.

We will now prove that the covenant concerning Christ is in Genesis xxii. Paul and Zachariah quote the language of this covenant; Paul in Galatians ii., where he calls it "the gospel preached to Abraham" and "the covenant concerning Christ," and in Hebrews vi., where he calls it "the covenant confirmed by an oath." Zachariah, in Luke ii., quotes the language and calls it a covenant confirmed with an oath, and concerning Christ. Now, where can we find it? We urge the following reasons for calling this, in Genesis xxii., the covenant.

1. Here alone do we find the words of the covenant concerning Christ separated from all other covenants or stipulations.

2. This alone was formally confirmed by the awful oath of Jehovah.

3. Here Isaac was figuratively offered as a type of Christ the spiritual seed.

4. Here Abraham was justified by faith and his works as James tells us, and by faith became father of the faithful. Hence the propriety of making the covenant concerning that spiritual seed or the faithful, here.

5. Lastly, the language of the covenant of grace or the covenant concerning Christ, as given by Paul and Zachariah, are found here alone confirmed with an oath. God here swore by himself that "in

thee and thy seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed." This is the covenant of grace as clearly as God's word can make it.

We will examine his second assumption. The covenant in Genesis xvii. made a church of the descendants of Abraham. We reply to this:

1. This covenant was all earthly, temporal and fleshly, and has no reference to any spiritual qualification or blessing, hence it can not be a church covenant.

2. There never was a Jewish Church. God never had a church till the day of Pentecost. What is a church? A body of men who have:

1. Faith in God, or who, with the whole heart, believe his word and obey it.

2. Who are called out from the world on account of such faith and obedience.

3. Who take revelation as their only rule of faith and practice.

4. Who have an organization based on such faith and obedience, in accordance with revelation.

5. Who have officers who possess these qualifications of faith and obedience.

6. Who have ordinances confined to themselves, or those who belong to this organization, and have this faith and obedience.

7. Who are recognized by God as his on account of faith and obedience.

8. Who are blessed with spiritual blessings on account of faith and obedience.

Now was there a Jewish Church? Birth and not faith made one a Jew. Those who from the heart believed and obeyed God were never called out from those who did not. God never had an organization based on faith and obedience from the heart, till Pentecost. The officers of the Jews were national and church officers. They were chosen on account of birth or flesh, and not for moral qualifications, as church officers are. The ordinances of the Jews were all national. They were not confined to those who had heartfelt faith and obedience. The blessings of the Jews were temporal and earthly, not spiritual, like those who belong to a church. Hence there was no Jewish Church. There was a Jewish nation, over which God was a civil as well as religious ruler. They had a national system of mingled religious and civil laws, but flesh was the qualification not faith. All the descendants of Jacob belonged to it regardless of piety. God had individual followers in the patriarchal age. He had a nation in the Jews, but no church. These were preparatory. To the Jews were committed the oracles, the service of the sanctuary, and the preparation for the church, which was set up in the fullness of time.

God never separated those who were his pious followers from those who were not. Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Nadab, Abihu, those who perished in the wilderness for every abomination, and all the sons of Belial, belonged to my opponent's Jewish Church; or how were they distinguished from those who did? Such a position is blasphemous and absurd; hence there was no Jewish Church. The Jewish nation lacked every qualification of a church.

We are now ready for the third position or assumption. Circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace. We have shown that circumcision was connected with a covenant that was not the covenant of grace at all. Circumcision had no connection with this covenant concerning Christ in Genesis xxii. It was a token that persons were entitled to the privileges of the earthly covenant, and not a seal of any covenant. It was not a sign and seal of faith to any but Abraham. It was the sign and a seal of his faith, and to no one else. How could it be a sign and seal of faith to those who never had and could not have faith? All Jews, all their servants, heathen as well as Jewish or proselytes, had this mark. It was a token that a man belonged to the nation by birth or purchase; and was based on flesh, birth, and property, and not on faith. Next we are told infants received circumcision, this sign and seal, and were members of the Jewish Church. Infants received this circumcision, but it was no sign and seal. They were members of the Jewish nation but not of the church, for there was none. Hence circumcision had no relation to a church, and was no church ordinance, but a national rite of no religious significance.

We come now to the fifth assumption. The Christian Church is a continuation of the Jewish and identical with it. To this we reply:

1. There was no Jewish Church as we have shown, hence the Christian Church is a new institution, and can have no identity with what never existed.

2. If we can show that the Christian Church never existed till the day of Pentecost, it can have no identity with the Jewish nation, established 1600 years before.

To establish this we showed that the Jewish or Israelitish commonwealth was established at Sinai, where they made a covenant with God and chose him as their temporal ruler, and established a nation, but no church. In Isaiah ii. we learned that the church was yet future, and that the law of the Lord was to go out of Zion, and the word from Jerusalem. In Jeremiah xxxiii. we learned that the Lord would make a new covenant with Judah and Israel, entirely different from the old one made at Sinai. It was to be in their hearts and not in their flesh. It should embrace only those who knew the Lord, or should exclude all who did not and could not, and embrace only those whose sins were forgiven for faith and obedience, or such as are in the Christian Church.

In Daniel ii. we read, that in the days of the Roman empire God would set up his kingdom or church. In the ninth chapter we read that in the last week of the city of Jerusalem, Messiah should confirm the covenant with the Jews, or from the time of John the Baptist to the destruction of the city. In the midst of this week, he should be cut off, and cause sacrifices to cease. We are now very near the time. John and Jesus preached that the kingdom or church was approaching, or near at hand. Jesus told Peter he would build his church on his confession, as it was still future. In Isaiah and Psalms God declares he will lay a foundation stone in Zion. Christ, Peter, Paul, and all the apostles apply this to Christ. God promised David he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne in his kingdom or the church.

Joel prophesied that this should be done in the last days of the Jewish nation, when God would pour out his Spirit. The church was built on the apostles of Christ and the Christian prophets, Christ being the chief corner-stone.

On the day of Pentecost Joel's prophecy was fulfilled. The Messiah of Daniel had been cut off, and had caused sacrifices to cease by offering himself. Peter, who had the keys of the kingdom, unlocked it to the Jews; he announced that God's promise to David was fulfilled; preached Jesus as the Christ; laid the rock, the Messiahship of Jesus, and laid him, the corner-stone; placed the apostles and prophets on the rock, and built the church. The law went forth from Zion, the covenant of Daniel was confirmed to all who believed, and the blood of Christ, the blood of the new covenant, was offered for the remission of sins. At the household of Cornelius he unlocked the kingdom to the Gentiles, broke down the wall of partition, and made of believing Jesus and Gentiles "one new man" or church, of which Christ is the head.

Then positively the rock was never laid, the corner nor foundation stones, and the living stones were not builded on it, till Pentecost; or the building, the church, never existed till then; and was of course neither identical with, nor a continuation of anything that previously existed. A kingdom needs a king, laws, and subjects. Christ was not king till after his ascension, as Peter and Paul tell us. His law never went forth till Pentecost, and he had no subjects till then, for till then all were yet under the old law. On Pentecost he was proclaimed king, his law went forth, and his first subjects took his name and allegiance on them. God never had a church, or organization based on faith and moral qualifications till this time; or here was the first church.

As further argument, we will show that there was nothing in common in the Jewish nation and Christian Church. God in Jeremiah, Christ and Paul, tell us they have not the same covenant, but the Christian Church has a new, better and spiritual covenant, written in the heart. The old was abolished Paul declares in Hebrews. It was cast out with all its subjects, he tells us in Galatians iv.

Paul tells us they have not the same faith and religion. Galatians ii. Acts xxvi.

They have not the same law, for the old law was done away, as Paul tells us in Galatians, Romans and Hebrews.

The Christian Church is a new man, has a new foundation, new religion, new law, new ordinances, new covenant, new mediator, new prophet, priest and king, new name, new and living way of access to God, and new throughout.

The Jewish Church was never called the new man, temple of the Holy Spirit, pillar and support of the truth, saints, the house of the living God, the bride and spouse of Christ.

We offer the following objections to church identity in addition to these. Nicodemus and all Jews were required to repent and be baptized to enter the Christian Church. They would have already been in it were the position of my opponent true.

The Jewish national system of religion existed as a rival of the

Christian Church for thirty-five years. Were they the same? What had the national system of religion lost? What was taken from it to which the Christian Church was added? Positively nothing. There was no identity.

The arguments advanced to prove identity—that they had the same God—the same figures were applied to each, and like comparisons were made; would prove the identity of the American commonwealth and Christian Church. Both are called a vine, a tree, a plant, and like figures of speech. Nothing can be proved by such juggling analogies. The promises given to the Jews were compared to a vineyard by Christ, and his church called branches of himself, the vine. There is no identity there.

The tabernacle of David was not a church. It was his family or lineage who were to be set up or restored to the throne in Christ; which was done, as Peter declares in his sermon on Pentecost. The house of Moses and the house of Christ were two different and contrasted houses, and there was no identity. The olive-tree was not the Jewish Church or nation, for how could the Jewish Church be rejected and the Gentiles grafted into this rejected church? How could the Christian Church, adopted of God, be the same as the rejected Jewish nation? The olive-tree was the new covenant or gospel which belonged to the Jews, as Paul tells us in Romans ix. The Jews rejected it, and were cut off from it, and the Gentiles grafted into it. Hence there is no argument for identity here.

The church in the wilderness is an incorrect translation. It should be the assembly or congregation, for there was no church there.

Thus vanishes every vestige of the argument for church identity. We will now take up the next assumption. Baptism is the sign and seal of the covenant of the Christian Church, and the faith of that covenant. To this we object that baptism is not the sign, but only a sign of faith—one of the many signs of faith. It is not and can not be a sign of faith to an infant. Such an idea is nonsense. It is not a seal. The Holy Spirit is the seal. Eph. ii. and iv. It is not a sign and seal of a covenant in the Christian Church. Such an idea is untaught and unscriptural. Children can make no covenant, and can give no sign and receive no seal. It is nowhere mentioned in connection with the new covenant as a sign or seal.

Should it be urged that baptism is a type or substitute for circumcision, we reply: It is not a type of baptism, but the spiritual circumcision or cutting off evil desires. It is nowhere declared to be such a substitute or type in the Bible. Christ and the apostles never taught, commanded or practiced such substitution. Indeed the Jewish Christians practiced both. The Holy Spirit, through the apostles, told the Gentiles to refuse circumcision, but not because baptism was substituted for it. If it were, his silence is unaccountable.

We have given also seventeen cardinal differences between baptism and circumcision. Indeed there are no two things in the Bible more dissimilar in character, nature, use, application and design. They had absolutely no connection or relation.

We come now to the last assumption. As children were proper subjects of circumcision, the sign and seal in the Jewish Church, they must be of baptism the sign and seal in the Christian Church. We have shown already that there was no Jewish Church—that there is no analogy between the Jewish nation and the Christian Church, that circumcision was not a sign and seal; that baptism is not, and we will now show that the law of baptism excludes infants entirely.

The commission, or the organic law of Christ's kingdom, confines the work of his disciples to those who can believe, repent and obey from the heart. "Make disciples by preaching, and baptize, and teach;" "he that believeth and is baptized;" "repentance and remission of sins should be preached;" "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins;" "ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine;" all apply to believers only, and positively exclude infants.

The object of baptism excludes infants. Peter says it is for the remission of sins. Can it be to infants? He says it is the answer of a good conscience. Is it to infants? Any object or design that can be given to it will exclude infants from it.

The objects of the church exclude infants from this ordinance, which inducts men into it. It is to save men from the practice of guilt and punishment of sin. Can infants take a part in such a work? What right have they to an ordinance which is one of the conditions of pardon, and ushers the penitent believer into the kingdom of Christ, which recognizes only believing voluntary subjects? Here the law of baptism excludes infants.

We have forgotten one hobby the gentleman rode to death in the debate. Circumcision was the sign and seal of Abraham's faith, and made him father of the faithful! We have already shown that this has no connection with baptism of infants; but we will disprove it or repeat our refutation. Circumcision was the sign and a seal of Abraham's faith, and to no other one before or since. How could it be to infants eight days old? Our faith makes us the children of Abraham, and of course makes Abraham our father: so says Paul in two places, as positively as human language can utter it. Circumcision was a seal of this faith; but did it make him our father, any more than a seal to a deed makes us owner of property? But he was a father of circumcision to us, who are uncircumcised. What kind of circumcision? The circumcision made without hands mentioned in Romans ii.; also in Colossians and Philippians. His fleshly circumcision made him father of all who had like circumcision, but not of the same circumcision to us who never received it.

His faith and spiritual circumcision made him father of similar circumcision to us who have like faith and circumcision, and his outward circumcision was only a seal of this faith, and did not make him our father, or father of circumcision to us.

Before coining to this argument, based on the Abrahamic covenant, we wish to take a look at its general character. The gentleman is attempting to prove a practice to be an ordinance in the Christian Church. Instead of going to the law which went forth from Zion, which governs this church and establishes its ordinances, he runs

away back to Canaan, or Ur of the Chaldees, in the twilight of revelation. He assumes the covenant made in Genesis xvii was the covenant of grace. We disprove; but were we to admit it, he has not found infant baptism. He assumes this covenant made Abraham's descendants a church. We disprove this; but were we to admit it, he has not infant baptism. He assumes circumcision was the sign and seal of this covenant. We disprove this also; but should he prove it, does it follow infants must be baptized? Next he assumes that infants receive circumcision in the Jewish Church. We disprove this for there was no such church; but were we to admit it, what has it to do with infant baptism? He assumes that the Christian and Jewish Churches are identical. We disprove this; but were it true, what has it to do with infant baptism? Next baptism is a sign and seal of faith in the Christian Church. We disprove this; but were it true, must infants who never have faith be baptized? He lastly assumes that as infants were circumcised or received the seal of the covenant in the Jewish faith they ought in the Christian. We disprove all this, but does not the law of baptism exclude infants. We can admit his first assumption, deny and refute all the rest. We can admit the first and second, and refute all the rest, and so on down to the seventh. We can then admit the assumption, and deny his final conclusion, for it does not follow necessarily that baptism must be as extensive in its application as circumcision, should we admit all he claims. We show by the law of baptism that it is restricted to believers, and infants Can have nothing to do with it.

Let me ask you, will you accept as an ordinance in the Christian Church any thing that has to be hunted so far back before the beginning of the church, and then traced through ways so devious and based on so many utterly untenable assumptions? The whole argument is like the story of "the house that Jack built." You know how we began. "This is the house that Jack built." "This is the unit that lay in the house that Jack built," and we kept building up the story till we got, away back to "the cock that crowed in the morn, that waked the priest all shaven and shorn, that marred the man all tattered and torn, to the maiden all forlorn, that milked the cow with the crumpled horn, that tossed the dog, that worried the cat, that caught the rat, that cut the sack, that held the malt, that lay in the house that Jack built."

Bo, the gentleman begins, "this is the covenant God made with Abraham; this is the seal of the covenant God made with Abraham," and; continues assuming and building till it reads thus: "These are the babies that should be sprinkled with the baptism, which is the seal of the covenant that was made with the Christian Church, that is identical with the Jewish Church, which had the babies, that were circumcised with the circumcision, which was the seal of the faith, of the covenant, which God made with Abraham." I ain much mistaken in this intelligent audience if they accept such an interminable string of baseless assumptions. He has utterly failed to find infant baptism in this long chase of several hours.

He next quotes Jesus blessed little children. There is not the



slightest reference to baptism here. But of such is the church or kingdom. Yes; but he does not say that they are of the church or are in the church. If they are entitled to one ordinance, why not the other? Why not the Lord's Supper? The gentleman has not noticed this. As we have already shown the law of baptism, its objects and the qualifications demanded of its subjects, exclude infants, so will any definition or object the gentleman can give to baptism.

The law of baptism is next quoted. Because all nations were to be discipled and baptized, infants must be discipled and baptized! If I say a whole city is converted, I mean of course that the infants are converted. But the disciples were to preach the gospel. To infants? No; to make disciples by preaching faith and repentance and remission? What of infants? No, they could not, and were to baptize them. Whom? The nations, infants, unbelievers and all? No; the disciples, or those who heard, believed, repented and were willing to become subjects of Christ. Baptism was to them—to all who were baptized—the answer of a good conscience, says the gentleman, It could not be to infants; hence they are not proper subjects. The gentleman has found no law or apostolic precept for infant baptism.

We will now examine his argument on apostolic examples. He appeals first to Peter's language at Pentecost. The promise is to you and your children. What promise? The promise Peter quotes from Joel concerning the outpouring of the Spirit. It has no reference to baptism.

He next goes to the house of Lydia, and assumes she was married; assumes she had children; assumes she had them with her three hundred miles from home on a merchandising tour; assumes they were infants; assumes they were at the river side; assumes they were baptized—all in the face of probabilities, and the last in contradiction of the law of baptism. What can not be proved by such bold, improbable assumptions, and so many of them? His argument on the house of Cornelius and of the jailer are of a piece with this. I shall not notice his reckless assertions concerning *oikos*, nor his reckless assertions concerning matters not in the accounts.

His appeal to history was peculiarly unfortunate. Irenaeus said nothing about infant baptism. Origen's and Justin's infants were those who had been instructed and believed. Tertullian condemned it as opposed to the commission and apostolic usage. All the fathers speak of the necessity of previous instruction. He first found it two hundred years after Christian connection with celibacy and other papal abominations, and infant baptism is one of these. The first apology for it was based on the gentleman's first argument, the genius of Christianity, as found by Elisha's stretching himself down to the dimensions of a child. There is the first historical reference he has found.

Such is the outline of his argument. We now urge the following objections to this practice:

1. It has neither apostolic precept, example nor toleration. The gentleman has labored two days, and I defy him or any one to name one that he found.

2. It is opposed, as we have shown, to the law of baptism, the objects of the church and the object of baptism.

3. It is opposed to apostolic precept and example. At Pentecost Peter commanded only such as repented to be baptized. In Samaria only those who believed are said to be baptized. The eunuch had to make a confession of faith before baptism. At the house of Cornelius only those on whom the Holy Spirit fell, and who spoke with tongues, were baptized. At Lydia's house the brethren who could be comforted were in her house. All the probabilities are against any infants being baptized, as well as the law of baptism. In the jailer's house only those who rejoiced in the Lord were baptized. The household of Stephanas ministered to the saints. Thus does the Holy Spirit exclude, in every case, all idea of infant baptism.

4. We object to it because no one can give an object of baptism that will not make nonsense of infant baptism. Infant baptism has no object.

5. We object to it because men can give no reason for it, and give such nonsensical reasons. We will not weary and disgust you by quoting them again.

6. Because of its palpable inconsistencies. Its advocates give this ordinance, but deny all others. Why? After awhile they compel all such to go through a converting process when they accept them in the church, although they were members and baptized as such when infants. When did they cease to be members? What was their baptism for?

7. It secularizes the church and destroys the distinction based on faith and intelligent obedience, that separates the church from the world.

8. It is a tradition of men and mere will-worship, condemned. Matt. xv. 9. Col. ii. 18. Tit. i. 18.

9. It utterly destroys the ordinance of baptism. No one obeys it himself. It is forced on him in unconscious infancy. Does God receive such service? Is such an ordinance of his church, which recognizes only intelligent obedience, the obedience of faith?

Now, my hearers, and with me men and women who will all be judged by the gospel, where is the authority for infant baptism? There is not a man in this house who can mention one scriptural example or precept that the gentleman has brought in proof of this practice. Not one! Not a single passage can be named!

*Mr. Hughey*—I hope there will be no more voting done. I hope the gentleman will not get so anxious as to have any more voting done.

*Mr. Braden*—I have taken no vote. Mr. President, I have borne these interruptions; now this is the fourth time. No man who understood or regarded good breeding would do it. I have never interrupted him. He would not do it did he not feel so keenly where he stands, and that his cause needs such help. I know it grinds down on to the gentleman to sit and be challenged to name his single scriptural proof, a single "thus saith the Lord," and feel that he can not name one.

There is not a judge in the United States who would not kick such evidence out of court as we have heard here before fifteen minutes had

expired. Not a lawyer in Christendom, in the most desperate case, would weaken his case by such testimony, for he would be hooted out of court. Is the God of heaven less particular in regard to the testimony to sustain an ordinance of his church?

Let me now exhort you, my hearers, to apply to all things in religion, the only true and safe test. Are they sustained by apostolic precept or example? Accept nothing less than this. Beware how you give heed to Jewish traditions and commandments of men, such as you have heard from my opponent. God will demand: "Who hath required this at your hands?" Take the Bible, apostolic precept and example as your only rule of faith and practice.—[*Time expired.*]



# QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.



## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE N<sup>o</sup>. 2.

---

Just before the commencement of the discussion of the Fourth Proposition Mr. Hughey rose and said:

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Before entering upon the discussion of this proposition, I have a paper in my hand which I wish to read, and have entered upon the report of the discussion, as my opponent did on a former occasion. I will state my reasons. There has a question of chronology arisen during the discussion of the last proposition, upon which my opponent took one position in the opening of the debate, and in his closing speech took another position, to which I had no opportunity to reply. I wish to read a simple statement in regard to the chronology of the period referred to.

*Mr. Braden*—If the gentleman is allowed to present his statement I shall also claim the right to file a statement in reply.

*Mr. Hughey*—Certainly, you can reply as much as you please.

*The Moderator*—(Mr. Kuykendall)—The paper can be read.

Mr. Hughey then read as follows:

The four hundred and thirty years of the bondage of Israel in Egypt, according to Mr. Braden's chronology, began at the time Jacob and his sons went down into Egypt, when he was one hundred and thirty years old. This was two hundred and fifteen years after the call of Abraham. Abraham was seventy-five years old when he was called in Ur of the Chaldees. Twenty-five years after this Isaac was born, when Abraham was one hundred years old. Isaac was sixty years old when Jacob was born, and Jacob was one hundred and thirty years old when he went down into Egypt:

Thus.....	25
.....	60
.....	130
Total .....	215.

Kothath, the son of Levi, and grandfather of Moses, was born in Canaan, before the sojourn in Egypt began; he lived one hundred and thirty-three years. Amram, the son of Kothath, and father of Moses, lived one hundred and thirty-seven years, and Moses was eighty years old at the time of the exodus. The whole lifetime of Kothath, Amram, and Moses up to the time of the exodus makes only three hundred and fifty years. Thus:

Kothath lived .....	133
Amram lived.....	137
Moses at the exodus .....	80
Total .....	350

Now suppose that Kohath was twenty years old at the time that Jacob went down into Egypt, and that sixty years after this, when he was eighty years old, Amram was born, and that Amram was seventy-five years old when Moses was born. Thus:

From the time that Jacob went down into Egypt, until the birth of Amram.....	60
From the birth of Amram to that of Moses.....	75
From the birth of Moses to the exodus.....	80
Total.....	215
Thus we have from the call of Abraham to the descent into Egypt.....	215
The time of the sojourn in Egypt.....	215
Total.....	430

Thus we prove that the actual period of Israel's sojourn in Egypt was just two hundred and twelve years; and that it was just four hundred and thirty years from the call of Abraham, and the giving of the promise in Ur of the Chaldees, until the exodus, and the giving of the law, and this proves the correctness of my interpretation of Paul's four hundred and thirty years in Galatians iii. 17.

For confirmation of this chronology see Gen. xii. 4; xxi. 5; xxv. 26; xlvii. 9; xlvi. 11. Exod. vi. 16-20; vii. 7.

A day or two afterward, Mr. Braden filed the following paper in reply:

#### ANSWER TO MR. HUGHEY'S CHRONOLOGY.

In Genesis xv. 13-16: "God said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years;

"14. And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.

"15. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age.

"16. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again . for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full."

Here it is declared they shall be in bondage in the land out of which they were to come to the land they were to possess four hundred years.

Stephen, in Acts vii. 6, 7, says that God said to Abram:

"6. That his seed should sojourn in a strange land; and that they should bring them into bondage, and entreat them evil four hundred years.

"7. And the nation to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge, said God: and after that shall they come forth, and serve me in this place."

Here Stephen says God declared they should be in bondage four hundred years in a land from which they should come to serve God in the land Abraham was then in.



Positively the four hundred years' bondage was in Egypt, and included no part of the sojourn in Canaan.

In Exodus xii. 40, 41 it is said:

"40. Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.

"41. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt."

Here it is positively declared that Israel was in Egypt four hundred and thirty years to a day.

In Galatians Paul speaks of promises to Abraham and his seed. Promises were made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and by God, through Jacob to his children.

In Genesis xlix. 10 is the first personal promise of Christ in these words:

"The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be."

To this Paul evidently refers when he says, "But this I say the covenant that was confirmed of God in Christ." The law which was four hundred and thirty years can not disannul that. It should make the promise of none effect.

This makes the time from the calling of Abraham to the exodus out of Egypt over seven hundred years. This agrees with Jewish historians.



# OPERATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

# OPERATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

---

## PROPOSITION FOR DISCUSSION:

*In the Work of Conversion and Regeneration the Holy Spirit operates immediately or directly on the Heart.* HUGHEY affirms.

### MR. HUGHEY'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I arise before you this morning to open the discussion upon the proposition we have agreed to discuss on the influence and operations of the Spirit of God in the work of conversion and regeneration. The proposition reads: "In the work of Conversion and Regeneration the Holy Spirit operates immediately or directly on the Heart."

I was surprised on yesterday afternoon when Mr. Braden rose and submitted a paper, asking me certain questions in regard to what my position was, and stating his own position on the influence and operations of the Spirit, when every item of that paper had been thoroughly canvassed between my opponent and myself in the correspondence that took place in regard to the discussion, so that I should think there could be no possible misunderstanding about my position. I could not tell what his object was in the presentation of that paper, as there was no possibility of misunderstanding the question between us. We had thoroughly canvassed the whole ground and agreed upon the precise point in issue between us, in respect to the operations of the Spirit. When I affirm the immediate operations of the Holy Spirit, I do not deny the mediate. The position of my opponent, as he stated yesterday, is that the Holy Spirit operates only mediately, or through the medium of the word. I do not deny the mediate, while I also affirm the immediate operations of the Holy Spirit, while my opponent denies the immediate, and affirms that there is nothing but the mediate operations of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of men.

Conversion and regeneration, in their theological sense, are synonymous. The only reason why I put both of these terms in the proposition is because I find that Mr. Campbell avers that they mean precisely the same thing. Conversion is immersion and immersion is regeneration. He tells us the Holy Spirit "calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion," and that "conversion and immersion are convertible terms."

When I use the term conversion, I do not use it in the sense of a change of mind, of a change of life; but in the sense of a change of heart. I use the terms as synonymous, and I mean by regeneration,

not a change of state, but the beginning of a new life in the soul by the Spirit of God.

My opponent will doubtless take the same position he did yesterday, for I suppose he agrees substantially with Mr. Campbell in his views on the influences of the Spirit; for the proposition which he first submitted to me was: "In the conviction and conversion of the sinner and the sanctification of the saint, the Holy Spirit exerts a power above, beyond, and distinct from any he exerts through the truth as contained in the sacred scriptures, or in the teachings of Christians which are in accordance with them." This proposition he offered to deny and asked me to affirm; but I did not accept it because it was not definite enough, and embraced more than one point at issue. I wanted a proposition that clearly set forth one single issue between us on the operation of the Spirit, so that we could understand precisely what we were discussing.

This is a distinct and emphatic denial of any spiritual influence on the hearts of men, either before or after conversion, except such spiritual influence as is exerted by words and arguments addressed to the understanding through the eye and ear. In order that you may see that I have not misrepresented the position of my opponent, and of the church to which he belongs, I will read to you from Mr. Campbell a full and explicit statement of the views of these self-styled reformers, on the subject of spiritual influences. In his *Christian System*, p. 267, Mr. C. says:

"In the kingdom into which we are born of water, the Holy Spirit is as the atmosphere in the kingdom of nature; we mean that the influences of the Holy Spirit are as necessary to the new life as the atmosphere is to our animal life in the kingdom of nature. All that is done in us before regeneration, God our Father effects by the word, or gospel, as dictated and confirmed by his Holy Spirit. But after we are thus begotten and born of the Spirit of God—after our new birth—the Holy Spirit is shed on us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; of which the peace of mind, the love, the joy, and the hope of the regenerate is full proof, for these are among the fruits of that Holy Spirit of promise of which we speak."

Here Mr. Campbell uses language that indicates that he believed in a direct spiritual influence on the heart after regeneration, but the following passages from his writings show that he meant to convey no such idea.

I will read again from *Christianity Restored*. The extracts can be found in Campbell and Rice's *Debate*, p. 627, as I do not happen to have Mr. Campbell's *Christianity Restored*. He says:

"Every spirit puts forth its moral power in words; that is all the power it has over the views, habits, manners or actions of men, is in the meaning and arrangement of its ideas expressed in words, or in significant signs addressed to the eye or ear.

\* \* \* \* \*

"The argument is the power of the spirit of man; and the only power which one spirit can exert over another is its arguments.

\* \* \* \* \*

"No other power than moral power can operate on minds; and this

power must always be clothed in words addressed to the eye or ear. Thus we reason when revelation is altogether out of view. And when we think of the power of the Spirit of God exerted on minds or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine that that power can consist in anything else but words or arguments. Thus, in the nature of things, we are prepared to expect verbal communications from the Spirit of God, if that Spirit operates at all upon our spirits. As the moral power of every man is in his arguments, so is the moral power of the Spirit of God in his arguments.

"But to return. As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas; so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas.

\* \* \* \* \*

"If the Spirit of God has spoken all its arguments; or if the New and Old Testaments contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile men to God, and to purify them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate upon the human mind is spent, and he that is not sanctified and saved by these can not be saved by angels or spirits, human or divine.

\* \* \* \* \*

"We plead that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the divine record."

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. vi. p. 356, Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 628, Mr. Campbell says:

"As all the influence which my spirit has exerted on other spirits, at home or abroad, has been by the stipulated signs of ideas, of spiritual operations by my written or spoken word; so believe I that all the influence of God's good Spirit, now felt in the way of conviction or consolation in the four quarters of the globe, is by the word, written, read, and heard, which is called the living oracles."

Now, there can be no mistake here in regard to what Mr. Campbell means when he tells us that the whole power of the Spirit in conversion and sanctification is in the word; that there is no such thing as spiritual influence, only as it is found in the arguments addressed to the eye or ear. My opponent yesterday adopted these sentiments by stating that the Spirit of God operates on the heart of man, just as his Spirit operates on those whom he addresses, and in no other way. Here is the position of our opponents clearly and distinctly stated. They distinctly and emphatically deny that there is any such thing as direct and personal spiritual agency upon the heart at all! All spiritual influence with them is "exerted by words and arguments addressed to the eye or ear," "and if men are not saved by this means there is no power on earth or in heaven that can save them." This is the position occupied by my opponent, by Mr. Campbell, and by those self-styled reformers who have arisen during the present century.

In the first place, I object to this position in regard to spiritual influence, because it deprives Christ of any direct personal agency or influence in conversion and sanctification. We hold that there is a direct spiritual influence over and above, separate and distinct from

the power of truth addressed to the understanding; a direct and personal agency exerted upon the heart, quickening the soul to spiritual life, and filling the heart of the believer with the joy of the Holy Ghost. In conversion there is this direct and personal agency to renew and change the heart; not to intellectually change the mind by giving it new Views, but spiritually by giving a new nature, giving a new heart, and imparting the whole moral image of Christ. This makes man a new creature by the operation of the Spirit of God on the soul of man. The instrument through which the Spirit of God operates in enlightening the understanding, and bringing the mind to consider the great truths of the gospel as the word of truth; and upon this point my opponent and I agree. But he tells you that the Holy Spirit does not operate on the heart in any other way, and here we differ.

I object to the position of my opponent, secondly, that, according to his views, there was no necessity for the pouring out of the Holy Ghost at all. There is no place left in this system for any spiritual agency whatever. There is no use for any Holy Ghost in its converting and sanctifying influences upon the heart. There is no such thing in the system as the Holy Ghost directly operating upon the heart, and bringing men to our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore there was no necessity for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

My first argument in support of my position is drawn from the fact that after the whole gospel had been taught by Christ—the entire system of revealed truth had been thoroughly made known to the apostles, and, so far as mere instruction in the doctrines which they were to teach was concerned, they had been thoroughly prepared for the work of the ministry, they were not permitted to go forth in that work until they were "endued with power from on high," until they received the promise of the Father. I will read you from Luke xxiv. 44-49:

"44. And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

"45. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures.

"46. And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day:

"47. And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

"48. And ye are witnesses of these things.

"49. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."

Here we not only have the fact set forth that their instruction had been complete and full, but their understanding also had been opened, so that "they might understand the scripture;" but still they were not permitted to go forth and preach until the promise of the Father came upon them. This proves that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, was not only designed to more fully prepare them for

their office and work, but that it was also necessary to touch the hearts of those who heard the gospel, to convince their consciences of sin, and make them feel all the force of divine truth in their hearts. Consequently, we see the first sermon preached by the apostles, after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, under his quickening power, resulted in the conversion of three thousand souls. The apostles were not prepared to preach, nor were the people prepared to hear profitably, until the Holy Ghost came to endue the one with power, and to quicken the hearts of the other.

The real object which the Saviour had in view in requiring the apostles to wait for the promise of the Father may be understood when we ascertain what the offices of the Holy Spirit, here styled the "promise of the Father," performs under the gospel. I will read you from John xvi. 7-14:

"7. Nevertheless, I tell you the truth, It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you.

"8. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.

"9. Of sin, because they believe not on me;

"10. Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;

"11. Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.

"12. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now.

"13. 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.

"14. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

Here we have the office of the Spirit set forth. He was "to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." He is to be a reprover to the unconverted. "He shall convict," etc., while he is to be a comforter to the child of God. On the one he exerts his power from without by reproving, convicting, etc.; on the other he exerts his power from within, comforting, consoling, etc. This is a special promise of a personal spiritual influence, over and above that which resides in, or is exerted through the word; inasmuch as it is a promise of the personal presence of the Spirit of God, both as a reprover of sin and comforter of the saints.

In John xvi. 12, 13 we read:

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth."

In this passage we have the personal presence of the Divine Spirit promised—the personal operation of the Divine Spirit set forth. It will not do to say that he performs this divine work mediately through the word, for this is a promise of spiritual influence over and above that which is exerted through the word. It will not do to confound the word and Spirit of God together here; for the Spirit here



presents us with the word by guiding the apostles "into all truth." This same Divine Spirit, which is promised in his inspiring influence to the apostles, is also promised as a reprover to the world and a comforter to the church.

Again, in John xv. 26, 27 we read:

"26. But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send to you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.

"27. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."

This Spirit was to come from the Father, and was to testify of Christ. The testimony of the Comforter, and the testimony of the apostles, in the word which they preached, is not the same. They are two witnesses who testify in regard to Christ, the Comforter, who is the reprover of the world, and the apostles who proclaimed the gospel. This Divine Comforter is promised to the church as a perpetual heritage; not merely to remain for a time, and then return to the Father, but he is to continue with the believers—"to abide with them forever."

In John xiv. 16, 17 Christ says:

"16. And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever;

"17. Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world can not receive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

Hera we have the promise of the Divine Spirit, which is to abide with and dwell in the believer for ever, and this can not be done without direct, immediate, and personal influence, for this is certainly embraced in dwelling in the believer. Nor will it do for my opponent to say that the Holy Spirit accomplishes this mediately through the word, for the Spirit spoken of in all these passages is a personal Comforter, promised to the church, above, separate, and distinct from the word; it is the Spirit promised as a personal Comforter and abiding guest to dwell in the heart of the believer.

When the promise of the Father came, when the Comforter descended on the disciples on the day of Pentecost, Peter declared that it was not only the fulfillment of Christ's promise, but also of Joel's prophecy, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." I will read Peter's language. Acts ii. 16-18:

"16. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel;

"17. And it shall come to pass in the last days, said God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:

"18. And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy."

Here it is manifest that the Comforter promised is the same of which Joel speaks, and whose influence directly on the heart is the only true test of discipleship Here reference is not made to the miraculous influences of the Holy Spirit, nor can this prophecy be limited to these; but it is a prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit

upon all believers, throughout all ages of the Christian dispensation, for Christ had promised the Spirit as a personal Comforter to abide with and dwell in his children for ever.

Prophecy under the New Testament does not always imply a foretelling of future events. It often means teaching, proclaiming of the truth, etc., as my friend well knows. Thus we have seen the office and the work of the Holy Spirit pointed out by the Master.

There is another point in this work of the Holy Spirit that I wish, in this place, to call your attention to: It is the office of the Spirit in witnessing our adoption into the family of God. Paul says, Rom. viii. 14—16:

"14. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

"15. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, "Abba, Father.

"16. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

Now the Spirit of God can not come into our hearts crying Abba, Father, unless the contact—the influence be direct and immediate—the thing is impossible. But this is not all; the expression "the Spirit itself," shows, as strong as language can show, that the influence is exerted directly and not mediately. What Spirit is it that bears witness with our spirit? It is not the Spirit in the word, but it is the Spirit which, is given to us—the Spirit of adoption—the Comforter. That which a man himself does, he does immediately. If I say a man himself does a thing, I do not mean that he does it through some other person or medium, but he himself does it directly. And now God says the "Spirit itself beareth witness." It is not bearing witness through some other medium; but it is "the Spirit itself" who "beareth witness with our Spirit." The testimony of the Spirit is not borne mediately and indirectly, but directly and immediately. Is the testimony of "our spirit" direct and immediate? If so, then the testimony of the Spirit of God is immediate and direct, for the two are joined together in their testimony. Here the argument is wholly conclusive, for we have a direct and express declaration of the direct and immediate operations of the Spirit of God.

Here it is expressly declared that the Spirit of God is communicated to the believer, not only to dwell in his heart, but to dwell there as a Comforter, and as a witness of his adoption into the family of God. This is a spiritual operation upon the Spirit of man, not through the eye and ear, but through a spiritual influence exerted by the Spirit of God on the soul of the believer.

Again, in Galatians iv. 6, 7, we read:

"6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.

"7. Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son; and if a son then an heir of God through Christ."

Here the apostle expressly affirms that the Spirit of the Son of God is "sent forth into the heart" of the believer, "crying, Abba, Father." By this Spirit of the Son of God in the heart, we know that

we are no longer servants, but are constituted sons and heirs of God. Here we receive the assurance of the pardon of sin, and sonship in the divine family, by the indwelling Spirit of God, given to and abiding in the heart of the believer. So we see by the offices which the Holy Spirit performs under the gospel that his operations must be personal, direct, and immediate, in the regeneration and sanctification of the believer.

In the conclusion of this my first argument, I say again that upon no other ground can we see any necessity for the shedding forth of the Spirit at all. Upon no other ground can there be any room for spiritual influence under the gospel, and the only possible place, according to the gentleman's position, where the Holy Spirit can have anything to do with the whole scheme of human redemption is in inspiring the apostles to proclaim the word of truth. That is the only room there is for spiritual agency in his entire system. It denies the whole idea of there being any personal Spirit operating upon, and dwelling in the heart of the believer, for there can be, says Mr. Campbell, "no other kind of influence exerted upon the Spirit, except moral influence, which can only be exerted through words and arguments addressed to the eye or ear," and so says my opponent.

The capital defect of this would-be, and self-styled reformation, or rather deformation of Christianity, is that it wholly sets aside the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion and regeneration, and leaves no room in the whole economy of the gospel for any such thing as spiritual influence. It makes the work of the Spirit not only unnecessary, but actually denies its very being.

My second argument in support of my proposition is drawn from these scriptures which represent the great spiritual change which we call regeneration, under the figure of being "generated, or born of the Spirit. I will read from John i. 12, 13:

"12. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:

"13. Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

How are we constituted sons of God? "Not by blood," not by natural generation. The Jew was not constituted a son of God, by being a son of Abraham according to the flesh, for Paul says, "they are not all Israel who are of Israel." We are not constituted "sons of God by the will of the flesh," or by an effort of our unrenewed nature. Nor are we constituted the "sons of God by the will of men;" nor by the action of some other person upon us. But we are constituted sons of God by being born, or begotten of God. The word here translated born (*gemmao*) properly signifies to generate or beget, and here we are said to be constituted the sons of God, by being generated or begotten of God. The active agent in the work of spiritual regeneration or reproduction of spiritual generation is the Spirit of God. We are constituted sons of God, made partakers of the divine nature, by being generated of God, just we partake of the nature of man by being generated of man. So we are constituted sons of God, by divine generation.

Peter, speaking of this spiritual birth, 1 Peter i. 23, says: "Being

born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

Here the word of God is presented as the instrument through which this spiritual birth is effected, while the Spirit of God is the agent by whom this is accomplished. If you will examine the word of God you will discover that the word of God is always represented as the means, or instrument, through which the seed is brought into the heart; while the Holy Ghost is represented as the active agent by whom man is regenerated, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus. This is the relation the word and the Spirit sustain to each other in the work of conversion in the holy scriptures. The word of God shows us the necessity of being born again, and leads us to see our helplessness, and points out to us the remedy; while the Holy Spirit, by his transforming power, creates the soul anew. Thus the word of God is the instrument through which the mind is enlightened, while the Holy Spirit is the agent by whom the soul is regenerated, as we shall see more fully as we proceed with the argument. In the first Epistle of John v. 1 we read:

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him."

And again in the eighteenth verse it is said :

"18. We know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not."

These passages prove clearly, first, that regeneration is a radical change of man's moral nature—the beginning of a new existence—not simply entering into a new state, as Mr. Campbell teaches. Being begotten of God we partake of his nature, we derive our new existence from him by spiritual generation. The agent by which this spiritual regeneration is performed is the Holy Spirit, as Christ plainly shows in his conversation with Nicodemus. John iii. 6—8:

"6. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.

"7. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.

"8. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

That which is born of the flesh partakes of a fleshly nature ; but that which is produced by spiritual generation is spiritual. Here is the parallel. Do you remember that my opponent on a former proposition, gave you a new translation of this passage in John. He said the word *pneuma* ought to have been translated here spirit, instead of wind. He said it should read, "The Spirit breatheth where he willeth, and thou hearest his voice but canst not tell whence he cometh or whither he goeth, so is every one born of the Spirit."

I have several capital objections to this translation. The first is that it makes us hear the voice of the Spirit in his breathing! Look at it. "The Spirit breatheth where he willeth, and thou hearest his voice." How do you hear his voice? As he breathes of course. This must necessarily follow. But this is a palpable absurdity; it is a

palpable perversion of God's truth. We do not hear the voice of the Spirit as he breathes; and yet it is "the sound produced by the blowing of the Spirit that we hear," or as Mr. Braden says, the breathing of the Spirit!

I also object to this translation again, because Jesus introduces the blowing of the wind here as an illustration of the operations and influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart in the work of regeneration. Nicodemus could not understand the nature of the birth of which Jesus was speaking. He had introduced one illustration, that of "being born of water," or cleansing by water in token of spiritual purification, but Nicodemus could not understand it. He now introduces another, and says: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Suppose now we translate this passage as the gentleman does, you can see in a moment that there is no illustration in the passage at all. His translation defeats the very object our Saviour had in view in uttering this language. We can hear the sound of the wind as it blows, we can see its effects, we can feel its power, but we can not see it, nor can we tell from whence it comes, nor whither it goes. So we can hear the voice of the Divine Spirit in our heart and conscience; we see the effect it produces in the tempers and lives of those who are "born again," and we can feel its transforming and renewing power in our hearts; but the manner of its operations we can no more comprehend than we can the blowing of the wind. Here we see the fitness of the illustration employed by Christ. But if we translate the passage as my opponent does, there is no illustration in the passage at all, and Nicodemus is still left in the dark in regard to the nature of the new birth, and the operations of the Holy Spirit.

But again, this great spiritual change is called "The washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." In Titus iii. 5-7 we read:

"5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;

"6. Which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour;

"7. That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

St. Paul here tells us, first, that we are not saved "by works of righteousness which we have done;" secondly, that we are saved through God's mercy, "by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Christ Jesus." Now I ask how can there be a "washing of the Holy Ghost" unless the Holy Ghost comes in immediate contact with the soul? But the Holy Ghost in this washing is "shed on us abundantly through Christ Jesus." How can the Holy Ghost "be shed on" the heart, without direct and personal contact? Here it is expressly declared that the Holy Ghost is the agent in the work of regeneration, and that his operation and influence is direct and immediate. He is "shed on the heart abundantly through Christ Jesus."

Here the argument is conclusive, for the testimony is direct and specific, that "in the work of regeneration the Holy Spirit operates immediately on the heart."

My third argument in support of my proposition is drawn from the fact that the great spiritual change called conversion or regeneration is in the scripture styled a "new creation," and the subject of it—the Christian—is styled a "new creature." In Galatians vi. 15 we read:

"15. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

The word here rendered "creature" properly means "creation," and the change expressed by it is not simply a change of state or of life, but it is a complete and radical change of the moral nature. In regeneration there is a "new creation," and the subject of it is made a new creature in a spiritual sense. Again, in 2 Corinthians v. 17, we read:

"17. Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

Here again the Christian is called a "new creature." In Ephesians ii. 10 the "new creature" is called the workmanship of God:

"10. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

Here we have this new creation, which, as we have seen in Titus iii. 5, is the work of the Holy Ghost. We are new creatures if we are in Christ. The Holy Spirit constitutes us a new creation, and being new creations we are the workmanship of God.

The active agent in all this work of regeneration, this new creation, is the Holy Spirit; and here we prove the direct, immediate and personal operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion as fully as we can in the first creation of the world, when "the Spirit of God moved upon the waters, and God said let there be light, and there was light." The one was a translation from darkness and chaos into order and light; the other is a translation from the darkness and chaos of sin, into the light and glory of the Sun of righteousness, and both are the direct work of the same Divine Spirit.

My fourth argument in support of my proposition is drawn from the fact that conversion is called an anointing, and a sealing of the Spirit. First, the Christian is said to be anointed in 2 Corinthians i. 21:

"21. Now he which established us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God."

And 1 John ii. 20, 27 it is said:

"20. But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things."

"27. But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him."

Now we know that in anointing there must be direct and immediate contact between the anointing substance and the object to which it is

applied. The anointing substance is here the Holy Spirit, and the object to which it is applied is the heart of the believer, and there must be a direct contact between them, or else there can be no anointing. The unction of the Spirit received in conversion, remaining with the believer as an inward spiritual teacher, not for the purpose of enlightening the understanding in the doctrines of the gospel, but to teach the heart, and lead it into a higher degree of spiritual life and enjoyment. It is the Christian's spiritual teacher.

But the conversion or regeneration is also called a sealing of the believer with the Spirit 2 Cor. i. 22:

"22. Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

In Ephesians i. 13, 14 we also read:

"13. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise.

"14. Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."

Also in Ephesians iv. 30 we read:

"30. And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

Again in 2 Corinthians v. 5:

"5. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit."

Now in the sealing process there must be direct and immediate contact between the seal, and the thing sealed. There can be no seal without direct and immediate contact. In conversion or regeneration the believer comes in contact with the Spirit, and the seal of the Spirit is placed upon the heart. "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. 'Ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of an inheritance.'" Here we are declared to be sealed, and the earnest is in our hearts, and also that the Spirit by which we are sealed is the earnest of our inheritance.

Here the argument reaches demonstration. It is a positive and unequivocal "Thus saith the Lord," that in conversion and regeneration, the Holy Spirit operates immediately or directly upon the heart. When a man believes, that is trusts in Christ, he is "sealed with the Spirit in the heart," and that seal remains with him as "the earnest or pledge of the inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession."

My fifth argument in proof of my proposition is founded on the fact that conversion or regeneration in the scriptures is called a baptizing of the Spirit, being baptized into Christ, etc.

We will first read in this connection from 1 Corinthians xii. 13:

"13. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

You will remember that this passage was quoted in another proposition, and that my opponent said that to be baptized by one Spirit into one body, did not necessarily mean the Spirit of God baptizing

the soul; but that it meant that we all partook of a similar Spirit. I will read you the whole passage, and see whether it does not necessarily mean the Holy Spirit. There is no better rule for us to observe in the interpretation of the scriptures, than to first examine the context of a passage; and, secondly, to compare it with parallel passages. By this means we will get at the exact meaning of the Holy Spirit. I will read you from the seventh to the thirteenth verse of the twelfth chapter of 1st Corinthians:

"7. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.

"8. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit:

"9. To another, faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;

"10. To another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, discerning of spirits; to another, divers kinds of tongues; to another, the interpretation of tongues:

"11. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.

"12. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.

"13. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

Now, I ask, if it is not just as plain as the shining of the sun, that the Spirit which baptizes here is the Holy Ghost, by which the believer is baptized into Christ? By one Spirit are we baptized into one body; but we are also made to drink into one Spirit as Christ promised. "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink;" "but this spoke he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given." We must necessarily understand here that it is the Holy Spirit baptizing us into Jesus Christ, and making us one body. In baptism there must a direct contact between the baptizing element, and the person or thing baptized. The baptizing element here is the Spirit of God; the thing baptized is the spirit of the believer, which is baptized into Jesus Christ, and constituted a member of his body.

Here we have demonstration again: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." It will not do for my friend to say that there is no spiritual baptism, for he will have Jesus and the apostles against him, as, indeed, he has had them against him all through this discussion. John says:

"I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

Christ said to his disciples: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." This baptizing power of the Holy Ghost was poured out on the apostles on the day of Pentecost, and is vouchsafed to all believers throughout all ages, by which we are all baptized into Jesus Christ, and made members of his body.

Here we have most clearly demonstrated the fact that by the bap-



tism of the Spirit is meant the Holy Spirit "baptized the believer into Christ," that this spiritual baptism by which the soul is renewed, sanctified and cleansed, is "the washing of regeneration, and the cleansing of the Holy Ghost," and that in this work of regeneration, here called a baptism of the Spirit, there is direct and immediate contact between the Spirit of God, and the soul of the believer.

The same thing is expressed to us in Romans vi. 3, 4, Col. ii. 12 where the symbolical import of baptism is presented to us, as introducing us into the benefits of Christ's death.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I shall be under the necessity of asking your indulgence this morning, while I go through with some preliminary work before entering directly on the discussion. I have observed that disputants often begin discussion without defining and limiting the proposition, and soon disagree as to its real meaning, and have to go back and agree upon this meaning, or perhaps spend more time in disputing about that than in debating the real issue. It has always seemed to me to be better to have a proper understanding of the question before commencing, and to know what the real difference is. Hence I asked the questions I did last night. I desired the audience to understand how far we agreed, where we disagreed, and what the real position of each was.

The gentleman has read largely from Bro. Campbell, wishing probably to get before you his views, or rather what he says he taught, and make them by implication mine. I am not responsible for Alexander Campbell's views, nor he for mine. I am negating the gentleman's views as expressed in that proposition. Properly construed, Mr. Campbell's views are correct, but it they were not it would have no bearing on the question. The gentleman was really out of order in reading irrelevant matter. It is agreed:

1. That there is a Divine Spirit or Holy Spirit.
2. That the Holy Spirit gave by inspiration the scriptures, and when they influence men the Spirit operates" on men.
- 3- That the Holy Spirit is always in the truth, as our spirits are in the words we utter, and that he influences men as we influence men by the arguments and motives in the truth thus presented. I believe this power to be resident in the word and co-extensive with the word, and I recognize no power beyond it as now exerted by the Spirit. My opponent believes in the existence and exercise of this power too.
4. But he claims that in conversion and regeneration the Holy Spirit exerts power in addition to and beyond this by direct and immediate operation on the heart. If an additional power, it must be distinct from any I recognize, By direct, he means without intervening instrumentality, or by contact or impact of the Spirit of God on the spirit of man. By immediate, he means without any medium or intervening means of communication.

The issue is now clearly before us, and I wish you to remember it, Remember, also, we are not discussing what the Spirit has done in other works than conversion and regeneration, nor what he can do,

but what he does. It is not a question of power, but of fact—a fact to be settled by an appeal to God's word. If that does not teach this direct and immediate operation in conversion, we shall reject it. If it teaches no more than what I have stated as his work, we shall go no further.

Before we can admit the existence of this additional, direct and immediate operation, we must have it so described that we can distinguish it from all others. We must know how it differs from, and how its work and results differ from all others, so that we can distinguish it from them, and know when it is present and when it is not. We should be able to contrast and compare it with others, so as to separate and distinguish them.

As in conversion there are operations of our own consciences and reasons—and our opponent claims this direct operation of the Spirit—our opponent should tell how we can distinguish between them, and tell when and how we can distinguish between this infallible and direct operation of the Spirit of God, and the imperfect actions of our own sinful and imperfect reasons and consciences.

He should tell us what he means by "operation." Is this influence a moral influence, such as is exerted on mind and heart through truth and motive, or is it a sort of physical influence independent of motive? Are we responsible for its existence or effects or not? Come, let us know what you mean by this direct and immediate operation, or cease to contend for what you do not or can not describe. If you do not or can not describe it to us so that we know what it is, how can we tell whether you prove its existence or not? When we have the region of the known, we have nothing to argue about or to base an argument on, for the known is all reason takes cognizance of.

He should describe to us what he means by conversion. Is it a moral, legal or a physical change? I contend that it is a moral and spiritual change. Not merely a change of views, although it includes and begins in such a change of views, but a conviction that leads to repentance, reformation, or a change of mind and heart, a change of views and purposes, desires and feelings and conduct.

What are the effects of this change? If we can determine that, we can easily determine what power or influence is needed to produce them. God never employs more or different means to accomplish a certain result than are needed. Then we claim after this change man has every religious, moral, rational, emotional and physical faculty he had before, and no new ones have been given to him. His ideas have been changed, his belief or faith changed, his religious nature aroused, his moral nature elevated, his emotional nature directed to proper objects and purified, and his physical nature put under restraint. What power is needed to accomplish this result? Faith accomplishes this result, for faith is the moving, energizing principle in the great change called regeneration. What is faith? Faith is a belief with the whole heart of the truth God has presented for our regeneration, and the trust and reliance resulting from this heartfelt belief, and is based on the evidence and testimony God has given to induce such belief. The steps then are hearing the word, faith, or believing with the whole heart this word, and this belief is induced by the evidences and testi-

mony presented; then repentance or emotion, and lastly volition to do what God requires, and be what he approves, and the carrying out of this volition. This is regeneration. It is caused by faith, and comes by hearing the word of God. We have then only a work accomplished by the truth, a work that needs only the truth, and God will employ no more power than this. All the power God ever exerts to convert a soul is resident in his truth. God has never converted a soul in all time except through the truth presented to the reason and heart of the person converted.

We will now inquire how many and what influences one mind can exercise on another, and then attempt to decide which God would employ in our conversion:

1. Motives or appeals to our reason, desires and feelings. These must reach the word through some of the senses, and they are either thoughts presented to our reason or what arouses thought in our reason, and their power is removed by the presence and influence of the intelligence presenting the motives. We can resist or yield to these, and are therefore responsible for their influence on us. All moral influence is exerted in this way.

2. Modern science has discovered another influence in mesmerism, biology and clairvoyance. In this a person loses volition and personality, and it is usurped by and merged into that of the operator. Man is responsible for yielding to this influence, but not immediately for his conduct while in it. The responsibility rests in his being responsible for being in such a state.

God has influenced men in two ways:

1. By motives or appeals to their reasons, consciences and feelings, in his word and works. These are moral means or moral power, and man is responsible for yielding to or resisting them, and for what he does under their influence. This is an ordinary influence.

2. He has exercised a miraculous influence in inspiration. This is direct and often irresistible, and does not necessarily affect the moral character of those affected by it. Balaam, at the instigation of Balak, prompted by his greed of gain, went out to curse Israel. God miraculously and irresistibly compelled him to bless Israel. This miraculous influence made him no better, for he attempted again to earn the bribe he eagerly desired. Everything in the account proves him to have been a wicked wretch, used by God as a medium of miraculous revelation, regardless of his character, and that his character was not affected by it.

The case of Saul, King of Israel, is another illustration. He went out to hunt down and murder David. The Spirit of the Lord compelled him to prophecy. He went out and continued his pursuit with murder still in his heart. Inspiration was given regardless of character, and character was not changed by it. There is another illustration in Kings xxii. A lying spirit inspired all the prophets, and did not affect their character. Jonah is another illustration. No clearer illustration of an unregenerated heart can be given than he gave, yet he was inspired to prophesy, and was still a wicked, rebellious wretch.

Take also the case of Caiaphas, who prophesied by inspiration and

was still a rebellious, unbelieving Jew, plotting Christ's death and at last compassing it. These are sufficient to prove that this miraculous influence was given regardless of moral character, and never affected the moral character of those influenced by it. It was never employed in the conversion of those influenced by it. Their revelations only affected them, as they afterward reflected on them as other men did, in the ordinary influence of truth. This miraculous influence has now ceased.

Mr. Hughey is contending for an operation of the Spirit that is essential to salvation, for all must be converted, and all must be converted by this operation. Will he tell us what it is, so we may know when we have experienced it and when we are converted? Are men responsible if they are not influenced by it to their conversion? If they are, they must be able to know what it is, and distinguish it from the imperfect, sinful operations of their own hearts and reasons and consciences. Is it an influence that usurps our personality, reason and volition? It must be to save us from error, and unless we can distinguish between it and our own imperfect reason and feelings. If so, how is man responsible if not converted?

If it is not such an influence, what can it be but an influence contained in motives and appeals to reason and feelings such as exists in the truth? What need of direct and immediate operation in such an influence? Let my opponent define and describe this influence. Let us clearly understand what he is talking about. It will hardly do to tell us we are not spiritual and can not discern these things, for we must discern them before we can become spiritual. Now then, sir, please tell us what this influence is, how it operates, how we can distinguish it from all others, and how we can know when we have it. What are you contending for? What are we debating? Tell us what you are talking about, or cease to talk about it.

We will now proceed to discuss at some length the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and his work. We do this because we are sometimes charged with denying the existence of the Spirit, and almost invariably with denying all operation of the Spirit. In denying that the Spirit influences men except through the truth, I no more deny his existence than I deny the existence of man's spirit, when I say he can exert no moral influence on the spirit of his fellow-man, except through the truth or appeals to reason and motives.

We say spirit, not ghost, Ghost once meant guest, and the word meant holy guest, but it means an entirely different thing now. *Pneuma* means spirit. We mean when we speak of the Holy Spirit that Divine Spirit that was sent into the world to convert the sinner and comfort the saint, who is mentioned in connection with the Father and Son in some places, and alone in others, in the scripture. With us he is a divine person, a spiritual being or person; hence we say he and not it, when we speak of him.

We have no theory concerning the nature of the union with the Father and Son, for this is utterly untaught, unrevealed in the scriptures. We are not concerned with the relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to each other, but with their relation to us. Hence all this speculation about the Trinity is an attempt to be wise beyond what

is written. We know nothing about it, and we believe nothing about it, for we can not believe what we do not understand. We do not profess to understand the arithmetic of heaven.

Some regard the Spirit whenever spoken of as a tendency of mind and heart; others as a spiritual messenger, but as divine only because divinely sent; others as a different manifestation of the God, or the Father; others as a person or spiritual being and divine, but as not equal to the Father, or not Deity.

Without discussing these, we will examine the passages where the Holy Spirit is spoken of. We must be careful not to refer to the Holy Spirit all passages in which a Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Lord are spoken of for these evidently mean sometimes disposition and sometimes messenger.

The question has sometimes been asked how God has revealed himself to men. Some suppose that God never revealed himself, but employed Christ and the Holy Spirit as mediums of revelation. In some places God is said to reveal himself. In other places the same revelation is ascribed to angels, angels of the Lord, an angel of his face. We read so in Exodus iii., xiv., xx.; Numbers xx.; Isaiah lxiii. Jacob and Abraham speak of the angels that visited them as God himself. Many things are attributed to God in the Old Testament, which, in the New, are attributed to Christ; hence some think Christ was the one who had all the intercourse with men mentioned in the Old Testament. We believe that he was at least largely concerned in the development of the scheme of redemption from the first, and that the Holy Spirit was the one who inspired all holy men of old.

But we are not so much concerned in the manner of revelation as what is revealed concerning the Holy Spirit. We will inquire what we can learn: 1. Of his personality. 2. Of his attributes. 3. Of his work. 4. Of how he accomplished this work.

1. His personality. Then; are two classes of scriptures we shall quote on that point: 1. Those where he is mentioned in connection with the Father and Son. 2. Those in which personal attributes are ascribed to him. In Matthew iii. 16, voice of the Father and the Holy Spirit descending on the Son. Matt. xxviii. 14, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. John xiv. 26, the advocate sent from the Father in the name of the Son 1. Peter i. 2, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, in order to obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. xiii. 14, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Eph. iv. 4, one God the Father, one Lord, one Spirit. 1 Cor. xii. 4. now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit, and there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God who worketh all in all.

These passages, except the last, do not teach conclusively the divinity or personality of the Spirit, though they strongly imply it. They do clearly teach that the Holy Spirit is not a different manifestation of him who is mentioned in connection with the Spirit as God the Father. They do teach also that the Holy Spirit is not the Spirit of

God in the same sense that we speak of man's spirit, or a spirit of a spirit. He can not be separate from the Father, as we are taught here, and yet his spirit. They teach that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are separate. The last passage proves the separate existence, personality and divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

We will now examine the passages which teach the personality of the Spirit, John xiv., xv., xvi. The Holy Spirit is sent, and called the Paraclete, or the Advocate, Counselor, or Comforter. These titles can only be applied to a personal, intelligent being. He is sent to guide, instruct and to call to recollection. These acts can only be performed by a personal, intelligent being. 1 Cor. xii. 1—13, the Spirit gives gifts, distributes them as he wills, makes them effectual and baptizes into one body. These acts can be performed only by a personal, intelligent being. 1 Cor. ii. 10: "Eye has not seen, ear has not heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man what things God has prepared for those who love him. But God has revealed them to us through his Spirit, for his Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God. The things of God no one knows but the Spirit of God. We speak in words taught by the Spirit." Here the Spirit searches, knows, reveals and teaches. None but an intelligent person can do these things. Acts xiii. 2, "And the Holy Spirit said, separate me Paul and Barnabas unto the work whereunto I have called them. So they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed." Here the Spirit speaks as a person, calls and sends the apostles as a person. Acts xxviii 15, Paul said, "Well said the Holy Spirit, by the prophet Isaiah." Here he speaks as a person. Acts xx. 28, "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers." Here the Holy Spirit made them overseers as a person. Acts xxi. 11, Agabus said: "The Holy Spirit says the Jews shall bind the man." Here he speaks as a person. These passages clearly prove the separate existence and personality of an intelligent being called the Holy Spirit.

2. His attributes. He is mentioned in connection with God in his work, and invoked with him in prayer. His work is called God's work, in a personal sense. Hence we would conclude he is divine. Divine attributes are assigned to him. Omniscience, 1 Cor. ii. 10, "For the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God." Foreknowledge: John xvi 13, "The Advocate shall show you things to come." Omnipotence, omniscience and foreknowledge: 1 Cor. xii. the Spirit gives gifts of miracles, prophecy and others which demand omnipotence, foreknowledge and omniscience. In John xvi. he was to call to mind all things for the apostles. Blasphemy can be committed against the Holy Spirit. Regeneration and other divine works are ascribed to him. We conclude, then, that the Holy Spirit is a separate, personal, intelligent, Divine Being. Such conclusions do we reach by a perusal of the scriptures.

Of his relation to the Father and Son we know nothing. It would not benefit us to know; as we have nothing like it on earth, we could not comprehend it. We receive what the Bible teaches, in Bible language, and stop there.

We will now ask how the Holy Spirit has manifested himself to

men? In different ways and for different purposes. A lack of understanding this is the source of nearly all error concerning the work of the Holy Spirit. Some have confounded all the work of the Spirit and made no distinction, and have made all his work miraculous. Others have gone to the extreme of almost denying his existence. One question often debated is: "Was the Holy Spirit ever given, except in inspiration, till the day of Pentecost?" Some ascribe all passages speaking of the Spirit of God, his Spirit, and such expressions to the Holy Spirit. Such are manifestly wrong. Others claim that he was never given till after the day of Pentecost. They quote John vii. 9, "For the Holy Spirit was not yet given." John xiv., xv., xvi., After he went away, the Comforter would come, and unless he went he would not come. Luke xxiv. 49, Tarry in Jerusalem till you are endued with power from on high. Acts i. 4-8, Wait the promise of the Father. Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. Ye shall receive power after the Holy Ghost is come upon you.

Others claim that he manifested himself before that time, and quote Gen. vi. 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Acts vii. 51, "Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit; as do your fathers so do ye." Acts xxviii. 25, Paul said, "Well said the Holy Spirit, by the prophet Isaiah." Psalms li. 11, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." Isaiah lxiii. 11, "They vexed his Holy Spirit saying, where is he that put his Holy Spirit within Moses?" In Luke we read that the Holy Spirit was given to Mary, Elizabeth, John, Simeon, Zachariah and others. Do the scriptures then contradict themselves? They do not, for these passages refer to different manifestations of the Spirit. In one sense he was given; in another he was not. There have been these manifestations of the Spirit.

1. The ordinary. 2. The extraordinary. The ordinary has always been by moral means, appeals through the truth, to man's reason and moral nature. This has been common to all ages where God's revealed word has been presented to the people, either through his inspired servants or the record of what he has revealed. This has never been the subject of promise.

The extraordinary has always been special and miraculous; was given for a special purpose; ceased as soon as that purpose was accomplished; was by direct or immediate operation of the Spirit of God on the spirit of man, taking possession of his powers and faculties and using them for a special purpose or end.

The ordinary may be divided into: 1. Reproof of the sinner. 2. Guidance and comfort of the saint. They differ only in the relation of the person affected by them; and this difference is occasioned by the difference in character of the person influenced. To the sinner the Spirit is an outward reprover of his sins, for the world can not receive him, and he is to reprove the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. To the saint he is an indwelling guest, guide and comforter. He uses the same agencies in each case—the truth, the word of truth. God strove with the antediluvians and his people, and tried to lead men back to himself, and reproved them by the truth presented by his

servants. All the converting power he ever exercised, or exercises now, is in his word or the truth.

The extraordinary manifestation of the Spirit may be separated into: 1. The inspiration of men till the day of Pentecost to prophesy and make known his will, and occasionally to work miracles. 2. The baptism of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and the house of Cornelius, and the gift of the Holy Spirit that existed in the church through the imposition of the hands of the apostles. Whether the baptism and gift were different or not, is not of much importance. If there were any difference it was merely in the way he was imparted. In one case by a direct gift from heaven; in the other, through the imposition of the apostles' hands. The gifts and powers were the same.

These last extraordinary manifestations were miraculous and special, and ceased as soon as their objects were accomplished. Every promise Christ made of the Spirit and the prophecy of Joel were of this character. The ordinary manifestation of the Spirit was never a subject of promise. This extraordinary manifestation began with Enoch and closed with the last of the inspired Christian prophets, on whom the apostles laid their hands. There is no miraculous work of the Spirit now.

We come now to the work of the Holy Spirit. We shall inquire:

1. What work the Holy Spirit has done for man; 2. How much of this has ceased; 3. What he does now; 4. How he does this work. The Holy Spirit has done the following work for men;

1. He inspired them.—2 Peter i. 21. This has ceased.
2. Gave miraculous gifts.—1 Cor. xii. This has ceased.
3. Baptized the apostles and others at the house of Cornelius.—Acts i., ii. and x. This has ceased.
4. Reproves the world.—Gen. vi. 3. John xvi. 8.
5. Begets us.—1 John v. 1. 1 James i. 18. 1 Peter i. 22. John i. 12.; iii. 5.
6. We are born of the Spirit.—John iii.
7. Sheds abroad love in our hearts.—Rom. v. 5.
8. Causes us to abound in hope.—Rom. xv. 13.
9. Quickens our bodies.—Rom. viii. 11.
10. Renews us to salvation.—Titus iii. 5.
11. Justifies us.—1 Cor. vi. 11.
12. Baptizes us into the one body.—1 Cor. xii. 13.
13. Seals us to the day of redemption.
14. Sanctifies us.—2 Thess. ii. 13.
15. Gives us access through the Son to the Father.—Eph. iii. 16.
16. Builds us together for a dwelling-place of God.—Eph. ii. 22.
17. Bears witness with our spirits that we are God's.—Rom. viii. 16.
18. Helps our infirmities.—Rom. viii. 26.
19. Makes intercession for us.—Rom. viii. 26.
20. Strengthens us mightily in the inner man.—Eph. iii. 16.
21. Reveals to us heavenly mysteries.—1 Cor. ii. 10.
22. Taught the apostles.—1 Cor. ii. 13.

We are told that the Spirit has done all this work for men, and still does it, except the miraculous work, which has ceased. We believe



all this. Let no man then misrepresent me by saying that we do not believe in the existence and work of the Spirit.

Of this work, inspiration has ceased; miraculous gifts have ceased; baptism of the Holy Spirit has ceased; revelation) in the sense in which he revealed himself to the apostles, has ceased; teaching, in the sense in which he taught the apostles, has ceased—in short, all miraculous operation of the Spirit has ceased. He reveals and teaches us the mysteries of divine things now only through the word he gave us through the inspired men of old. The rest of his work now remains, and is performed for us only through the word. He performed the same work for the apostles, in the same way also, and he may have helped the infirmities of those who received miraculous gifts; and borne witness with their spirits in a sense and to a degree he does not now. We can not claim all Christ promised to his apostles, nor all they attributed to the saints in their day, for the miraculous gifts have ceased. We should bear this in mind in all our investigations.

Now we will take up the question, how did and does the Spirit perform all this work? All will agree that the miraculous operation of the Spirit has ceased. Or all except a few who are generally regarded religious fanatics. In regard to the ordinary work, one party contends that it is done directly or immediately; or at least a part of it. Another that it is all done through the word. I think the trouble has arisen from not understanding the word clearly, and distinguishing between the extraordinary and transitory work of the Spirit, and the ordinary and perpetual work which he has done, and will do through all time.

That we may properly distinguish between these, we will examine the cases referring to the extraordinary work of the Spirit. The inspiration of the prophets, John the Baptist, Mary, Elizabeth, Zachariah, and Simeon, was extraordinary, miraculous, and has ceased. The promise of Joel concerning the outpouring of the Spirit was miraculous, for it was miraculously fulfilled at Pentecost, as Peter tells us. The promises of Jesus of the Spirit, were all concerning and confined to the miraculous gift of the Spirit, and the baptism of the Spirit. In Luke xii. 12 his promise is evidently in reference to inspiration. So also in Matthew x. 19, Mark xiii. 11, and Luke xxi. 14. In these places Jesus promised his disciples that the Holy Spirit should inspire them when they were before the rulers. This was fulfilled in Acts iv. 8, and vi., when Peter and Stephen were inspired to answer the rulers. In John vii. 38 we read. "Jesus said, if any man believe on me, out of his inward parts, shall flow rivers of living water. This spake he of the Holy Spirit, which they that believed on him should receive, for the Holy Spirit was not yet given." This evidently has reference to the inspiration and miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit in the church after the day of Pentecost. The expression "rivers of living water," evidently means that, and the Holy Spirit had been given in all other senses except that, as the scriptures clearly teach. In John xiv., xv., xvi., Jesus promises the Comforter to his disciples. All the religious world has made a mistake in interpreting this, to mean the ordinary indwelling of the Spirit in the saint. The purposes for which he was given, and the work he was to accomplish, clearly show that it was

miraculous and extraordinary. He was to recall to mind all Jesus had said, show them things to come, guide them into all truth, reveal to them the truth. All this clearly implies foreknowledge, omniscience and miraculous power, and that it was a miraculous work he was to do for the disciples. We can in no sense claim this for ourselves, unless we show he does this for us as he did for the disciples. He now does his work for us through the truth the disciples have left. He operated on others by the truth the disciples presented. He guided, revealed, and recalled to them alone. We can not appropriate this scripture to ourselves. In Luke xxiv. 49 the disciples were told to tarry in Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high. As this was fulfilled at Pentecost, it was evidently a miraculous gift.

There is one more manifestation of the Spirit that I wish to prove miraculous—the baptism of the Holy Spirit. This is promised. Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16. John i. 33. Luke xxiv. 49. Acts i. 5. It was fulfilled at Pentecost, Acts ii., and at the house of Cornelius, Acts x. Peter, in Acts xi., refers to the day of Pentecost and to the house of Cornelius, and says they were the fulfilling of this prophecy. This has ceased for the following reasons:

1. It was extraordinary and miraculous, and all such action has ceased.

2. It was always attended with miraculous powers. These have ceased, hence the cause, baptism of the Spirit, has ceased.

3. It was promised only as an extraordinary and miraculous gift. These gifts were, in promise, confined to the apostolic age. Were by the apostolic declarations confined to that age, and have therefore ceased. All who pray for a baptism of the Spirit now pray not according to knowledge of the word, for that they never will receive. Those who pray for it and claim it should show that it was promised to all believers in all time. That they can work miracles as all could who were thus baptized anciently. This baptism was extraordinary and has ceased.

We will now inquire concerning the gift of the Spirit by the imposition of hands. This is included in Joel's prophecy in Christ's language, John vii. 39, and in Mark xvi. 19. They were to follow those who believed on the apostles preaching the miraculous gifts. In Acts ii. Peter says the baptism in the Holy Spirit was a fulfillment of the prophecy of the prophet Joel. He then promises the gift of the Spirit to all who repent and are baptized, and says the promise of Joel is to them and their children, and to those who were afar off. He means this miraculous gift promised by Joel, for that is what he is talking about, and the ordinary indwelling of the Spirit was never a subject of special promise. In Acts xi. 16, 17 he clearly and positively calls the baptism of the Spirit, and these miraculous powers as exhibited at Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius, the gift of the Spirit. The only promise he has mentioned and discussed in the chapter (Acts ii.) is the promise made by Joel, hence he refers to that when he speaks of the gift and the promise they were to receive, and that was to them.

In Acts iv. Peter and John were full of the Spirit by inspiration. In the same chapter we read that the whole church was full of the

Holy Spirit, and prayed, praised, prophesied by inspiration. In Acts vi. we read of Stephen being full of the Holy Spirit. Acts viii. the apostles laid hands on the Samaritans and they received the Holy Spirit. Acts x. the Holy Spirit fell on the house of Cornelius. Acts xi. Barnabas was full of the Holy Spirit. Also prophets were in the church and prophesied the famine. Acts xiii. the Holy Spirit was in the church at Antioch in inspiration and direction. Acts xv. the Holy Spirit is spoken of as the common gift of the churches, Jewish and Gentile. In the 28th verse the apostles speak of the Holy Spirit as the common guide of the churches, in his inspiration and before any of the New Testament was written. In Acts xvi. the apostles were forbidden by inspiration of the Holy Spirit Acts xx. 23 the Holy Ghost witnessed in all the churches and every city. The daughter of Philip prophesied or spoke by inspiration. Paul's course with John's disciples, Acts xix., shows that the gift of the Holy Spirit was a common gift in all churches. So does James' letter to all the churches, where he directs the sick to have the elders miraculously heal them.

Paul, in Ephesians iv., tells us God placed inspired men and women in the churches, and to remain till they come to the unity of the faith, and to a perfect man. In 1st Corinthians xii., xiii., xiv., he gives full account of these miraculous gifts. Collating the 8th, 9th, 10th verses of the 12th chapter, with the 28th, we learn that he (the Spirit) gave the word of wisdom by the apostles, word of knowledge by the prophets, faith or doctrine by teachers—healing by others—miracles by others—government by those who could discern spirits—the gift of tongue and interpretation by others. In Hebrews ii. 4, and Ephesians iv., we learn what these were for. So also in 1st Corinthians xiv. they were to give divine attestation to the divinity of the religion and preaching of the apostles and the churches they founded, and to furnish inspired preaching when the apostles were absent, until the church attained the unity of the faith and perfect manhood in the complete word of God, or till the New Testament was completed. So teaches Hebrews ii. 4, Ephesians iv., and 1st Corinthians xii., xiii, xiv.

How long were they to continue? "Forever," say some. They have not, for they have ceased. But they have ceased on account of our lack of faith. We will show that they have ceased and were designed to cease. They have ceased because their object has ceased. There is no more use for them. The divinity of the gospel has been demonstrated, and the New Testament is complete. We need no more inspiration. But Paul, in 1st Corinthians xiii., tells us all these gifts shall fail, shall be done away. He says that this partial revelation shall be done away when the perfect word of God, the perfect law of liberty of James has come He compares the growth of the church to a child. These gifts and revelations were for the childhood of the church, but when it became a man, attained to the unity of the faith, or to the complete word of God, to a perfect manhood, these childish, partial revelations should be done away, should cease. Then inspiration, baptisms of the Holy Spirit, and miraculous gifts have accomplished their purpose and have ceased as the word of God declares.

Now we will sum up our reasonings that the extraordinary and

miraculous operation of the Spirit has ceased, and all direct action of that kind. That the ordinary existed in all ages, as we learn from Genesis vi. 6, Isaiah lxiii. 11, Psalms li. 11, Acts vii. 51, and xxviii. 25. That this was through the teachings of Moses, Noah, and the inspired prophets. That it was by resisting their teachings, that the ancients resisted the Spirit. That God, or the Holy Spirit, operates on the hearts of men through the truth, and has in all ages, where his inspired word has been heard or read by them.

Then the work of my opponent is to show that in the ordinary Work of the Spirit, or that which has not ceased, and which he now does for men, there is a direct and immediate action, beyond and distinct from that on which we agree—that there is an operation without means or medium, by direct impact or contact. We must be careful to separate the miraculous and extraordinary operation that has ceased, from the ordinary which remains, and be careful not to apply to the latter, passages which refer to the former. The extraordinary was direct and immediate. We deny that the ordinary was. We can not claim indiscriminately, all promises and powers that are attributed, by the Scriptures, to the apostolic church, or saints in those days. We can claim only the ordinary operation of the Spirit.

A thought here which had almost escaped me. The miraculous gifts that existed in the apostolic churches were, except in the case of the baptism of the Spirit, always imparted by the imposition of the apostles' hands, as we read in the case of the Samaritans, and also in the case of John's disciples at Ephesus. These were the signs of apostleship Paul speaks of—the power to impart miraculous gifts. These gifts never descended to a third person.

Having thus given the doctrine of the Spirit, as set forth in the scriptures, we will spend a few moments in reviewing my friend's arguments. They can all be set aside for one radical defect. He reads different passages of scripture, where the work of the Spirit is spoken of, and assumes that the work is by direct action, and makes no attempt to show that it is or must be. Now there is no controversy between us as to whether the Spirit does the work, but there is in reference to how he does it. I deny that in any instance it is by direct contact or impact.

His first argument is that man is made a new creature in conversion. True, but how? By direct impact of the Spirit on his spirit? I deny it, and the gentleman made no attempt to show it. Man lost God's image, and he must regain the lost likeness of God. True, but how? It must be stamped on his spirit by a direct and personal contact or impact of the Spirit of God on his spirit! All assertion, and no proof. We deny it. Does he mean a real and literal impact, by which the image of the Spirit is pressed on the spirit of man, as the image is stamped on a metal coin? Certainly he can not so grossly materialize all spirit, as this would imply. Man becomes a new creature in being born again, and when we examine that we will dispose of all his assumptions nearly.

Christ gave his whole gospel to his disciples, but they were not to go forth till they were endued with power from on high, or till they had the Holy Spirit, showing that there was an operation of the Spirit

needed, beyond what was in the word. Christ gave his gospel to his disciples, but the Holy Spirit had to be given to recall it to their minds. John xiv. 26. He was to teach them all things and thus fit them for their work. He was given in direct contact or impact to the disciples, in inspiration, but not in their conversion. He converted others through the words spoken by the disciples, and not by direct impact. He never operated on their converts by direct impact, till he was miraculously given in the imposition of the apostles' hands.

This whole passage refers to the miraculous gift of the Spirit. In Hebrews ii. 4 we learn that he was to confirm the apostles' preaching, by signs and wonders in this miraculous gift. So also in Mark xvi. 17. All this promise of the Spirit in John xiv., xv., xvi. was clearly miraculous, for he was to reveal, prophesy, recall all things, and show things to come. His action on the apostles was direct, but on those they converted, his action was mediately, or through the truth they presented.

Prophecy he says sometimes means preaching. It does, but never unless the person preaches by inspiration, or the miraculous operation of the Spirit. But the Spirit witnesses with our spirit. True, but how? By direct action? By no means. How does the Spirit bear witness or testify? How can he? By direct action? The Spirit bears witness by his words, as we read in Acts xx. 23; xxi. 11. The prophets, inspired by the Holy Spirit, told Paul what awaited him, or he witnessed to Paul, in his words. John tells how we know we are children of God, how the Spirit tells us how we may know we are children of God, or how he witnesses with our spirits. 1 John iii. 19: "Hereby do we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him; for if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts, and knows all things: but if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God, and whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do the things that are well pleasing in his sight." In Galatians v. 22 we are told what are the fruits of the Spirit. Then if we examine the word of God or the words of the Spirit, and learn what are the fruits of obedience to the words of the Spirit, and compare our conduct therewith, and our hearts condemn us not, the Holy Spirit in his words or in God's word, and our hearts, bear witness, or he bears witness with our spirits, that we are God's, or of the truth.

Men are said to be born or begotten of God. True, but how? By direct impact of his Spirit? The Bible nowhere teaches it. On the contrary it teaches the reverse. Christ tells us there, in the context, how we are begotten of the Spirit: "The Spirit breathes where he pleases and you hear his voice. You can not tell whence he comes nor whither he goes. In this way is every one begotten, who is begotten of the Spirit." "The Spirit breathes." How? By the inspiration of God's servants, in miraculous inspiration, in the days of Nicodemus. "And you hear his voice," or his inspired words. "In this way," by his inspired word, "is every one begotten who is begotten of the Spirit." In 1 John v. 1 we read that "he who believes that Jesus is the Christ" believes this truth, "is begotten of God." 1 Peter i. 21 we read that we are begotten by the Spirit, through the word of

truth. 1 James i. 18, we are begotten through or by the word of truth.

Christ, in John iii., told Nicodemus how we are begotten of the Spirit, and after he had told him, Nicodemus knew whence the Spirit came, and whither he went. Paul, in 1 Cor. iv. 15, tells the Corinthians that he had begotten them through the gospel. Hence we are begotten of the Spirit, through the word of truth, and not by direct contact or impact.

We have next Titus iii. 5, "The washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit." This is explained by John iii. Washing of regeneration is baptism. Renewal of the Holy Spirit is being born again of the Spirit, or begotten of the Spirit, through the word. There is no argument for direct action.

.Man becomes a new creature in conversion. How, by direct impact of the Spirit? We have already shown that he becomes so in the birth spoken of in John iii., through the word. In Colossians iii. 10 we learn that we put on this new man, or become a new creature, by knowledge, or the truth. So in Ephesians iv. 23 we learn that it is done in living a righteous and holy life, through our knowledge of God's word.

We are baptized by one Spirit into one body. 1 Corinthians xii. 13. How, by direct action? Not at all. The gentleman here assumes the very point at issue, without a word of proof. We are baptized into the body, or by baptism come into Christ's body, or church. It is done by the Spirit, just as the Spirit begot the Corinthians, through Paul as his agent, by the word. By the direction of one Spirit, or in accordance to the command of the Spirit, we are baptized. It is done by the Spirit, through his servant.

We are sealed by the Holy Spirit. How, by direct impact, as we apply a seal to a letter? No, surely not, for that would be grossly material. The language is found in Ephesians i. 13; iv. 30. The expression is figurative. The word translated sealed is *sphragizoo*, which means to seal; figuratively to confirm or declare one to be what he claims to be, to receive him as such, or regard him as such. In John iii. 33 it occurs, "He that received the testimony of Christ hath set to his seal that God is true," or literally is sealed that God is true, or confirmed in his opinion that God is true. How? By the testimony of Christ, or by his words, John vi. 27, "God has sealed the Son." How? Confirmed or made certain that he is his Son, by his words, heard at his baptism. Romans ii. 28, Paul would seal to the Gentiles certain works. How? By confirming them in them. Then how are we sealed by the Spirit? We are confirmed or established as the children of God, by the words of the Spirit, as we have shown, the Spirit bears witness with our spirit, and not by direct impact.

We have thus examined every passage and shown that direct action is not even implied. It is all assumption on the part of my opponent. We have gone further, and shown that in all cases the work was done by the Spirit through the word.

We wish to lay down this law. When anything is said, in the scriptures, to be done by a person, and by certain instruments, we must understand that it was done by the person, using that instrument.

When I say the writing before my opponent was written by him, and was written with a pencil, you understand me to mean that it was done by him, with a pencil. So we understand man to be converted by the Spirit, through the word as the medium or instrument. So Paul says he begat the Corinthians through the gospel. It was done by the Spirit through Paul as agent, and the word as instrument.

Now I hope my opponent in his next speech will tell us carefully and clearly what this operation of the Spirit is. How we can distinguish it from all other operations of the Spirit, and from the imperfect operations of our own spirits, so that we may know what he is talking about.

We hope he will also tell us whether it is a moral influence through motive, or an influence for which man is responsible. If so, how can it be exerted in any other way than through reasons and motives, or through the truth? If not, is it a physical power, or what is it? If independent of motive and truth, how can man be responsible? We do hope the gentleman will define this all-important direct action he is contending for.

When he quotes a scripture, we hope he will show that we can expect such an influence—that it was exerted in conversion—and above all that it was a direct action or impact, and not assume it. Let us have a clear knowledge of what we are talking about, and talk about nothing else. This all-important influence necessary to the conversion and salvation of all men, should be understood by all men, and proved to their satisfaction, by one occupying my opponent's position. Let him now do it.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. HUGHEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The gentleman's speech reminds me very forcibly of an anecdote I once heard of a young lawyer who prepared his speech in a certain case before he heard the testimony. When he began to read his speech the court called him to order. He cleared up his throat, began again, but the court called him to order the second time. To this he replied: "May it please your honor, it is my speech, and I must speak it; I have got it written, and I must read it." So my opponent had his speech prepared before hand, and instead of replying to my arguments he had to "speak his speech" because he had it written, and therefore he had to read it. [Laughter.] And perhaps it was as good a way of filling up the hour as he could have chosen, occupying his position.

You remember at the outset I stated distinctly the question in debate. It was agreed upon in our correspondence, and again agreed upon last evening. I affirm that in conversion there is immediate, direct, spiritual influence, and he denies it. The question is not in regard to whether the apostles were inspired or whether we are inspired as in the days of the apostles, or how many ways God has of operating on the hearts of men. These matters are not in debate; but there is one single question, and I directed my argument to that point. In the work of conversion and regeneration, how does the Holy Spirit operate on the heart? Does he operate only mediately,

or does he operate immediately? To this point I directed my entire speech, after having stated distinctly and precisely what the question in debate was. My opponent, instead of addressing himself to the work of replying to my speech, went on to tell you at length what course I should have pursued in conducting the discussion on this proposition. He tells us that he is a teacher! Well, I have known some teachers who were very good at teaching others, and yet miserable practitioners of their own precepts; and my opponent belongs to this class. He can tell you how I ought to conduct the discussion, but how to conduct it himself he does not know! [Laughter] He should know that it is the business of the respondent to follow the affirmant in his argument, and show that either his premises are unsound or that his conclusions do not necessarily follow from his premises; and if he fails to do this, it is a confession of his inability to do it, and an acknowledgment that the argument of his affirmant is conclusive. When, in discussion, a proposition is clearly stated, and arguments are presented bearing directly on the question in debate, and an opponent spends nearly an hour in desultory talk before he reaches the question at issue, it shows that he feels that he can not meet it at all; and I apprehend that this was the trouble with my opponent. As I am the affirmant, I am the leader of the discussion on this proposition. But my friend, Mr. Braden, does not seem to understand this; for whether he is in the affirmative or negative he is determined to lead! [Laughter.]

I propose to make no reply to that part of the gentleman's speech in regard to the various ways in which the Spirit of God has operated in ages past, as it does not touch the question before us, being really extraneous matter thrown in by him to fill up the time. There is one single point at issue between us. and to this I intend to strictly confine myself whether Mr. Braden keeps to it or not. He can keep on "traveling around Robin Hood's barn" just as long as he pleases; I shall proceed with my argument.

Now, I want to state again the question that is in debate, and the only question: "In the work of conversion and regeneration, does the Holy Spirit operate directly and immediately, or does he operate only mediately through the word?" There is one point on which my friend and I are agreed, and that is, that ordinarily the word is the instrument through which the Spirit operates in awakening the conscience and enlightening the understanding, so as to bring the heart to the Lord Jesus. You noticed that the gentleman's speech was based upon the assumption that I denied that the Spirit ever operates through the word at all. Indeed one would be puzzled to know from the gentleman's speech what is the precise difference between us on the operation of the Holy Spirit. There were a great many things I approved of in the gentleman's speech, and there were a great many of which I did not approve, and these truths and the falsehoods (some of them not material to the point in debate) were thrown together in the most promiscuous and undigested manner, so that it will require some skill to separate them.

I brought forward a number of arguments, bearing directly on this one single point, showing that there must necessarily be direct and per-



sonal contact between the Spirit of God and the soul of the believer in the work of regeneration. However the Spirit of God may operate in the preaching of the gospel, yet there is a point where this mediate operation ceases, and is superseded by the direct and immediate operation. The mediate operation of the Spirit through the word is for the purpose of enlightening the understanding; but immediate is necessary to change the heart and renew the spiritual nature of man—to make him a "new creature in Christ Jesus." This is not a physical operation, it is a spiritual operation. It is the operation of the Spirit of God on the spirit of man, the operation by which the Spirit of God comes in direct contact with the spirit of man, and changes the spiritual nature of man.

If man is the same mentally, physically and spiritually after conversion that he was before, then conversion is no change at all. Conversion does not change a man physically nor intellectually, but it is a moral, a spiritual change. My opponent will certainly not contend that man is the same morally and spiritually after conversion that he was before! Now, I hope he can understand what is the nature of the change wrought by conversion.

According to the drift of the gentleman's speech, there never has been but one kind of spiritual influence exerted on the hearts of men, and that was the influence of inspiration on the hearts of the prophets and apostles. Here, he says, there was direct and personal contact of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man, and this was miraculous for the purpose of bestowing upon them the necessary qualifications to constitute them authoritative teachers. This, he tells us, is the only kind of direct personal influence ever exerted on the hearts of men. But here he assumed the very point at issue between us, and based his argument upon this assumption. I proved that in conversion or regeneration there must be direct and personal contact between the Spirit of God and the soul of man, because conversion is called an "anointing," and the Holy Spirit is the unction or anointing substance, and there can be no anointing without contact between the anointing substance and the person or thing anointed.

Again I showed that conversion is called a "sealing of the Spirit." The Spirit of God is the seal by which the heart of the believer is sealed. Now there can be no sealing without contact; the thing is impossible. Here I proved that Mr. Braden's position is false, for I proved that there is direct and immediate contact between the Spirit of God and the heart of man, not only in the inspiration of the prophets and apostles, but also in the conversion of every believer who is "sealed with the Spirit in the heart." The gentleman assumed that there can be no kind of direct spiritual influence on the heart only in the case of inspiration; but I proved that there is direct spiritual influence in every case of the conversion of a sinner to God. I do not hold that every converted man is inspired; but from the tone of the gentleman's speech you would have thought, had you not known better, that I hold and teach that every converted person is just as much inspired as were the prophets and apostles. The whole of his speech was directed against this position, and if there was any point to it this was it, and this alone. But I find myself in the same predicament I

did on a former occasion. There was such confusion and repetition in the gentleman's speech that the notes I took are of no manner of use to me in making a reply, and I shall have to throw them aside and rely wholly on my memory, for his speech was a very miscellaneous talk, very confusedly thrown together. [Laughter.]

My opponent tells us "the natural man" in 1 Cor. ii. 14, is not the unconverted man, but "the man without revelation I" He tells us "the princes of this world would not have crucified the Lord of glory if they had had the light of revelation!" What a pity those princes did not have the light of revelation, that they might not have committed so great a crime! But did not "the princes of this world, who crucified the Lord of glory," have the light of revelation in their hands and shining upon their hearts? It was the very princes of this world, the Jewish priests and rulers, who had the oracles of God in possession, which bore full testimony to Jesus Christ who crucified him. It was not the want of revelation, but it was the deep-seated depravity of their hearts that prompted them to reject and "crucify the Lord of glory." They were unregenerated men, and they did what "the natural man" always does when left to himself—they rejected the Sou of God. They were the children of the devil, and his works they did. They did not need intellectual illumination, but they needed spiritual illumination that they might understand the things of God. "The natural man," here means the unconverted man, and not the man without revelation, as Mr. Braden would have us understand. His position here is not merely untenable, but it is also absurd, and contradicts the facts of the history of the crucifixion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is therefore false.

The gentleman touched on 1 Corinthians xii. 7-13. He doubtless saw that any attempt to reply to my argument on this passage would only make his position appear the more ridiculous. Here it is manifest that the Spirit by which the believer is baptized is the Holy Ghost, and every one can see this at a single glance, and any attempt to explain away the force of this passage only shows the weakness of his cause.

Again: My opponent quoted Psalm xix.7: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul," to prove that there is no need of direct spiritual agency in conversion. But the Psalmist here only declares the all-sufficiency of the divine word to illumine the mind, the understanding, just as we hold. He does not teach that there is no need of spiritual agency in the renewing of the heart; for elsewhere. Psalm li. 10—12, he expressly teaches the necessity of this direct spiritual agency. The object of the direct spiritual agency of the Holy Spirit is not to illuminate the understanding in the doctrines and duties of Christianity; this the word of God does, and sufficiently does. But after the word had been fully revealed by Christ, he still declared that it was necessary for his disciples that the Holy Spirit should come and abide with them forever, to quicken, renew, sanctify and comfort them.

I will now proceed with my affirmative argument.

My sixth argument in support of my proposition is drawn from the fact that nothing short of such a creative and renewing spiritual

agency is adequate to the accomplishment of this great moral or spiritual change. Nothing but an Almighty energy in active operation is competent to the work of the reformation of man's spiritual nature in the image of God. For regeneration is a "new creation," and if man is fallen and morally depraved, and his moral nature opposed to God, it requires the same Almighty energy to create the soul anew that it did to bring it into existence. This is self-evident—it is established by the very nature of things.

That man is morally depraved, and therefore must have a moral re-creation to be restored to the divine image, is expressly declared in the word of God. Horn. viii. 7, 8:

"7. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

"8. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God."

Here it is expressly declared "the carnal (the unrenewed) mind is enmity against God"—not "at enmity," but it is the very principle of "enmity" itself, and that those who are under its dominion and power "can not please God." In Ephesians ii. 3 it is declared that we are "by nature the children of wrath." It is not necessary to stop here to show man can not change his nature; for we are assured that the sinner can not even change his own habits of sin or adopt a new course of life without divine aid. Jer. xiii. 23:

"23. Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil."

We have also seen in our remarks on 1 Corinthians ii. 14, that without spiritual illumination the sinner can not even understand the things of God. These things fully prove the absolute necessity of the direct and all-creating energy of the Spirit of God in the re-generation, the re-creation of the soul.

My seventh argument in support of my proposition is drawn from the fact that the evidences of our conversion or regeneration are all internal and spiritual, produced by the indwelling Spirit of God, showing that the work of regeneration is itself an internal and spiritual work, accomplished by that Spirit God, who also witnesses to the work accomplished. See Romans viii. 14—16

"14. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

"15. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

"16. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

Rom. viii. 9:

"9. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

Gal. iv. 6:

"6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

1 John iii. 7, 8:

"7. Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God.

"8. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love."

2 Cor. i. 21, 22:

"21. Now he which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God;

"22. Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

1 John iii. 19-21:

"19. And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him.

"20. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.

"21. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God."

Eph. i. 13, 14:

"13. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise,

"14. Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."

1 John v. 10:

"10. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself."

These passages are not a title of the testimony that might be brought forward, proving that it is by the testimony of the Spirit in our hearts, an the fruits which he produces in us, that we know that we are the sons and daughters of the Most High; but these are abundantly sufficient.

My eighth argument in support of my proposition is drawn from the fact that if the Holy Spirit does not operate immediately or directly on the heart in the work of regeneration, then none can be regenerated or born again who are not able to hear and understand the word of God. Consequently, infants, idiots and pious or conscientious heathens must all be lost, for "no man can enter into the kingdom of God except he be born again." He must have spiritual regeneration. But, says Mr. Braden, "the Spirit operates only through words and arguments addressed to the understanding," and if these words and arguments can not reach the understanding, how can any person be saved according to his doctrine? If the Spirit operates only through the word, and the word can not be read or preached to the individual, he must be lost! Who can believe that this is true? But if it is not so, the doctrine of my friend is proved to be false both by the teachings of reason and the word of God.

My ninth argument is that if the Spirit of God does not operate immediately or directly on the heart, then God is placed at great disadvantage in saving men, for Satan, the great adversary, can operate directly on the heart, while the Almighty can only operate mediately or through his written word. The doctrine of my opponent involves this absurdity, or it denies that there is any such thing as Satanic influence exerted on the hearts of men at all! But we know that there

is satanic influence exerted upon the hearts of men to tempt them and lead them astray; and if the Spirit of God can not operate on the heart, only through the written word, then Satan has the advantage and God is at great disadvantage in this great warfare! That God can only influence men by words and arguments, is Mr. Campbell's position on the subject, as I have shown; and Mr. Braden occupies his ground precisely. Now, will he tell us that there is no operation of the Spirit except by words and arguments addressed to the understanding? If so, there is no such thing as satanic influence exerted on the heart of man, and thus my friend goes completely over to Universalism!

These necessary and logical conclusions from the premises of my opponent, show clearly that his whole system rests upon a fallacy that can not bear the light of investigation a moment. Man is by nature morally corrupt and depraved, and he must be regenerated—begotten or born of God by the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit on the heart. The "new creation," the "new birth," must be accomplished by the direct agency of the Spirit of God.

In conclusion, I remark that the word of God is the instrument through which the mind is enlightened, the judgment convinced, and the understanding brought to see the real state or condition of the heart; and when the heart is brought to put its trust in Christ alone for salvation, the Holy Spirit, as the efficient agent, regenerates and renews the soul, seals the heart, gives the earnest of the inheritance in the heart, and witnesses the adoption of the soul unto the divine family, and this he does by direct, personal influence on the heart.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Permit me to call your attention to the difference in the courses pursued by my opponent and myself. I have told you clearly what influences I believe in, and defined and described them to you. My opponent says he believes all these, but there is another influence, an influence essential to the conversion, and of course salvation of all men; yet he has utterly failed to define or describe this all-important influence. He has not told us wherein it differs from what he agrees with me in accepting, nor how we can distinguish it from all others; nor above all, how we can distinguish between this all-important influence and the imperfect, sinful operations of our own imperfect, sinful hearts. He has not told us whether it be a moral or physical influence, nor how it can be independent of truth, and be a moral influence. All is mystery and myth. I believe we shall almost have to leave that butchery of God's word, in John iii., to describe it: "But canst not tell whence it cometh, and whether it goeth," when you have it, when you got it, whether you have it now, nor how you got it.

The gentleman can not see the pertinence of much that I said. He will before we get through. I stopped short of an application designedly. I wanted to see if he would walk into the trap. He did. Just as, on the second proposition, he indorsed my analysis of the fall,

without seeing how fatal its application would be to his position, so now he indorses my position concerning the manifestations of the Spirit, without seeing its effect on his position. He admits all extraordinary, miraculous operation has ceased. He admits this *was* direct, but claims that it was not the only direct action. We have shown that it was the only direct action, both from God's word and because the effects of the ordinary operation require, and indeed will permit, no direct action. Man is responsible for them. The effects are moral, or man is accountable. That can be done only by rational means, appeals to reason and conscience, or motives, and can be done only through the truth.

Again, as the gentleman has admitted that all miraculous and extraordinary action has ceased, we have now only two things to do:

1. To show in all cases where he does find direct action, that it is miraculous and has ceased.

2. That all action that remains is said by the word of God to be done through the word of truth, and never by the direct action of the Spirit.

We expect to take most of the gentleman's proof texts out of his hand by the first method, and all the rest by the last. The gentleman will see the point before we are done.

I come now to the arguments be repeated and introduced in his last speech. He says ordinarily the operation is through the word. Then that is all we have now, for, as we have shown, all extraordinary action has ceased. He then repeats the passages he rehearsed before, and begged the question again in assuming that the operation in each case was the direct operation, without a word of proof or argument in most cases. He refers again to the fact that we are said to be begotten of the Spirit. Very true; but how? By direct action? All mere assumption. But we showed that we are begotten by the Spirit through the medium of the truth, and not by direct impact. Jesus declared, in John iii., as we showed, that we are begotten by the words of the Spirit. Nicodemus demanded an explanation, and he gave it. The Spirit breathes in inspiration where he pleases, and you hear his voice, his inspired words, and by them are you begotten of the Spirit. Such is the meaning of his explanation. 1 John v. 1 we are said to be begotten of God by believing the great truth that Jesus is the Son of God. 1 Peter i. 21 we are said to be begotten by the Spirit through the word. 1 James i. 18 we are begotten by the word of truth. 1 Corinthians iv. 15 Paul begot them through the gospel. John i. 12 we receive power to become sons of God by believing on the name of Christ.

Paul says that preaching is to save the world, 1st Cor. i. 21. Also that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, Rom. i. 16. Also that we are saved by the gospel, 1 Cor. xv. 2. Hence our being begotten is said to be done by the Spirit as a person, and the word as the instrumentality or means employed. The gentleman's position is vicious in taking into account only the person, and utterly ignoring the means through which he works.

The gentleman refers to the quickening influences of the Spirit. We are quickened by the Spirit, but how? By direct impact? Let

David tell us how it is done, Psalm cxix. 50, also 93: "Thou hast quickened me by thy word." So also 25th, 107th and 149th verses of the same Psalm. Then the Spirit quickens us by his words.

Men are said to be dead and must be made alive. How? By direct impact of the Spirit? No, Christ tells us how, John vi. 63: "The words which I speak unto you are spirit and life." The words of Christ and the Spirit supply us with spiritual life, or we receive spiritual life through their words.

Man needs illumination, says my opponent. Truly, but how? By the direct impact of the Spirit? David tells us how, Psalm cxix. 130: "The entrance of thy words giveth light."

He brings up again the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit, Titus iii. 5, and resorts to his nonsensical symbolizing to destroy all sense. The washing of regeneration means the cleansing influences of the Spirit, and the renewal is the same thing. Why did the Holy Spirit utter such nonsense as to repeat them then? But one is a type and the other the thing typified. Then they are not the same, and even if they were, how does the Spirit cleanse and renew, or make one new? He cleanses by the word, Psalm cxix., in several places. He renews or begets by the word, as we have shown by a large number of quotations. John iii. explains this passage in Titus. The washing of regeneration means baptism, as all the early fathers, and all commentators and common-sense agree, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit is being born again, or begotten of the Spirit through the word.

The gentleman reminds me that he is not contending for inspiration, but for direct impact. Yes, but if all direct action were only in inspiration, and all your passages where you find direct action were instances of inspiration, you will have to contend for inspiration to sustain direct action. He asserts that nothing but Almighty power can regenerate or recreate man. True; but the re-creation is moral, and not physical, and moral means, or the truth alone, must be used. Moral regeneration does not necessitate direct action. Indeed, it utterly precludes it. He can be renewed, recreated, regenerated, made a new man, put on the new man, only by moral means, and through the truth, as we have shown in several ways.<sup>1</sup> Colossians ii. 10 we read that the new man is renewed in knowledge of the truth.

The gentleman attempts to avoid the issue I have made, that the Spirit operates through the word, by asserting that the Spirit and word are two agencies. Suppose we grant it, are they ever separated? Has he found an instance yet? Does not the Spirit always operate through the word? In every instance he has found of the Spirit's work, that was not clearly miraculous, such was undeniably the case. The Spirit is the person, and the word is the instrument he uses in all cases. The Spirit is in the word, and never now separate from the word in direct action, as the gentleman claims.

Man can not change his heart, he says. He can not because he can not discover or obtain the truth that the Holy Spirit reveals, and which he uses in this change. But he has a part in this work, as is clearly shown by God's language to Israel, Ezekiel xviii. 31: "Make

you a new heart and a new spirit, O house of Israel." Man, then, has a part of the work of changing his heart.

His next proof is taken from 1 John ii. 26, 27. John says, commencing with the twentieth verse:

"Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. I have not written because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it. Let that remain in you which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, ye shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye have need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth."

The unction they received from the Holy Spirit was the things they had heard. The anointing was the truth. So says John. It was not direct impact, but the truth as clearly as language can make it.

The sealing of the Spirit is again referred to, and we will review it. *Sphragizoo* is here used figuratively, for it does not mean that the Spirit is applied to our spirits like wax to a letter. Certainly the gentleman does not have any such gross, material idea as that. It means, as in John iii. 33; vi. 27, and Romans xv. 28, to confirm, or to make all believe that such is the case. Christ was confirmed to Israel, by God, as his Son, by his words: "This is my beloved Son, hear him." So the Holy Spirit confirms, or makes it certain, that we are the children of God, as John says by his words. It is not by direct impact. We know we are his children because we keep his commandments, and are approved by the words of the Spirit.

We have a rehash of the witness of the Spirit. As this is the only refuge left my opponent we examine it at length. The controversy is as to how the Spirit bears witness. He says by direct impact. I say, as common-sense says, he bears witness, testifies, or gives testimony, in his words. Hebrews x. 15: The Holy Ghost is a witness to us. How? By his words. "For after that he had said," etc. Act\* xx. 23. "The Holy Spirit witnessed in every church of what awaited Paul." How? By Agabus, xxi. 11, and other prophets in his words. John v. 36, Jesus says his works which he did, as he tells us, through the Spirit, bear witness of him. The Spirit has never borne witness except through his word and his works. He has borne witness repeatedly, and the gentleman can find no instance where he bore witness by direct impact. He could not do so. How can he testify except by words and works?

How does he testify by his words? The scriptures are his words. They testify what are the fruits of the Spirit, Galatians v. 22. John tells us that when we examine our hearts and find we have these fruits, or keep his commandments, then we know we are his children. The words of the Spirit assure our spirits, or give us witness, or bear witness with our spirits that we are children of God, 1 John iii. 19. In this common-sense, rational way does the Spirit bear witness, and not by direct contact or impact, an influence we could not know or distinguish from the imperfect, sinful decisions of our own imperfect, sinful hearts.

We come next to the natural man and the spiritual man mentioned



in 1 Corinthians ii. There is no passage of Scripture that has been more distorted and perverted. It has been generally applied to the unconverted and converted man, and interpreted that an unconverted man can not understand the word of God. He can not till he is converted by the direct operation of the Spirit. Now we respectfully submit to all that this makes a mockery of preaching, for why preach to a man what he can not understand? Paul says also the gospel, or preaching, is the power of God. And yet man can not understand it. By preaching God has ordained to save the world. Preaching what man can not understand! All gross nonsense.

But he can understand by this direct operation of the Spirit. Well, why do not all then understand? Because the Spirit does not make all understand. Why does he not? My Methodist or Arminian friends can not tell me. A Calvinist can. This doctrine of human depravity and inability is necessarily Calvinistic. In consequence of depravity man can not understand the word of God which is preached to save him. How is he to be saved then? By the Spirit's making him able to understand, by direct impact, removing this inability, by removing its cause, the depravity; for man is so corrupt he can not originate a good impulse or volition. But why does not the Spirit remove it, says one? My Arminian friend can not tell. The Calvinist says God has elected some to eternal life. Others he passes by.

But, says the other, one man resists the Spirit. The other submits. Indeed, he submits or wills in favor of good. Away goes your total depravity and inability. This interpretation gives rise to bigotry, religious pride, and Phariseism. The orthodox has been illuminated by this special, direct impact. He is spiritually wise. He is favored of God. The others are totally depraved, can not understand anything. This spirit has been cropping out in all this debate, in the sneers at the benighted Campbellites, and the gentleman's assumptions of knowledge of the scriptures, and the gross liberties he has taken and the perversions he has made. He can spiritually discern these things.

By going back to the twenty-first verse of the first chapter of first Corinthians, we will see that Paul says the world, by its systems of philosophy, when there was no revelation, knew not God; and that God has ordained, by the simplicity of preaching, or revelation, to save the world. Then natural man is the man in a state of nature, or without revelation. The spiritual man is the man to whom God has made a revelation by his Spirit, or man with revelation. This agrees with the context and common-sense.

Now we will remind our opponent that he has not defined this special spiritual influence, and that he has utterly failed to find an instance where this special influence is even implied, much less directly taught. We have taken every passage, and shown that the work he speaks of is declared, by the Spirit, to be done by and through the word. Will the gentleman tell us what he is talking about, and find one passage where the doctrine is taught?

We will now proceed to show all, that all the work the gentleman has spoken of is accomplished through the word. We need only refer

to passages we have already quoted in rebutting his arguments. The work of the Spirit in conversion and regeneration is spoken of. The Spirit converts and regenerates, we both believe. But how? The gentleman says by direct impact. I say through the word. David declares, Psalm xix. 7, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Does my opponent believe the Bible? It declares that God's law, or word, converts the soul, and that it is perfect and needs no other power except the Spirit as it operates through it. It is the perfect medium of the Spirit.

The Psalmist declares also he is quickened, made alive, illuminated, purified, cleansed, by the word. Christ declares the word is spirit and life. Paul declares that it is the power of God unto salvation—that men are saved by the gospel—that the world is saved by preaching the word. Christ, Paul, John, James, and Peter, all repeatedly declare that we are born, begotten, and made sons of God, and put on the new man by and through the word, the gospel, and a knowledge of the truth. We have already quoted these several times. We need not repeat them. We affirm, then, that all the power the Spirit exercises in the conversion of men, is the moral power resident in the truth, is coextensive with the truth, and does not exist beyond or separate from it. So teaches the word of God as clearly as it teaches that men need conversion.

We find this all through the word of God, and the word declares that it is perfect in this work. Paul declares that the scriptures make us wise unto salvation; that they are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness, and by them we are made perfect to every good work. The Spirit does all this by his word, by the truth in it. He uses moral means adapted to us as moral, rational creatures. We accept these because taught in God's word. We reject all other mythical, mysterious influence, because untaught, as the failure of the gentleman to find it clearly shows. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." We are begotten by the word of God, which lives and abides forever.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. HUGHEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—It is perfectly apparent from the gentleman's speech—and I trust you all see it—that with him there is no such thing as any personal agency of the Spirit in conversion whatever. He talks about the Spirit being the agent and the word the instrument in conversion and regeneration; but the only sense in which the Spirit is the agent in the work of conversion with him is, the Spirit inspired the men who wrote the Holy Scriptures. The word is the instrument, in that it enlightens the understanding, and then the sinner thus enlightened "creates himself anew in Christ Jesus." This is the position of my opponent. The work of regeneration with him is man's own work, without any spiritual agency whatever except that which is found in the word of God in its operations on the understanding. I showed you that this was the position of Mr. Campbell, and my opponent has here taken the same position, which necessarily excludes any personal oper-

ation or influence of the Holy Spirit from the economy of the gospel, and leaves no place for the Holy Spirit in the work of redemption except in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. But this is in direct opposition to the teachings of Christ. He said to his disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." The Savior also tells us that this Divine Comforter shall dwell in the believer, and abide with the church forever. This Comforter had not yet come to dwell in the believer, and Jesus tells them he would not until he should go away, and then he would send him. At the time this promise was made the whole gospel had been made known by Christ to his disciples, and yet another Comforter, the Holy Ghost, is promised to come and abide with the church of Christ forever, whom he would send when he was departed from them. Here is the promise of a personal Comforter, who is to dwell in the heart of each believer, and is to remain with the church forever. This language can not apply to the word; so we see that under the gospel there is a personal Spirit who operates on the hearts of men as a reprover of sinners and a Comforter of saints. But my opponent denies any such personal agency or influence! I intend to hold him right here. When he talks about the Spirit operating through the word, you must not forget that by it he simply means "the Spirit inspired the word," and nothing more.

I will now proceed to review the gentleman's speech. With all his efforts not a single position that I took in my argument has he been able to take from me or answer. He wants to know what is the direct operation of the Spirit. I have explained this time and again. It is not the Spirit as he operates through the word enlightening the understanding. That is mediate operation. But it is the Spirit of God moving upon the soul and creating it anew by divine power. When we speak of the Spirit operating immediately, we speak of it coming in direct contact with the heart. This is what I mean by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion and regeneration, and with this immediate operation there is no regeneration—no spiritual conversion. The gentleman tells us that the believer is born of the Spirit, that is, he is begotten of God "through the word of truth," and there is no direct spiritual agency or influence in the work at all. To prove this he quotes Paul's language in 1 Corinthians iv. 15:

"15. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel."

Now, I ask the gentleman if Paul was the spiritual father of the Corinthian Christians in the same sense that God is the father of Christians? According to his position he was, for Paul begot them "through the gospel," and God begets them in the same way! Paul was the father of the Corinthian Christians in a subordinate sense, for he was the means, through the gospel, of bringing them to Christ, but God was their father in the primary sense, for he had regenerated them by the power of his Holy Spirit, thus imparting to them the Divine nature. In this subordinate sense the believer is "begotten

through the word of truth." The word is the instrument through which he is brought to the foot of the cross, and then the Spirit of God creates him anew in Christ Jesus. Paul was instrumental in bringing the Corinthian Christians to Christ, and in this subordinate sense he had "begotten them through the gospel;" so the word of God is the instrument through which men are ordinarily brought to Christ, and in this subordinate sense the Christian is "begotten through the word of truth." This sufficiently illustrates the position I started out with, that the word of God is the instrument through which the mind is enlightened and the judgment convinced, while the Holy Spirit is the agent by whom the heart is renewed and the believer is made a new creature by spiritual regeneration. The Spirit operates mediately through the word in enlightening the understanding; but he operates immediately in the regeneration and renewal of the heart. The word is the instrument ordinarily used to bring the sinner to that point where the immediate operation of the Spirit in regeneration takes place; and hence it may be said in this subordinate sense that the Christian is "begotten through the word of truth." This makes the New Testament harmonious with itself, and places the word and Spirit in the proper relation to each other in the economy of the gospel. But yet my opponent will have it that these operations are exactly the same. What the word does the Spirit does, and what the Spirit does the word does, and the operation is precisely the same in both cases! The word enlightens the mind, but it leaves the moral nature of man unmoved without the Spirit's influence to send it into the heart and rouse the conscience.

But Mr. Braden tells us man is to make himself a new heart, and he quotes Ezekiel xviii. 31, "and make you a new heart and a new spirit," to prove that man does actually make himself a new heart in the work of conversion, or, in other words, that man "creates himself anew in Christ Jesus!" How were these persons to make their new hearts? Surely this passage does not teach that man has the power to change his moral nature like the chameleon its color! God makes the heart and spirit new. See Ezekiel xxxvi. 26, 27. The house of Israel are here represented as making them a new heart, because they are called upon to do that upon the condition of which God would pardon their sins and make their hearts new. In this sense where can any man make his heart new, that is, to submit to the conditions upon which God pardons sin and renews the soul, as the scriptures every where teach.

But again he tells us we are "quickened by the word." Does David say that sinners, or does he say that righteous men are quickened by the word? He is not here speaking of sinners being quickened by the word; he is speaking of the quickening power of the word of God on the heart of righteous man. The sinner is quickened into spiritual life by the Spirit of God convincing him of sin, and renewing the heart—the personal Spirit who was promised for this especial purpose.

My opponent tells us the "gospel is the power of God." But what constitutes it the power of God? Is it not the power of the Holy

Spirit which accompanies it? I am not contending for a spiritual agency or influence separate from the gospel, but one which is a part of the gospel itself, and which makes the gospel "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

In vindication of his translation of John iii. 8, the gentleman tells us that "in every other instance in the New Testament the word *pneuma* is translated spirit, and this is not its ordinary meaning in the New Testament." In reply to this, I remark in the first place that wind is the original meaning of *pneuma*, as may be seen by consulting the lexicon. Secondly, his translation gives us no illustration of the spiritual birth. Nicodemus could not understand the nature of a Spirit birth. Christ had used an illustration, "born of water;" now he uses another: "The wind bloweth where it listeth," etc. Suppose we translate this: "The Spirit breathes where he willeth." There is no illustration in the passage at all. The connection here shows that the original meaning of *pneuma* must be adhered to in this passage.

The gentleman tells us the Holy Ghost bears witness through the word, and that his testimony is to be found in the word which he inspired. But we must not confound the witness of the Spirit, in the heart of the believer, with the external testimony which he bears to the facts of the gospel in revelation. My opponent tries to confound these two methods of the Spirits witnessing together. While the Holy Spirit, in the word, bears witness to the truth, he does in the heart of the believer bear witness to the fact of the believer's adoption into the family of God. The Holy Spirit is given to the believer to abide with him and to dwell in him, and it is the Spirit thus given that bears witness with our spirit that we are sons of God; not the Spirit that speaks in revelation. Paul says: "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself (the Spirit that we have received—the Spirit of adoption) beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." Here the testimony is direct and is conjoined with our spirit, showing that it is the personal testimony of the Spirit of adoption—the Holy Ghost—to our conscience that we are born of God. This is the representation every where given in the scriptures of the testimony of the Holy Spirit to our adoption into the divine family.

Paul tells us "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost is shed on us richly through Christ Jesus." The gentleman tells us "the washing of regeneration," is one thing, and "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" is another thing. Well, which of these is shed on us? Will the gentleman tell us? If "the renewing of the Holy Ghost is shed on us," then there is direct contact between the Holy Ghost and the heart in regeneration, for the Holy Ghost can not be shed on us without direct contact! If it is "the washing of regeneration" that is "shed on us," then, as "the Washing of regeneration" here must mean baptism, as the gentleman holds, his whole system of immersion falls to the ground, for baptism is "shed on us!" Let him take either horn of the dilemma, and this passage will gore him to death. For if it is the renewing of the Holy Ghost which is "shed on us," then there is direct operation of the Holy

Spirit in conversion; and if it is "the washing of regeneration" that is "shed on us," then the scriptural mode of baptism is by pouring! Here the argument is wholly conclusive. Let the gentleman answer i. if he can!

But he tells us believers are anointed with the word! John says, 1 John ii. 27:

"27. But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and you need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie. and even as it hath taught you ye shall abide in him."

Now I ask you what did Jesus promise his disciples that they should receive, and which should abide with them forever? It was the Holy Ghost, and it is he who anoints us with the holy unction of the Spirit, which abides in the believer forever. The Holy Spirit is the anointing element, and there can be no anointing without direct contact between the anointing element and the object anointed. Here again the argument is conclusive.

But the gentleman tells us it is not necessary that there should be direct contact in the sealing process; he said a seal sometimes means a pledge. But I showed you that in sealing there must of necessity be contact between the seal and the thing sealed. But suppose the seal here means a pledge, what is that pledged? Is it not the Holy Spirit which is given to the believer? The seal I showed you was "the earnest of the Spirit in the heart." So the gentleman's explanation, instead of helping him out of the difficulty, only gets him deeper into it; for if the seal here means a pledge given, that pledge is the Holy Spirit given to the believer.

I stated that nothing but Almighty power could create man anew in Christ Jesus, from the fact that man is morally depraved. The word of God expressly declares that "the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God." Rom. viii. 7, 8.

Here we have clearly set forth the fact not only that man is depraved, but that he can not please God; that he stands so diametrically opposed to God that nothing but a change of his spiritual nature can bring him into harmony with God, or effect a reconciliation between him and God.

And again in Ephesians ii. 1—3:

"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;

"2. Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:

"3. Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath even as others."

Here we have the fact of man's alienation from God set forth in the strongest manner. He is "dead in trespasses and sins;" he is living under the dominion of Satan: he is "by nature a child of wrath." Can such a one be changed "into the image of God," ex-

cept by Almighty power? It is self-evident that nothing but the Spirit of God, exerting a divine energy upon the soul, is competent to regenerate such a lost sinner, and make him a new creature in Christ Jesus.

But the gentleman tells us, that whatever is ascribed to the Spirit is also ascribed to the word; and consequently we must understand that the word and Spirit are both one in their influence and operation. But this is not true. Some things are ascribed to the Spirit, that are not to the word, and some things are ascribed to the word that are not to the Spirit. But if it were true this would not help him in his argument, for the scriptures everywhere recognize two agencies operating upon the hearts of men—the word and the Spirit of God. The word is the instrument through which the Spirit operates in enlightening the mind; and, therefore, that which is effected only by the direct agency of the Spirit, may often be ascribed to the word in a subordinate sense, as it is used to enlighten the understanding; while the Spirit quickens, regenerates, and sanctifies the heart. These two agencies are not one. They do not perform the same office. It is true the Spirit operates through the word; but he also comes himself and exerts a direct, quickening, and renewing power on the heart, and renews and sanctifies the soul. Not only can not the sinner change his nature, but he can not change his life without divine aid. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil."

The scriptures declare that without spiritual illumination the sinner can not understand the things of God. The whole history of the world is an illustration of this fact. Paul thus expresses it:

"For what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

"Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

"Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

" But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned."

The gentleman told us of a "spiritual discerning-stone," and thinks I have one through which I look. Well, it seems that Paul had a "spiritual discerning-stone," too, for he expressly declares that without spiritual illumination we can not understand the things of God.

I wish to make a few remarks again in regard to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Braden now tells us that when Paul says: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," he means that it is by the direction of one Spirit that we are baptized! If this be so, then, as the apostle immediately adds, "and have been made to drink into one Spirit," we are made to drink by the direction of this "one Spirit!" But what are we to drink by the direction of this "one

Spirit?" This shows the absolute folly of his interpretation, or rather perversion of this passage. "Go with me unto the banks of the Jordan, where John was immersing," said my friend; but I reply, not where John was immersing, but where he was baptizing the people by sprinkling them with water by means of a bunch of hyssop, notwithstanding the sport the gentleman attempted to make of this idea; for this was the usual method of performing the various baptisms under the law by Jewish priests, and John would most certainly adopt this usual—this universal method of purifying. But I am not going to argue the question of the mode of baptism, for I am perfectly satisfied with my argument on that proposition. John said to the multitudes who flocked to his baptism: "I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." The same persons who received the baptism of water are here promised the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Christ said to his disciples: "For John did truly baptize with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." In these passages the baptism of the Holy Ghost is promised to believers in general, to all those who receive the baptism of water.

But my opponent told us that the scriptures give us but two examples of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and these were where the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost were bestowed, and these miraculous gifts always accompanied the baptism of the Holy Ghost. I do not wish to misrepresent him, but this is what I understood him to say. But I prove this position to be false, first, by showing, that the promise of the baptism of the Spirit was given to all who received John's baptism—to all who should believe in Christ. I prove it false, second, by showing that, while the Spirit gives different gifts to different individuals, yet "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Mr. Braden will not contend that all the apostolic Christians possessed miraculous gifts, and yet Paul expressly affirms that they were all baptized by the Holy Spirit, and that it was by this spiritual baptism that they were put into the body of Christ, and made to "drink into one Spirit." If the gentleman should contend that all the apostolic Christians were possessed of miraculous gifts, he would flatly contradict the scriptures, which plainly declare that these miraculous gifts were confined to a few, while all were made partakers of the Holy Spirit in his baptizing power and influence. Here I prove the position of my opponent to be radically wrong; and at the same time I prove the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit on the heart.

My friend was opposed very much to my reading those extended paragraphs from Mr. Campbell. I know that in his church there is a diversity of opinions; "every one hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation," and it was necessary after giving you his position to give you also the position that some of his leading brethren have taken. He says he is not responsible for what Mr. Campbell teaches; but are not the doctrines Mr. Campbell taught, the doctrines generally received by his church? In a discussion which is to go before the public in a permanent form, I wished to expose the false teaching not of Mr. Braden simply, but more especially those of



the father of this self-styled reformation. But after all his objections to reading from Mr. Campbell, he has taken precisely the position which Mr. Campbell took; denying the possibility of spiritual influence except by words and arguments addressed to the understanding, gave in the case of inspiration.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The gentleman began his last speech by asserting that I denied, or virtually asserted that there is no personal Spirit. I can not, without using language that would be indecorous, speak of such an assertion as I should. When you remember that in my last speech, and in almost the last sentence in it, I asserted that there was a personal Spirit in the word, and operating by and through the word, you can yourselves apply the proper term to such language. I now assert that he or his spirit can exercise no influence on the spirit of any one in this audience, except through words or their equivalent. Do I deny the existence of his spirit? In like manner, when I assert that the spirit of God does not exert any influence except through the word, do I deny the existence of a Holy Spirit?

The gentleman says he has told what this direct action is. He has by the use of those words, but in no other way. Has he told you how we are to distinguish it from the operation through the word, concerning which we agree? Has he told you how we can distinguish it from the imperfect operations of our own erring, imperfect hearts? Has he told you whether it is a moral or physical operation? Has he explained how the Spirit can operate by direct impact, except as he did in inspiration, which he admits has ceased? He has not told us one of these things. A perfect definition of anything will include all that belongs to it, and exclude everything else. The gentleman has attempted neither. He has used the word direct and immediate, and has attempted nothing beyond that.

He says Paul did not say he was a father of the Corinthians, for that would be assuming to be a creator, for such is the force of the term beget, in conversion. We turn to 1 Corinthians iv. 14:

" 14. I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn you.

"15. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet ye have not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel."

They were his sons and he had begotten them. That settles that matter. Paul begot them through the gospel, just as the spirit does also.

The word and Spirit are several times said to do the same thing. The gentleman wants to have it appear that in each case they are independent of each other. Now when [ say in one assertion a man was killed with a knife, and in another by an assassin, do I mean that they were independent of each other? No, I mean the man was killed by the assassin with the knife. So we are begotten, converted, renewed,

regenerated, sealed, and cleansed by the Spirit, the personal agent, through the word, the instrument.

He wants to know how the Israelites were to make a new heart. By hearing, believing, and obeying the word of God addressed to them by the prophet. David tells us how, Psalm li. 6':

"Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom. Make me to hear joy and gladness. Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." It was to be done by the truth, by wisdom, by fearing the truth with gladness. He read that the Spirit quickens us. I showed, by several quotations, that he did it by the word, and never by direct impact. To avoid this he asserts that the saint can be quickened or made alive by the word, but the sinner can not. Now, why not? It seems to me that the saint was quickened when a sinner, and made alive or made a saint.

To avoid the force of the translation we made of John iii. 8, rendering *pneuma* spirit, he asserts *pneuma* ordinarily means wind. Does he intend to assert it does in the New Testament? I find by examination it is used in the New Testament eighty-eight times. Eighty-seven times it is rendered spirit. Once in the passage in question it is rendered wind. In this chapter it is everywhere else translated spirit. Why not here? In this very verse it is rendered also spirit. Why not at the commencement, or to be consistent, why not read "so is every one born of wind?" Does the wind choose or please to blow? No; but the Spirit does breathe or inspire when he pleases.

We have a rehash of the witness of the Spirit. Indeed this is all the passage he really has to rely on. I have shown that in several other cases the Spirit is said to bear witness or to testify, and in every instance by words. Indeed how can he bear testimony that we are children of God in any other way? I have shown that John said that we are the children of God when we keep his commandments, that we know, or our spirits bear witness with the Spirit, when they declare we have kept God's commandments, given by his Spirit, or our spirits bear witness with the words of God's Spirit, that we are his children. How can it be done otherwise? The word of God always represents the Spirit as testifying by his words, and not by direct impact, and there we leave it.

We have a symbolizing of Titus iii. 5. I should think by this time the gentleman would himself weary of that interminable twaddle about type and antitype, symbol and thing symbolized. The washing of regeneration is symbolical of the purifying influences of the Spirit. Well, what is this washing that is symbolical of the influence of the Spirit? It is not the influence of the Spirit itself, for a thing can not be a symbol of itself. Then the washing of regeneration and influence of the Spirit, of which the washing was a symbol, are clearly different things. Has not the gentleman common-sense enough to see that? Now in the name of all that is reasonable, in the name of common-sense and a decent respect for the good sense of all present, I protest against butchering, jumbling, and making utter nonsense of God's word any more by this stale, oft-exploded twaddle about the symbol and the thing symbolized.

By turning to John iii. we find an explanation of Titus iii. 5, which we verify by comparison with Mark xvi. 16. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved. From numerous scriptures we learn that belief is the birth of the Spirit. Then the other, or baptism, is the birth of water, the washing of regeneration. Then the washing of regeneration is baptism, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit is belief, or we are renewed through the word. But suppose we admit that the renewal and washing are the same: How are we renewed by the Spirit? A3 David tells us we are renewed by the truth, by hearing the word with gladness. Ps. li. As Paul tells we are renewed or put on the new man by knowledge or by the truth. Col. ii. 10. How are we cleansed or washed or made clean by the Spirit? By direct impact? David tells us, Ps. cxix., by the word. So he says in several places.

Next we have a repetition of the talk about anointing. Does he really mean that the Spirit is a substance which anoints our spirits like oil or some such substance? Certainly he can not. How does the Holy One give us this unction, this anointing? John says in the passage which he reads, 1 John ii. 27: "The anointing teacheth you all things, and is the truth." Then the Holy Spirit gives this unction through the truth. So says the passage he quotes as clear as human language can make it.

He refers again to the sealing by the Spirit. That must be by direct contact. Does the Spirit fasten himself on our spirits, as we fasten wax on a letter when we seal it, and stay there as a lump of wax or a plaster of wax? Nonsense say all. Yet the gentleman would so grossly materialize the figure to carry his point. The Spirit is said to seal us. Eph. i. 14; iv. 30. The believer is said to set to his seal or seal himself. John iii. 33. The Father is said to seal his Son. John vi. 27. Paul declared he would seal the Gentiles. Rom. xv. 28. Now what does it mean. It means to confirm, to regard as certain, to make certain. The believer regards as certain or confirms himself in the conviction God is true. How? By reading his word and believing it. The Father confirmed or made certain that Jesus was his Son. How? By his words at his baptism. Paul sealed the Gentiles to a certain work, or confirmed them in it. How? By his exhortations, by his words. The Spirit seals us or confirms us in our faith or convictions. How? By the words of truth, for faith comes by hearing the word of God. The gentleman's argument on the sealing, anointing, and bearing witness, is all assumption. He asserts the sealing, anointing, and witness must be by direct impact, without a syllable of scripture or particle of argument. We have shown by the word that they are through the word of truth.

He attempts to set aside our explanation of the natural and spiritual man by asserting that it is not correct. Paul says in the twenty-first verse of the first chapter of first Corinthians that man by his systems of philosophy knew not God, but God had ordained to give him this knowledge, or save him through preaching the gospel. In the second chapter, ninth verse, he declares man can not know the divine things necessary to salvation, but God has revealed them by his Spirit, or we have them through the word of God. He de-

clares that he received this knowledge by the revelation of the Spirit. Finally, he says that natural man can not discern the things of God, but he that is spiritual is able to judge all things. Now it is as plain as can be that all through Paul compares man without revelation or in a state of nature, as the natural man, with man that has revelation, or the words of the Spirit, or the spiritual man. So teaches common-sense and the context,

It was necessary for Jesus to go away before the Comforter should come. Well, what of it? Does that prove that his operation on those whom the disciples should convert must be by direct impact? The thought is not even suggested. . He had been in the world in his ordinary work on saint and sinner from the first word he revealed. But in the work he was to do for the disciples he had not been given yet. He was to recall all Jesus had said, to guide them into all truth, and to reveal to them things to come, or to do a miraculous work for them. This promise of the Comforter was concerning miraculous power, it was the same as the baptism by the rivers of living water, the gift which was to tell them what to say, the power from on high. All of Jesus' promises of the Holy Spirit had reference to miraculous power or inspiration, hence no argument can be based on this.

But in this connection Jesus told what the Spirit should do for the world. It should reprove them of righteousness, of sin, and of judgment. How should he do this? By his words addressed to them through the apostles, as Paul reasoned before Felix of righteousness, a sober or godly life, and a judgment to come. The Holy Spirit operated on the disciples miraculously in inspiration by direct impact, but on those whom they addressed he operated through the word.

"The evidences of conversion are internal." John and Paul say they are manifest or seen, and say they are works of obedience of faith. But suppose they were internal. Does that necessitate direct impact of the Spirit, to give a person evidence that he is converted? Does not the Spirit work internally when he operates on our hearts by the truth, and assures us by his words that we are children of God, because we keep his commandments, as John says?

But now we come to the clinching argument. The Spirit has to regenerate infants dying in infancy, idiots, and pious heathen, before they can be saved, and as they can not hear the word, he must do it without the word, or by direct impact. Well now what next. Pious heathen. That would be an anomaly. A pious worshiper of idols. That is a specimen of men converted without the word, and idiots are another, and infants. How does the gentleman know that the Spirit operates on the hearts of infants, or idiots? How does he find it out? not in the word of God. Such an operation must be spiritually discerned! But how are they saved or converted? They need no conversion. Idiots are not responsible, and hence need no operation of the Spirit, through the word, to convince them of sin, and lead them to repentance and conversion. Infants need no conversion, for they have no sin, no guilt. But, says orthodoxy, their depravity must be removed. All assumption. A theory of depravity is conjured up, untaught in the word, and then a theory of direct operation of the Spirit, or a theory of regeneration by direct impact on the heart of

infants, is assumed to help out of the difficulty of infant damnation. I have no theory of hereditary depravity that necessitates that assumption of something we do not know, and never can know whether it exists or not. The whole thing is untaught in the Bible.

He assumes that the devil tempts men by direct impact of himself on their spirits, and we must have a direct impact of the Spirit of God to counteract it, or we assign more power to the devil than to the Holy Spirit. Well were it true that the devil operates by direct impact, can not the Spirit of God counteract all this by motives and appeals to reason through the word? But how does the gentleman know the devil tempts by direct impact? The Bible nowhere says so. Nor does it ascribe to him results which necessitate direct impact. He operates through temptations addressed to our minds and senses, through words and things apprehended by the senses.

There was once an operation of the devil by direct impact, in the demoniacal possessions of the times of Christ and his apostles. This was supernatural, and a miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit, by direct impact, existed to counteract it. The direct impact of the devil in demoniacal possessions, and the direct impact of the Spirit in miraculous power, have ceased, as Paul assures the latter will cease.

The devil has no revelation he says. He once had in these demoniacs, and he now operates on men through moral means, and God counteracts his power in the same way. We have now passed in review all the gentleman has brought forward, and proved that not a single passage of scripture affirms direct operation in conversion, or what necessitates direct action. His affirmation is a myth untaught and unknown in the word of God.

We will now urge the following objections to and arguments against any such direct action.

1. No such power is needed. Conversion and regeneration are works in which man acts voluntarily, and is responsible. His will can be influenced in such a way as to leave him responsible, only by appeals to reason, conscience, and his heart, couched in words, ideas, or their equivalent. No other power is needed then than this power resident in the truth.

2. Any more powerful influence would destroy his responsibility. Any influence by direct impact, independent of the truth, must irresistibly influence man to be effectual. If so, man is a mere machine. The case of Balaam shows that man is not responsible for the influence of direct impact. He told Balak plainly he was not responsible for what he did, when under such an influence. Any such influence in conversion would destroy man's moral responsibility. The influences must be addressed to man's reason, conscience, and heart, and then he voluntarily yields to them, or resists and is responsible. For the result of any other influence he is not responsible.

3. The absurdities of the direct impact theory show its own falsity. All men must be converted this way, if at all. All are not converted in this way or any other. Why not? Because God has not so influenced them. Why has he not? Are they responsible? Nay, verily, if it depends on God and not on themselves. "Ah but," says one, "they resist or raise their will in opposition to this influence."

What? A sinner able to resist a direct impact of God's Spirit? Resist an influence that does not appeal to his will at all, and that his will can not therefore resist? The appeal to his reason and the appeal to his will contained in the truth, can he resist, and he is responsible for it, but for the other he is not.

We have already exhibited the absurdity of this whole theory of conversion. It is essentially Calvinistic. It is based on a theory of human depravity and inability that is stated thus: "In consequence of Adam's transgression in its inherited influence and original sin, and our own sinfulness, we have become so depraved as to be utterly unable to originate a single good thought, impulse or volition. Before we can will in favor of good, or do good, or understand the word of God, or it can have any influence on us for good, this depravity and its consequent inability must be removed." Weil how? Not by the word of God, for man can not originate a single good impulse that it urges him to make. What an insulting farce is God's word then! The carnal man can not understand the word of God. Why does God mock him then with it? It is a dead letter and kills the carnal man. What fiendish cruelty to give it to him then, and pretend that it is the power of God unto salvation. Man is dead. The word is dead, and the dead word kills the dead man. If that is not one dead thing on another dead thing, trying to kill it, I can not see the drift of language. But don't the Bible say so? No, it says that man is dead, but the word of God quickens him or makes him alive. It declares that the old Jewish law killed or condemned men, but that the gospel or Spirit makes alive. The Spirit through the gospel.

But why does not God remove this depravity and inability in all men by the direct impact of his Spirit as is claimed he must? This must be done before he can understand the word, will in favor of good, have faith and repent. My Methodist friend can not tell. The Calvinist says because he has chosen some and reprobated or passed by others. For a Methodist to adopt this theory, as my friend does from his regeneration of idiots and infants, is to involve himself in endless absurdity. But perhaps says one he can submit to this influence or resist. Indeed! he can will to be moved by this influence, or be changed by it? Is not that an impulse in favor of good? He has to will in favor of good before he can receive this change by the direct impact of the Spirit. What produced that will to submit to this influence? Will any one tell me?

Look at it again; the depravity must be removed before the inability can be removed, and before he can believe and repent. There you have a person who has not believed and repented, who is not depraved, or sinful. What logic! The theory is in violation of every teaching of reason and God's word. They teach men are converted by and through the power in the truth, and that they choose to receive the truth, or reject it, and are responsible for it.

4. The Spirit will not do what man is conscious he can and ought to do for himself. Man is conscious he can and should receive the truth, obey it, and that the truth alone is all-sufficient to enable him to do this. The Spirit will not do for him then what he should do for himself.

5. Christ and his disciples always talk as if the conversion of men depends on the truth. Christ says his words are Spirit and life. He says men will not hear and understand the truth that he may convert them. He declares the truth makes men free from sin. He declares that his gospel was given to save men. The apostles always preached the gospel as the power of God. They say men are saved, begotten, born again, renewed, cleansed, anointed, sealed, by the word. True they attribute the same things to the Spirit. But in so doing they mean that the Spirit is the person, and the word his instrument. There are not two agents as my opponent claims who work independent, but there is one agent who always uses one instrument, the word.

6. We assert in no land or age has there ever been a conversion without the word. All conversions in the Bible were through the word. All since have been through the word. My opponent can not mention a case of conversion by direct impact. Why contend then for what never has existed. Unless he mentions an instance, we will decide his position to be unworthy of a moment's consideration.

7. The work of the Spirit was to reprove the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment. How is this done? Through his inspired word. Paul reasoned of these things to Felix. It is done through the word.

8. The Spirit can not convert the sinner by direct impact, for our Savior says, John xiv.: "The world can not receive him." How can he convert a sinner by direct impact when the world can not receive him?

9. All conversions have been through the truth. Peter preached the truth on the day of Pentecost, though the Spirit was miraculously present. Hearing the truth pierced their hearts. Philip preached to the Samaritan, to the eunuch. Paul preached to Lydia, to the jailer, and declared he begat men by the gospel. Peter preached at the house of Cornelius. Take the case of Saul of Tarsus. Christ appeared to him. Why? To convert him? No, but to make an apostle of him, to enable him to be a witness because he had seen him. Was he converted yet? No, he was to go into Damascus and there he was to be told what to do. Our Savior had committed the conversion of the world to the disciples. It was to be done through their word. Ananias preached obedience to him, as he was converted not by direct impact, but by the word. Hence all conversions have been through the word. In no age or part of the world has there ever been a conversion by direct impact.

10. All that is ascribed to the Spirit-is ascribed to the word. We have shown this already in another place. It shows that the word is always the medium or instrument of the Spirit.

11. Resisting the words of the Spirit through his inspired servants, is called resisting the Spirit; hence he operates through the word.

12. God has in all ages accomplished all he has ever done by his word. Creation, redemption, salvation, and ruling the universe are all said to be done by the word of his power.

But I may be told that we place too much stress on the word of God. Paul says, Heb. iv.: "For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword; and pierces even to the

dividing asunder of the joints and the marrow, and the sou] and the spirit, and is a discerner of thoughts and intents of the heart." He says also, 2 Tim. iii. 15: "The Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation; and are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction, and that the man of God may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work." David, Ps. xix. 7, says the Jaw of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. He says its entrance gives light. That it creates a new spirit and a right heart within him; that it quickens him, cleanses him. Christ says his words are Spirit and life. The apostles declare ye are born, begotten, renewed, purified by the word. Paul says Christ cleanses or purifies the church by the bath of water and the word. Eph. v. 26. Do we make more of the word then than the Spirit of God himself does?

We believe, also, that the Spirit is in the word, energizing it and giving life and power to it. But if a man waits till he is converted by direct impact, he will wait till doomsday, and then be condemned because he rejected the instrumentality God uses to convert the world. Through the word God addresses us as rational creatures: "Come, let us reason together," saith the Lord.

Now as my opponent is quoting his many passages, ask yourselves each time, "Is the operation of the Spirit in that instance a direct impact? Does the word of God say so? Does the result imply or necessitate such operation? Does not the Spirit himself elsewhere, or even in that passage, declare that he does it by or through the word? Does he not assume the very point in debate? That the action is direct impact?" Analyze his examples in this way, and you will always see the transparent shallowness, and baseless sophistry of his cause. Apply the test of God's word, and his direct impact will vanish like the ghosts of superstition before the rising sun.—[*Time expired.*]

---

*Mr. Hughey*—Will Mr. Braden state what he means by the Spirit operating through the word? Does he mean that the Spirit of God operates through the word of God just like his spirit operates through his words? I want to know what he means. I do not want to misrepresent him in my reply.

*Mr. Braden*—I think my friend has been giving a good illustration. He has been arguing that there was a personal operation, and therefore a personal influence; and that is what he meant by it. There was no personal impact or contact with my spirit, and, therefore, no influence without words or arguments.

*Mr. Hughey*—You mean, then, that the Spirit of God operates through the word, just as your spirit operates upon me through your words and arguments. This is the way I understood you, and I am glad I understood you correctly.



## MR. HUGHEY'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I rise before you this evening to close the discussion on my part on the operations and the influences of the Holy Spirit. My opponent complained in his speech about my laughing, and reminded me of a certain proverb, which speaks of "laughter without cause." Well, I ought to stand reproved, for his speech was too weak and foolish to afford even sufficient cause for laughter, and I confess that for once that I laughed without sufficient cause; and I acknowledge the justice of the gentleman's reproof. [Laughter.] But it is my nature to laugh when I feel well, and see anything that is amusing; and as I am getting better so rapidly, when I see the gentleman making such tremendous efforts to get out of his difficulties, and only getting in the deeper all the while, it amuses me so well he must allow me to laugh a little, even if his speech does not afford sufficient "cause for laughter." But there is another saying of the wise man which my opponent ought to remember, which speaks of a certain character being "known by the multitude of words." Of course the allusion here is to "a multitude without wisdom," and I think this later saying of the wise man would aptly apply to all his speeches in this discussion. However, if my laughing annoys him, I am very sorry for it, for I am sure I do not laugh for that purpose. When we were arranging the preliminaries of this discussion it seems he had got the idea that I was rather good natured, and inclined to laugh, and he wanted to have a rule adopted, prohibiting me from laughing at him! [Laughter] But I told him I could not consent to such a rule, for if he said anything funny or ludicrous, I should certainly laugh, for I believe that all who are acquainted with me, know that I can not well keep from laughing at that which is laughable. [Continued laughter.] The gentleman also stated that I might complain of him for reserving his strong arguments until his last speech; and asked if he had not a right to bring in new arguments in that speech? Certainly he has the right to advance new arguments in any but his closing speech. I never called in question his right to do so, but the propriety of reserving his strongest arguments until I had but one chance to reply. That course on the former proposition showed a conscious weakness of his argument, which he was endeavoring to protect by this maneuver. But I shall not complain on this score in regard to his last speech, for several reasons, which, however, I will not state for fear they might give offense to my opponent.

You remember that he denied emphatically the position that I said he had finally been driven to—that there is no such thing as a personal operation of the Spirit of God on the heart. He claimed that it was a personal operation of the Spirit, but that this personal operation was by and through the word. But did you not notice that when I asked him what that personal operation was, he said it was the Holy Spirit speaking through the prophets and apostles. It was the Spirit in the prophets and apostles speaking through them to you and me; so the nearest personal contact, according to him, there is now between the Spirit of God and the souls of men is about eighteen hun-

dred years apart! That is the nearest he can come to a personal operation of the Spirit! When I asked him what he meant by a personal operation of the Spirit, you remember he stated that the Spirit of God operates upon men in no other way than his spirit does, that is, through words and arguments addressed to the understanding. I knew he was putting the meaning of Ashdod on the language of Canaan, which is not uncommon for his brethren to do in order to deceive the simple; and that is why I was determined to bring him out and show you just what he does mean by the personal operation of the Spirit. When I speak of the Spirit of God I mean the personal Spirit, which Jesus promised to his disciples, to abide with, and dwell in each individual believer. And when I speak of the operations of the Spirit, I mean the personal operations and influences of this personal Spirit, quickening, regenerating and sanctifying the soul. It is this personal operation of the personal Spirit of God, which the gentleman denies.

But he says I can not tell the difference between the mediate operation of the Spirit through the word, and the immediate or direct operation. I thought I had defined the difference clearly, but I will do it again, so that my opponent can understand it. We agree that the Spirit of God operates through the word, by enlightening the mind, and that in this operation words and arguments are addressed to the understanding through the eye and ear; this is what I mean by the mediate operation of the Spirit, the Spirit operating through the word, and by this means exerting an influence on the heart.

By the immediate operation of the Spirit, I mean that the Spirit of God exerts a power or influence upon the heart of men by direct personal contact. Where does the mediate operation in conversion and regeneration cease, and the immediate begin? It is where the Spirit of God moves upon the heart, changing the inward nature, and stamping the image of Christ upon it. Here is the difference between the two.

But again the gentleman wants to know how we can know when this direct and immediate operation of the Spirit takes place? We know it by the evidences the scriptures assure us always accompany it. John tells us: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren;" and Paul tells us, "The Spirit itself bear<sup>3</sup> witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Can a man be brought out of a dark and noisome dungeon into the full light of day, and not know it? And can a condemned sinner be translated out of darkness into the light and kingdom of God's dear Son and not know it? When this glorious work takes place the man can not but be inwardly conscious of it, for he is "a new creature in Christ Jesus," and he bears the image of Christ upon his heart. Now I think my opponent can understand how we can tell when this immediate operation takes place. I do not know whether he has felt it or not, but if he has he knows it. Multitudes have lived in the joyful consciousness that they had experienced this great spiritual change. Multitudes have died in holy triumph through the power of this blessed assurance, and entered the rest of the people of God, and multiplied thousands to-day rejoice in the conscious assurance that

they have felt the immediate operations of the Holy Spirit, renewing and sanctifying their hearts.

But my friend tells us again that Paul was the father of the Christians at Corinth, and that he had begotten them through the word of truth. But was Paul the father of the Corinthian Christians, in the same sense that God is the Father of all believers, and were they begotten by Paul in the same manner that believers are begotten of God? This, indeed, is the position of Mr. Braden, for he tells us that God begets us "through the word of truth," and Paul had begotten the Corinthian Christians in the same way! Paul does not intend to convey the idea that he was the father of the Corinthian Christians in any other sense than as being the instrument through whom they were converted. So when it is said that Christians are "begotten of, or through the word, the gospel," etc., the idea conveyed is simply that the word or gospel is the instrument through which they have been brought to Christ. God alone is the Father of believers, and they are begotten of him by spiritual generation, and are thereby made partakers of "the divine nature." This passage from Paul furnishes us the best illustration we could possibly have of the truth of my position, as it shows that the Christian is often said to be begotten of, or by the instrument through whom or which he has been brought to the knowledge of salvation. But in all these cases this must be understood in a subordinate sense, while in the primary sense God alone is the Father of the Christian, and begets us by spiritual generation.

But my opponent tells us that the sinner is quickened by the word, and he quoted the language of the Psalmist: "Quicken me, O Lord, according unto thy word." But David was a man of God, not a sinner destitute of spiritual life. He was quickened by the word, in the sense of being through its instrumentality brought into a higher spiritual life. There is a vast difference between this quickening of the child of God by the word, and the quickening of the sinner into spiritual life, by the power of the Holy Spirit. The one is but the stirring up the zeal of the child of God; the other is breathing life into the dead; and this can only be done by the Spirit of our God moving on the soul of man.

The gentleman goes again to John iii. 8: "The wind bloweth where it listeth." He tells us that *pneuma* is never translated in the New Testament wind, but in this single case. In reply to this, I remark the word *pneoo*, which he here translates breathe, is never translated breathe at all in the New Testament, but always "to blow." But he can not deny that the primary meaning of *pneuma*, is wind, and Spirit is a secondary meaning of the term, and the connection here shows unmistakably that the primary meaning in this place is the true one. But, says Mr. Braden, "the wind can not will at all!" But, I ask, if it is not often the case that volition is ascribed to things that really do not possess it, especially in the parabolical or figurative teachings of the scriptures? But my opponent tells us the common translation throws an air of mystery around the new birth, which has been a fruitful source of error on this subject, causing it to be looked upon as an incomprehensible mystery! But does his translation clear

up this mystery any better than the common translation? Let us see. "The Spirit breatheth where he pleaseth, and thou nearest his voice, but canst not tell whence he cometh, and whither he goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." Now, I ask, how does this translation clear up the mystery of the new birth. "The Spirit breathes where he wills, and you can hear his voice, but you can not tell whence he comes, and whither he goes." This clears up the mystery of the new birth in a wonderful manner! "So," in the same mysterious manner as "the Spirit breathes, comes and goes," is every one that is born of the Spirit. This translation leaves the matter still more involved in mystery than the common translation does. Indeed any attempt to clear up the mystery of the new birth must be a failure; for while the fact is as palpable as the blowing of the wind, the manner is as incomprehensible.

But the gentleman tells us that the Spirit always witnesses through the word; and he brought forward a number of passages to prove that the Holy Ghost testified to men in and through the word. But not one of those passages refers to the witness of the Spirit in conversion and regeneration, the very point in controversy. The Holy Spirit witnesses to the truth in the word; but he bears "witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." It will not do to confound these two branches of the Spirit's testimony together. The one he bears in the word; the other he bears in the heart of the believer. Again, he confounds the Holy Spirit as given to the believer—the Spirit of adoption, with the Holy Spirit as inspiring the prophets and apostles to write the word of God. But, as I showed you, the word of God makes a marked distinction here. Every evidence of our conversion is internal and spiritual. I mean the evidences by which we may know ourselves the children of God. The word of God speaks of these evidences thus: "The Spirit itself (the Spirit of adoption) beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." "He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not on the Son shall not see life," etc. Such is the language of God's word in regard to the witness of the Spirit.

This same doctrine of the direct and internal witness of the Spirit is also fully taught in those passages which speak of the seal and earnest of the Spirit. The "seal of the Spirit" is "the earnest in the heart," and we know that "the earnest in the heart" is the Holy Ghost given to the believer to abide and dwell with him; for Paul says: "What I know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God." So when we come to examine the scripture evidences of our conversion to God, they are all internal and spiritual—the Spirit of God bearing testimony to our hearts and consciences that we are born of God. It is not the Spirit of inspiration, speaking through the prophets and apostles which thus witnesses to our adoption and sonship, but it is the Spirit of adoption which Christ promised to abide with and dwell in the believer forever—the Spirit which seals us heirs of God and thus becomes "the earnest of our inheritance"—the Spirit that dwells in us and thus constitutes

our bodies the temples of the Holy Ghost—this is "the Spirit that bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God."

The anointing of the Spirit teaches the same thing, the same internal and direct testimony of the Holy Spirit to our adoption and sonship. But my opponent tells us Christians are not anointed with the Holy Spirit at all, but with the word I Now, let us turn and read the passages in 1 John ii. 20-27, where this anointing is spoken of, and see whether it is the word or Spirit:

"20. But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

"21. I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth.

"22. Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.

"23. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledged the Son hath the Father also.

"24. Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father.

"25. And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life.

"26. These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you.

"27. But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him."

Now, the question is, was this unction the anointing of the word or the Spirit? If it were the word, they had been anointed with that which John was then anointing them with again. For this epistle is itself a part of the word. They had already received the anointing from God, and now John proceeds to give them instruction in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. This shows that the anointing is one thing and the instruction another. The anointing of the Spirit is given not for the purpose of instructing in doctrine, but for the purpose of fortifying the soul against seducing spirits, by giving a conscious assurance in the heart, that the gospel is "the power of God unto salvation." This anointing is for our instruction and guidance in the spiritual privileges of the gospel, and not for our edification in doctrine; while the gospel, the word, is for our instruction in doctrine and discipline.

But the word of God is never spoken of as anointing any one; such a figure is never used in the scriptures; but the Spirit is always spoken of as the anointing to be received under the gospel. Go, if you please, and examine the import of the anointing with oil, under the Jewish dispensation, and you will find that it typified the anointing of the Holy Spirit under the gospel. The anointing of the priests with oil represented the anointing of the universal priesthood, every true believer, with the Holy Ghost under the gospel. Hence it is said by the prophet, in reference to Christ, our great High Priest: "Therefore, God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of glad-

ness above thy fellows." This anointing, then, is the Holy Spirit promised by Christ to his disciples, when he said: "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, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him, but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Again he says: "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and manifest myself to him."

But my friend says God manifests himself in revelation. But does he not manifest himself to the world in revelation? "Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot), Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered, and said unto him: If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." There can be no misunderstanding here, for the manner in which Christ manifests himself unto his people, in opposition to the manner in which he manifests himself unto the world is spoken of. He manifests himself unto the world in revelation, in his word; but he manifests himself unto his people by his Holy Spirit dwelling in their hearts.

Here, then, the unction that is given to believers, is the Holy Spirit, the Comforter who is to abide with the people of God forever; and this unction is given alike to all believers, who are thus constituted and consecrated priests of the Most High God to offer spiritual sacrifices, the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving unto God. In anointing there must be contact between the anointing substance and the thing anointed, for there can be no anointing without it. Here, again, I prove the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion.

But I must come again to the seal of the Spirit. Paul says: "Now he which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." I showed you that in the sealing process, there must be direct contact, and consequently here we reach absolute demonstration. We are "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," "in our hearts," as is fully demonstrated by comparing 2 Cor. i. 22, and Eph. i. 13. Here "the Holy Spirit of promise," the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, is the seal which is put upon the heart; it seals the heart and stamps the impress of the Son of God upon it. Here there must be direct contact between the Holy Spirit who seals, and the heart which is sealed; the very nature of the figure shuts us up to this idea. But, again, this seal is the earnest or pledge given of the inheritance; and this earnest or pledge is put into the heart: "Who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." Demonstration could not be made clearer than does this figure demonstrate the direct and immediate operations of the Spirit of God on the hearts of men. Here again the argument is closed. I was surprised at the gentleman's interpretation of the figure of the seal of the Spirit. One of his brethren (Mr. Sweeney), with whom I had a discussion, said that the seal of the Spirit was the laying of the

hands of the apostles on the heads of their converts! To this I replied, that the scriptures tell us the Holy Spirit is the seal; but Mr. 8. tells us the hands of the apostles are the seal! The Holy Spirit says the seal is put upon the heart; but Mr. S. says it is put upon the head! Mr. Braden has taken another position: he says that a seal sometimes means a pledge, and therefore contact is not necessary in sealing! But I showed that this seal of the Spirit is the earnest or pledge in the heart, and therefore there must be contact; for "the Holy Spirit of promise" is the pledge given to the heart, and this pledge could not be given and received without contact. There is no possible chance to evade the force of the argument here, for by the seal of the Spirit, I prove the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion in spite of every effort of my opponent to evade its force.

But now we come again to 1 Cor. ii. 14, which speaks of the natural man not being able to understand the things of God. He still tells us that "the natural man," is the man without revelation. Turn and read this chapter, and you will find that there are insuperable difficulties in the way of the gentleman's interpretation. The fact is, the very "princes of this world who crucified the Lord of glory," had the knowledge of revelation. It was the Jewish princes, priests and rulers, who delivered Jesus to be crucified. They had the revelation of the Old Testament, and the preaching of Jesus under the New. This proves that "the natural man" is not the man without divine revelation; but the unconverted man, the man without spiritual discernment, who, therefore, can not understand the things of God. For Paul says: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

The natural, the unconverted man, can not understand the things of the Spirit of God because they are spiritually discerned. So says my God. But Mr. Braden says he can perfectly understand the things of God. It would be a good thing for him to try Paul's spiritual discerning-stone, and see if he could not better understand the teachings of God's word!

But why, I ask, was it necessary that the apostles should wait for the promise of the Holy Spirit before they went forth to proclaim the gospel, according to the gentleman's argument? They had already received full instruction in the doctrines of the gospel Christ had breathed upon them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," and had given them their apostolic power of remitting and retaining sins; but the Holy Ghost had not yet descended in power to prepare them for their work, and to move the hearts of their hearers. My opponent tells us there is no necessity for spiritual influence outside of the word

of God. No man could have presented the antagonism that exists between Campbellism and the New Testament in a stronger light than he has done. He said that the only thing that the Holy Spirit would do when he came, would be to bring to the minds of the apostles what Jesus had taught them. But Jesus said: "He shall reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come;" and that he should be an abiding Comforter in the hearts of his people. This places the heresy of his system in the strongest light. His system declares that there is no necessity for any spiritual influence under the gospel, outside the word of God; yea, he totally denies that there is any such influence exerted on the hearts of men. God's word declares that there is such a spiritual influence, and that it is necessary. The antagonism here shown to exist between the doctrine of my opponent and the word of God is palpable, and unmistakable; and proves that his doctrine is not the doctrine of God.

The gentleman tells us there is no native depravity, and therefore, infants and idiots do not need to be regenerated or born again; and he scouts the idea of there being any pious heathens! Cornelius was a pious heathen, and there are, and have been multiplied thousands, who like him have followed the light they had, and lived conscientiously before God; and such we know will be judged by the law of their conscience, for so Paul teaches in Romans ii. Yet they are depraved and "must be born again," or they can not enter heaven; and they can not be born again if the Holy Spirit operates only through the word. His doctrine irretrievably damns all those conscientious heathens whom God's word saves! This proves that his doctrine is false. So with infants, their nature is depraved. By their first or natural birth, they inherit a depraved nature, and they "must be born again," or they can not enter heaven. Paul declares that we all "by nature are the children of wrath." Those who deny the native depravity of the human heart, tell us that the word *phusis*, here translated nature, does not mean nature, but that it signifies custom, habit, etc. But this is a meaning the word never has. Neither Liddell and Scott, Parkhurst nor Greenfield, give it any such definition, nor does it ever have this signification in the New Testament. The only passage in which it occurs in the New Testament, where it is even claimed to mean custom, habit, etc., is 1 Cor. xi. 14: "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him." But here, as Greenfield tells us, it is "spoken of a native feeling of decorum, a native sense of propriety," so that in this case the word means nature and not custom, as is apparent from the very connection in which it is used. In the passage in Ephesians ii. 3, the word can mean nothing else but nature, and because we are "by nature children of wrath," we "must be born again." But if the Holy Spirit operates only through the word, then none can be regenerated only those who can hear and understand the word; infants and idiots can not understand the word, therefore, they can not be regenerated or born again, and consequently all who die in infancy and idiocy must be damned! There is no getting from this revolting conclusion but by repudiating the premises from which it necessarily flows.

But again, the gentleman tells us that there is no such thing as



Satanic influence on the heart of man—that no man has ever been tempted directly by the devil since the days of the apostles! I was surprised to hear him take this position. I knew that this was the necessary consequence of his position, but I did not expect him to avow it. Here Mr. Braden has gone over completely to Universalism, and I will have to turn him and his church bodily over into the hands of my Universalist friend here, Mr. Beard, whether he will receive them or not. [Laughter.] I knew that there was great affinity between Campbellism and Universalism, but I did not know that they were avowedly agreed in regard to the non-existence of satanic influence before!

But, not only is his doctrine concerning satanic influence opposed to the universal experience of Christians, it is also opposed to the unanimous teachings of the word of God. The scriptures' teach us everywhere that the devil is the chief adversary of the Christian, that "he goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." Paul declares that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world," and he therefore exhorts us to "put on the whole armor of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." But, says Mr. Braden, "There is no devil to tempt men, for he can not reach them, as he has no revealed word to operate through! What a pity he had not been present to inform Paul that he was mistaken, and let the old apostle know that Satan could not tempt men, for he has no way to reach their hearts! This absurd position, to which I have forced the gentleman, is of itself sufficient to forever condemn his entire system. The scriptures everywhere represent Satan as the ever active foe of the Christian, and as continually exciting the mind and heart to evil, and spreading snares to entangle his feet, and lead him to sin and death. Here Mr. Braden takes square issue with the word of God. In his system there is no spiritual influence, divine or satanic! This again shows the antagonism between the scriptures and the doctrine of my opponent.

I asked my opponent how the devil tempts men under the gospel? He replied, "through the speeches and writings of bad men." But how can he tempt men through the speeches and writings of bad men, if he can not influence the hearts of bad men? How can the devil speak through bad men, if he can not get into them? The devil can not influence men's hearts at all, and yet he inspires the speeches and writings of bad men, and thus tempts men by this means! To such a pitiable absurdity is the gentleman driven in his efforts to maintain his unscriptural doctrine!

And so I might go on with his whole argument, and show the utter fallacy of everything he has advanced against my argument; but I must be brief with the further review of his speech, and hasten to review my own argument. He told us that my doctrine of the direct and immediate operation of the Spirit is subversive of the moral agency of man. Will he please tell us how the immediate operation of the Spirit of God on the heart in conversion, which is always consonant with the will of man, can destroy his will, or his moral agency? The inspiring influences of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of the pro-

phets and apostles, which Mr. Braden admits was direct or immediate, did not destroy their moral agency, and how can the regenerating influences of the Spirit destroy man's moral agency? My position does not involve any such consequences; we do not hold to any such a spiritual operation or influence as would destroy man's moral agency. The Spirit of God quickens the soul and makes it feel its ruined condition, and offers it the necessary help to lift it out of that condition; but he does not regenerate it until it becomes willing, and believes in Christ. Instead of our doctrine of the direct operation of the Spirit destroying the moral agency of man, it recognizes that agency, and co-operates with it in the whole work of regeneration and sanction. This the gentleman can not but know.

But Mr. Braden did give us one example of the direct or immediate operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion in apostolic times; but in the other apostolic conversion, he tells the operation of the Spirit was mediate always, and alone through the word. But I would like to know in the case of Lydia, how "her heart was opened?" It was not by the word, for "the Lord opened" her heart, "that she attended to the things that were spoken of Paul." The word did not "open her heart," but "her heart was opened" that she might attend to what was spoken to her. Here is an unquestionable example of spiritual illumination, preparatory to hearing the word. This was done by the direct quickening power of the Holy Spirit. But he admits that in the case of Cornelius there was direct contact—immediate operation, but that this was a miraculous manifestation to convince Peter that God was willing to receive Cornelius! I proved however, on a former proposition, that Peter was already convinced that God was willing to receive Cornelius, and consequently Mr. Braden's explanation of this example of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion falls to the ground, while his admission is fatal to his argument.

He told us there could be no direct operation of the Spirit on the heart of the unconverted, for the "world can not receive him." But does this prove that he can not reprove the world? None can receive the Holy Spirit into their hearts, only those who believe in Christ, and are made the sons of God, but he can operate upon the heart of the sinner from without, and reprove and convict the most obstinate unbeliever, as he did Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus.

I can not spend further time in reviewing the gentleman's speech, and indeed it is not necessary, for I have already noticed everything that he advanced, that is of any force, and I shall spend the remaining few minutes I have in a brief review of my argument.

The proposition which I affirm, is: "In the work of conversion and regeneration, the Holy Spirit operates immediately or directly on the heart."

My first argument in proof of my proposition, was: That after the whole gospel had been taught to the apostles, and they had been thoroughly instructed in the doctrines of the gospel, they were not permitted to go forth in their great work of preaching until they received the promise of the Father—the Holy Ghost. I showed that the Holy Spirit was necessary, not only to bring to the minds of the apostles what Christ had taught them; but that it was also necessary

to move and influence the hearts of those who heard the word, so as to make the gospel the power of God unto their salvation. This I proved by an array of passages of scripture which it is not necessary for me here to repeat. Here I showed that the Holy Spirit exerts a direct personal influence upon the heart in conviction, by reproving "the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment;" and that when the heart becomes willing to receive Jesus Christ by faith, and trusts in him, the Holy Spirit regenerates him, he is born of God, and saved from sin. Thus I showed that the preaching of the gospel, and the direct and personal operations of the Holy Spirit are conjoined in the work of spiritual illumination and regeneration. Here I showed that the Holy Spirit is the agent by which this work of moral regeneration is accomplished, while the word of God is ordinarily the instrument through which the mind is enlightened and brought to Christ.

My second argument was drawn from the fact that the scriptures represent this great spiritual change as a "new birth," a being born or generated of God, or being "born of the Spirit," or "from above." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." This spiritual birth is received or obtained through faith. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Here it is declared that Christians are generated, or born of God, and thus "become partakers of the divine nature." By being generated of God—Christians "become partakers of the divine nature," which is the seed and germ of the new life; just as by being generated of men, we become partakers of human nature. The implantation of this germinating principle of the new life is the work of the Holy Spirit.

My third argument was drawn from the fact that the great spiritual change, here called conversion or regeneration, is also styled in the scriptures, "a new creation," and the subject of it—the Christian—is called "a new creature." The Christian is also called "the workmanship of God;" and the agent by which this new creation is accomplished, is the Holy Spirit, by which we are "renewed in Jesus Christ."

My fourth argument was drawn from the fact that conversion, or regeneration, is called an anointing, and a sealing of the Spirit. But I have just reviewed this argument, and it will only be necessary to restate it here. In anointing there must be contact between the anointing substance and the object anointed. The anointing substance is the Holy Spirit, and the object anointed is the heart of the believer, and there is necessarily contact here. We are nowhere said to be anointed by the word, as my opponent would have you believe, but in opposition to this we showed you that the anointing with oil under the former dispensation was typical of the anointing of the Holy Spirit under the gospel. I showed again that the seal of the Spirit is placed upon the heart, and that this seal of the Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, and that it is the Holy Spirit communicated to the believer. The anointing and sealing are the same thing, and are both put

upon the heart. I showed that in the sealing process there must be contact, and that there can be no sealing without it, whether the seal be a stamp put upon the object, or a pledge given to a person. Here the argument reached demonstration, and from the overwhelming force of this argument it is impossible for my opponent to escape.

My fifth argument in support of my proposition was drawn from the fact that conversion, or regeneration, in scripture, is also called a baptism of the Holy Spirit. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." You remember that my opponent explained this passage of scripture by saying that it is by the direction of one Spirit that we are all baptized, or that the "one Spirit," here spoken of is not the Holy Spirit, but the spirit of Christianity! But I showed conclusively that the "one Spirit" here is the Holy Ghost and that he is the baptizer in this spiritual baptism, and that this baptism of the Spirit is the common heritage of believers. There can be no baptism without direct contact, and as the Holy Spirit is the baptizing element and the heart of the believer is the object baptized, there must be direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit here, or there can be no baptism. Here again the argument is wholly conclusive.

My sixth argument was drawn from the fact that nothing short of such a creating and renewing spiritual agency is adequate to the accomplishment of this great moral or spiritual change. Nothing but an Almighty energy in active operation is competent to the task of reforming man's spiritual nature in the image of God. I proved that man "is dead in trespasses and sins"—that he is "by nature a child of wrath" and that he can not even change his life without divine aid; much less is he able to change his heart. It requires the same Almighty energy to create man anew, that it did to create him in the first instance. I proved here also that it is by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit that man is made a new creature in Christ. Paul says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." But my opponent tells us the washing of regeneration is one thing, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost is another thing! Well, if this is the case, which is "shed on" believers? If "the washing of regeneration" here means baptism, and if it is "shed on" believers, then, away goes immersion; for if baptism is "shed on us" it must be by pouring or sprinkling; immersion can not be "shed on any thing. But if it is "the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which is "shed on us," then there must be direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion or regeneration, for one thing can not be "shed on" another without direct contact. Let the gentleman here take either horn of the dilemma, and he is destroyed. Here again we reach demonstration in our argument.

My seventh argument in support of my proposition is drawn from the fact that the evidences of our regeneration and adoption into the divine family are all internal and spiritual, proving that the work itself is an internal and spiritual work. » The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." "He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself." "And hereby we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the

brethren." We might bring numerous passages from the word of God in support of this position, for this is the general teaching of the scriptures.

My eighth argument in support of my proposition was drawn from the fact that if the Holy Spirit does not operate immediately on the heart, infants, idiots, and all conscientious heathens must be lost; for the nature of every child of man is depraved, and he must be born again, or he can not enter heaven. Here the doctrine of my opponent comes in direct conflict with the word of God, as I showed you, for I proved by the scriptures that pious or conscientious heathens would be saved; but according to his doctrine they can not be saved, for none can be saved but those who are "born again," and none can be "born again" but those to whom the gospel is preached, or the word comes.

My ninth argument in support of my proposition was drawn from the fact that if the Spirit of God can not operate immediately on the heart, then either Satan has greater power in this respect than God, or else there is no such thing as satanic influence on the hearts of men. This is so self-evident, that my opponent at once accepted the consequences, and denied that there is any such thing as satanic influence in the world, or that any man has ever been tempted of the devil since the days of the apostles! This is the logical and necessary consequence of Mr. Campbell's position, that spiritual influence can only be exerted through words and arguments addressed to the understanding. This flatly contradicts the uniform teachings of the word of God, which represents Satan as "a roaring lion, going about seeking whom he may devour," and plunges headlong into Universalism! These legitimate and necessary consequences, following from the gentleman's position, are sufficient of themselves to stamp the whole system with falsehood.

What has my opponent advanced in reply to this chain of argument, each link of which is demonstration? The sum and substance of his reply to my entire argument, has been: "Whatever is ascribed to the Spirit, is also ascribed to the word, therefore the Spirit operates only through the word." But I showed that if this were true, which it is not, still it would not affect my argument; for the word is the instrument through which the Spirit ordinarily operates in enlightening the mind, and, therefore, that which is accomplished by the Spirit may be ascribed to the word in a subordinate sense, just as Paul is said to be the father of the Corinthian Christians. This makes the scriptures harmonious in their teaching on this subject; but the moment you adopt the gentleman's position, you get into interminable contradiction and confusion. It is not the Spirit as he speaks to us in the word of God that operates upon the heart in conversion, and that witnesses our adoption into the family of God, but it is the Holy Spirit, in his personal influences which Christ promised to abide with, and dwell in the hearts of his children forever. The gentleman, by ignoring this distinction, plunges into interminable confusion and error.

Thus I have presented the argument in support of my proposition briefly in the short space of time allotted for its discussion, and yet enough has been said I think to settle the question in every reflecting

mind. This is a question of transcendent importance to every child of man. Jesus says: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Without this spiritual birth we can not enter heaven; and this great spiritual change can only be effected by the power of the Holy Spirit. In order that we may obtain this spiritual qualification for heaven, we must do what God requires—we must put ourselves into the position where the Spirit of God can meet us, and make us new creatures in Christ Jesus. God requires that we shall repent of our sins, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, casting ourselves entirely upon his merits alone, and that by simple, confiding, trusting faith, and then the Spirit of God will apply the blood of Christ to our hearts, cleansing us from, sin, and by his transforming power he will create us "new creatures in Christ Jesus."

In conclusion, let me ask you if you feel in your hearts the witness of the Spirit, that this great moral transformation has taken place within you? If you are a son of God, he hath 'sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your heart, crying, Abba, Father." If you "have not the Spirit of Christ, you are none of his." No other test will stand the fires of the judgment day. I beseech you rest not until you know that your sins are forgiven you, and that your heart is changed, by the direct witness of the Spirit of God with your spirit, that you are a child of God, and that you have "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." And may God in his infinite mercy guide us all in the way of ail truth, for Jesus' sake. Amen.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My opponent contends that there can be no personal operation of the Spirit, except by direct impact. I am now influencing all of you. Is it by direct impact, or through my words? Through my words. Is it not a personal influence? If I had you all mesmerized, and had usurped your reason and volition, till you saw and thought as I do, and neither reasoned nor willed for yourselves; but were mere breathing machines under my power, would the influence be of a higher order than what I now exercise, by appeals to your reason? Should it be a moral, influence at all? Could there be any merit in feelings aroused in such a way? Could they make you any better? I now exercise over you the highest influence known in the moral exercise—a personal influence, and solely through my words.

In like manner God has always exercised moral power over men, such power as he exercises in conversion, through his word, by reason and motive. It is the only moral power that he can exercise, so long as man possesses the constitution he has given him. All influence by direct impact has been miraculous, and has never had any moral influence on the person affected by it, until he afterward reasoned on what he himself had said.

But he urges that this personal influence by and through the word was exerted while the word was being given by inspiration, and now it has ceased. As the Holy Spirit is divine, he is omnipresent, and is

always in the word, exercising an influence, a personal influence, analogous to what my spirit exercises in my words. But this influence is always in the word, coextensive with the word, and never beyond it, or by means that interfere with man's moral responsibility.

The gentleman at last attempts to define and describe the direct impact of the Spirit. Every characteristic he ascribes to it, the word of God attributes to the word or the Spirit operating through the word. Love of the brethren. We know we love the brethren when we keep the commandments given in the words of the Spirit. Spiritual illumination. The entrance of the word gives light. Consciousness of change. We know we have passed from death unto life or are changed, because we love the brethren, or love God and keep his commandments. Every characteristic is one of the characteristics of the operation through the word. Every passage that is now applicable refers, as the scriptures show, to an operation through the word. Wherever he finds direct impact, it is by miraculous influence and has ceased.

The gentleman admits now that Paul was a father of the Corinthians, but only in a secondary sense. That is true. God was the real Father. Paul was then a spiritual father, as the agent God employed. So in the case of the Spirit and the word. The word begets in a secondary sense. The Spirit is the person, the word his instrument. But as God did not beget a single Corinthian, except through Paul or some agent, so the Spirit never begets a single person, except through the word, the instrument or means.

We are next told that David was quickened by the word, but he was a saint, and the sinner can not, because he is dead in trespasses and sin. The sinner is morally dead. But the word quickens or makes alive. The Spirit makes alive through the word. As a sinner, David was quickened or made alive by the word. As a saint, he was kept alive by the word. Suppose the sinner is dead. Christ says his words are spirit and life, or he gets that spirit and life he needs to make him alive through the word. The gentleman assumes that because the sinner is dead, he can be made alive only by direct impact. He assumes this in direct violation of the teachings of Christ and the inspired servants of God.

Next we are told *pneoo*, used in John iii. 8, means to blow, and how can persons blow, he asks? By consulting the lexicon, I find it means primarily to breathe, and it is only when used figuratively of the word, it means to blow. The gentleman has not told us yet why he translates the passage, "The wind blows where it pleases and you hear the sound, but can not tell whence it comes and whither it goes"—

translating *pneuma* by wind, and in the same sentence translates the same word spirit. "So is every one born of the Spirit." If the first *pneuma* means wind, why does not the latter mean wind also, and why does he not be consistent and say, "So is every one born of wind?" The passage is an explanation of the birth of the Spirit. It means "the Spirit breathes (in inspiration) where he chooses, and you hear his voice (or his word or the words he inspired), and you can not tell whence he comes or whither he goes." In this way (by hearing the words of the Spirit) "is every one born of the Spirit." That is in accordance with the context and makes sense.

He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness within himself. 1 John v. 10. True, but how? By direct impact assumes the gentleman, without a word of proof. If I believe a thing because I have sufficient reasons or evidence in my mind, or have the witness of my reason that it is true, is there any direct impact? John tells us that if we believe in the Son, or believe this record, it then becomes a witness in our minds of the Messiahship of the Son of God. John here speaks of the record or the word of God as bearing testimony or witness, and not of the Spirit, except as he inspires and is in the word.

But pressed by our explanation of the Spirit bearing witness only in his word, he says it is another kind of spirit from the Spirit of inspiration. It is the Spirit of adoption. Well, is it not the Holy Spirit in both cases? If the Spirit of adoption be not the Holy Spirit, the gentleman has wandered from the question, for we are discussing the work of the Holy Spirit.

We are told that anointing guards against error. Granted; but what except truth can guard against error? John in that passage says this anointing is the truth. That settles that point.

But was not the work of the Comforter a direct impact? Certainly it was; but it was miraculous and has ceased.

This promise was to the disciples only, and to those on whom they laid hands. We urge that every promise Jesus made concerning the Spirit was concerning the miraculous operation of the Spirit for these reasons:

1. In every instance he coupled with it miraculous power. He should inspire them with what they should say. He should cause rivers of living water to flow from them or inspire them. The Comforter was to recall all things Jesus had said, show them things to come, guide them into all truth. He was the power from on high; he was to be given in a baptism, which was always attended with divine power. In every instance Jesus coupled divine power with his promises of the Spirit; hence it was a miraculous gift.

2. In the sense in which he promised him he was not given. John vii. 39. Now in the ordinary operation through the word, on both saint and sinner, he had been given ever since the first word of revelation was given to men. Hence it could not mean this. In what sense had he not been given? Only in the miraculous manner in which he was given to the apostles and apostolic churches. The ordinary manifestations of the Spirit were never a subject of special promise. Then this operation of the Spirit, which Christ calls sending the Comforter, was in the disciples direct; but on all whom they converted, his work was through their words, for he was to convince the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, which could only be done by and through words.

We have the assertion repeated that the sending was direct, and so also was the anointing, and with no reason, except that the Holy Spirit is the earnest or pledge of our inheritance. The Holy Spirit is given to us as the pledge of our inheritance. That I believe, but how do we receive him, and when we receive him, how does he operate on us? Do we receive him by direct impact? The gentleman assumes it. We receive him only when we receive his words by believing them,



and obey them. When we receive him, thus he operates only on our hearts through the words, as one Spirit can rationally operate on another. The pledge or earnest of our inheritance then is God's promises, and the Holy Spirit operating through them.

The natural man is mentioned again. I have already shown by Paul's teaching that without revelation men knew not God, he meant that the natural man who could not discern the things of God was man without revelation; and that when he declared that by revelation of the Spirit man learned all these things, he showed that the spiritual man was the man enlightened by the words or revelation of the Spirit. But these things must be spiritually discerned. The Spirit must help more to discern them. How? By direct impact? No; but by revelation, or the word, for Paul tells us, Heb. iv. 6-12, that the word of God is a discerner of the thoughts of men, or by it men discern the nature of their thoughts. No passage of scripture has been more distorted and had more nonsense preached from it than this second chapter of Corinthians. If we read its context it is very plain.

He asserts that my position teaches that the Spirit would be in the disciples alone, and when the word was complete he ceased to influence men, and left the word to do it, and we have the word alone. Our position is that he was in inspired men alone by direct impact, that he operated on others by the word, and when the word was complete, his work by direct impact ceased, and he remains in the word, in men in the word, and operates on them through the word.

He has found a pious heathen, or pious idolater in Cornelius. Cornelius was not a heathen, for he feared and worshiped God. How was he taught to do so? By the Jewish scriptures, and he did the good works it commanded. But how was he converted to Christ? By direct impact of the Spirit? An angel appeared to him, and told him to send for Peter, who preached the word to him, and he was converted by that, and not by direct impact.

I did not deny that there was a satanic influence, but I do deny that there has been or is any direct satanic impact on the spirits of men, since the demoniac possessions of the days of Christ. Then direct and miraculous power of the Spirit exerted to counteract it. Now this has ceased, and so also has all supernatural or direct influence of Satan. The Spirit and Satan now influence men only by moral means, or through motives presented to the mind by words or their equivalent. But Paul wrestled with powers and principalities. Do we in the same way, he an inspired man did, when he cast out demons? Must we wrestle by direct impact? No; the word of God teaches no such superstition.

The Lord opened Lydia's heart. How? By direct impact? No; by hearing the word which she believed and obeyed. I did not say that there was a case of conversion by direct impact at the household of Cornelius; but that the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit formed no part of their conversion. They were converted by the words preached to them, telling them what to do. So says the account in Acts. This operation of the Spirit was direct and miraculous, and has ceased.

"The Spirit operates on the saint and sinner differently. He operates on the saint through the word, but on the sinner by direct impact." The scriptures do not so teach. They teach that in conversion especially he operates through the word, and in both cases. In the case of the sinner, he is an outward reprove. In the saint, he is a comforter dwelling in him, in and through the word and its influences.

But the Spirit operates on spirit, and his word on our minds. Does not Mr. Hughey's spirit influence men? How does it do it? Through his words? The Spirit operates on our spirits, or words through the word. Besides one can not separate spirit and mind, as he attempts in this evasion.

I do not make word and Spirit one. I have distinctly taught that the Spirit is the person, and the word his means or medium of operation. The Spirit of God in his ordinary manifestation has always been in the church since the word was given to God's servants. David said or prayed God not to take his Holy Spirit from him.

I did not say there was no necessity for any influence of the Spirit, but I did say there was no necessity for this direct impact in conversion, for it was a moral work and must be accomplished by moral means, or by motives presented to the mind and heart, in the truth.

We are now ready to review the gentleman's entire course of argument. It was agreed between us that there was a personal divine spiritual being called the Holy Spirit. That he gave by inspiration the Holy Scriptures; that there was an operation of the Spirit by and through the truth influencing men's hearts by motives in the truth; that the Spirit was in the word influencing men by and through the word. To all this and in all this we both agreed.

But my opponent claims that, in addition to, and distinct from, and beyond all this, there is a direct or immediate operation of the Spirit on the heart in conversion and regeneration. That is an influence without instrumentality or intervening medium, or an influence by direct contact or impact of the Spirit of God or the spirit of man, and that is now exercised in man's conversion.

It was agreed also that we were not discussing what the Spirit has done in inspiration, but what it does in conversion. Also, that the question is not one of power, but of fact. Not what he can do, but what he does.

You remember we pressed him all through the debate to tell us what this operation was! How we might know and decide when it was exerted! What distinguished it from all other operations! As it was distinct from the operation through the word, in what does the distinction consist? He utterly failed to do this, and has been guilty of the logical folly of talking for two days about what he has not and can not describe, and of which we can form no idea from all he has said. Once he gave certain characteristics, but we immediately showed that they were those of the operation through the word.

We asked him to tell us how we could separate the operation of the Spirit by direct impact independent of appeals to our reason, heart and conscience, from the very imperfect operations of our own hearts. He has never noticed this.

We asked him to tell us whether this be a moral influence, for

which, and in which, we were responsible or not; and to tell us what power the Spirit could exert, independent of the word, that would leave us responsible. He never touched this. He has never told us what he means by "operate."

We next asked the gentleman to tell us what sort of a change conversion was, and what power was needed to produce it. To show from the nature of the work that operation by direct impact was necessary to accomplish it. He has utterly failed to do this. He has utterly failed in the first duty of a disputant. He has not clearly defined what he is defending.

He began his argument by the singularly and irrelevant course of reading long extracts from Mr. Campbell. With Mr. Campbell's views we have nothing to do. When read in full, and fairly interpreted, they will defend themselves.

His first argument was that man was made a new creature in conversion. But he utterly failed to show that this necessitated direct action of the Spirit. He asserted that man lost God's moral image in the fall, and it must be restored in conversion. Restored, he said, by being stamped on man's spirit by direct impact of God's Spirit. We asked him if it were stamped on literally, as the image is stamped on a coin. He would not tell us how it was done. We will let Paul tell, Colossians iii. 10:

" 10. Ye have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him."

Renewed in the knowledge of God's word. Again the image of God was lost in the fall. How? By a direct impact of the tempter on the spirit of man? No; by his words which tempted man to sin. There is no more necessity for direct impact to restore it than there was to deface it.

He next quoted Christ's language concerning the Comforter, showing that what he was to do for the disciples necessitated direct contact or impact. We admitted it and showed that he was not given to them to convert them, but that this was a miraculous gift, as what he was to do clearly show, and we could not appropriate such language to ourselves, or apply it to conversion. We showed that his work on the converts of the disciples was through the word. "But," says my opponent, "Christ gave the whole gospel, yet they were to stay till the Holy Spirit was given." If this gift was in conversion and for conversion, the apostles were never converted till Pentecost. But why were they to tarry? Jesus tells us. The Comforter would recall to mind all Jesus said, show them things to come, guide them into all truth, inspire them, and qualify them to preach and furnish the New Testament to the church.

He had to come, they had to be endued with power from on high, that the signs Mark speaks of should follow their preaching. Why did these follow? Heb. iii. 3. To establish the divinity of their mission and the religion they preached. The Comforter attesting the divine origin of the gospel, and his ordinary work in conversion, are not the same.

His next argument was that the Spirit witnessed with our spirits, that we are children of God. We have repeatedly asked him to show

that this rendered direct impact necessary; but he failed to do so. We then showed that a person like the Spirit can bear testimony only in words. We showed by a dozen scriptures that he is always said to bear witness by his words—where he bore witness he did it by words. We showed from John that it was by his word assuring our hearts on account of our works, that we were children of God, that he bare witness that we were children of God.

He then attempted to avoid this, by claiming that as word and Spirit were spoken of, they operated independently, and each had a work, and the Spirit, he assumed, did his independent of the word, by direct impact. We then laid down this law, that when the same thing is said to be done by two different things, we are not to assume that they necessarily operate independently, but that they work together, and that when one is a person and the other an instrument, we understand the person did it by the instrument. Hence the Spirit does the work through the word, his instrument, and not independent of it, by direct impact. Nor does the instrument operate independent of the word.

Next he read that conversion was compared to a birth of the Spirit, to a being begotten of the Spirit, to being quickened by the Spirit, being made alive. We asked him to show how this made direct action necessary. He never attempted it. We then showed that Jesus said we were begotten of the Spirit by hearing his words. That John, Paul, Peter and James all said we were begotten by the word of truth, by the gospel, by or in believing the truth. David said we were quickened by the word, that we are renewed by the word.

He asserted that no one but God could regenerate man. Granted; but must he do it by direct impact? The gentleman never attempted to show it. We then showed that Paul declared that the gospel was God's power unto salvation, or that God exercised his power in conversion in the gospel, that men are saved by the gospel.

He next befogged the question by a lot of mist about the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit. The renewal was the washing, and how could one wash without contact? We showed the gross literalness of washing by contact of the Spirit as a substance—that they were different, for the Spirit would not be guilty of such nonsense if both were the same. We then showed washing and renewal were Mark's baptism and belief, and Jesus' birth of the water and Spirit, or baptism and faith. David says he was renewed by the word or truth. Paul says Christ cleansed his church by the washing of water, or baptism.

Next conversion was a re-creation. We asked him how that rendered direct impact necessary. He asserted man was passive and the work was entirely God's, hence an agency or instrumentality like the word, that man had to use, could not be used. We showed from Ezekiel that God required the Jews to make unto themselves clean hearts, and showed from David that man and the Spirit accomplished it by using the word.

He next appealed to the anointing done by the Holy Spirit. We asked him to show that must be by direct impact. He compared the action of the Spirit to a literal anointing, thus grossly materializing

the idea. We showed that John in the same sentence said "the anointing was the truth."

Next men are said to be dead in trespasses. Can not God make them alive except by direct impact? David says he makes them alive or quickens them by his word. Christ says his words are spirit and life, or they furnish the sinner spirit and life.

Man is in darkness. David says the entrance of God's word gives light. Next the natural and spiritual man are referred to to show that man could not be benefited by the word without this direct impact. We showed that Paul meant man in a state of nature, or man without the revelation of the Spirit by the natural man; and man with revelation, or illuminated by God's revealed word given by the Spirit, by the spiritual man. We confirmed this by an appeal to where Paul said, "the word discerns our thoughts," or enables us to discern what God would have us to be.

Man receives a new heart in conversion. But must it be done by the direct impact of the Spirit of God? David says, Psalm li.:

"6. Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom."

How shall this be done? "Make me to hear with gladness. Create a clean heart in me." By truth, wisdom, by hearing, David says God creates a clean, or new heart.

We are sanctified by the Spirit. How, by direct impact? Let Jesus tell us. John xvii. 17:

"17. Sanctify them by thy truth: thy word is truth."

He wants to know next if all the works of the Spirit are not internal? Most assuredly they are. But must they therefore be produced by direct contact or impact? Is not the influence of the truth on our minds and hearts internal? The Spirit works within us through the truth.

Next infants, idiots, and pious heathen must be regenerated, or be lost. They can not through the word, hence it must be done through the direct impact of the Holy Spirit. Now we object to this assumption, that the necessity of regeneration is untaught by the word, is contradicted by it, for Jesus tells us of such as little children is the kingdom of heaven. Again, it is something of which we can have no knowledge whatever. How does he know what is done to an infant or idiot? His pious idolater is certainly a rich idea. He belongs to the gentleman by right of discovery.

Next the devil tempts men, and the Spirit must work by direct impact to counteract him. Not unless the devil works by direct impact, and not even then, for God would exert a higher power through his perfect word than the devil could even then. But the devil has not exercised supernatural power by direct impact, since the demoniac possessions of our Saviour's time. There is no necessity for direct impact, since then, to counteract his influence.

His final quotation was, that we are sealed with the Spirit, as the earnest or pledge of our inheritance. We showed, by referring to all the cases where the word seal was used, that it meant confirm by words. We are then established, or confirmed in our faith, by the promises of God in the words of the Spirit.

Thus have we reviewed all his quotations, and shown conclusively that all power he has brought forward as instances of direct impact, was produced by and through the word. He has utterly failed to sustain his affirmative.

You will remember that we opened our argument, or rather prepared the way for it, by an inquiry into the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as taught by the Scriptures. We showed that there is a divine spiritual person, known as the Holy Spirit. That there were two manifestations of the Holy Spirit, the ordinary and the extraordinary. The extraordinary was by direct action, or impact of the Spirit of God on the spirit of man, taking possession of his powers and faculties, and using them for a certain end. It was for a special purpose, was transitory and miraculous, and ceased as soon as its object was accomplished, and this manifestation ceased altogether when its objects were accomplished. It may be divided into the inspiration of men before Christ, and the miraculous powers that existed in the apostolic churches. Some divide the power that existed in the church, into the baptism of the Spirit, and the gift of the Spirit by the imposition of the apostles' hands. They only differed in the way they were given. Inspiration before Christ was given to good and bad men alike. Indeed, this miraculous operation of the Spirit was not given for the purpose of making those better who were influenced by it, and it never did. They were left by it as they were before. This, then, was not a moral influence, or power, on those to whom it was given. This influence has ceased.

The ordinary operation is by appeals to reason, heart, and conscience through motives, and is common to all ages in which revelation was given or has existed. It was never the subject of special promise. This may be divided into reproof of the sinner, and the guidance and comforting of the saint. They differ only in the relation of the person affected by them. To the sinner the Spirit is an outward reprover. In the saint he is an indwelling guest, dwelling in him richly in the influences of God's word. He uses, however, the same means in each case, the word of truth. We showed from the scriptures that this is the only power or manifestation exerted in conversion.

We inquired next what works the Spirit has done or does for men. We then showed that inspiration, revelation, the baptism of the Spirit, and giving miraculous gifts, had ceased, for their object was accomplished and Paul declared they should cease.

We pointed out here the sectarian source of error in claiming for themselves all that was promised to the apostles and apostolic churches, and existed in those churches. You can see now the application I have made of this preliminary work. It has enabled me to take every passage, in which my opponent found direct impact, out of his hands, by showing that it was the miraculous manifestation of the Spirit, and has ceased.

We examined every other passage he produced, and showed positively that the work of the Spirit was also ascribed to the word, or to the Spirit through the word, and not by direct impact.

We then proceeded to show what conversion was. We showed that it was a moral change of the spirit or heart. It is not only a

change of views, but a change of affections, feelings, desires, and volition, consequent on such change of views, and includes both mind and heart. But man has the same powers and faculties after that he had before. No new physical, moral, religious, rational, or emotional faculty has been imparted.

His ideas have been changed, his belief or faith changed, his religious nature aroused and directed to, and centered on, a proper object, his emotional nature directed to proper ends and purified, and his physical nature brought under proper control. Next we showed that faith accomplished all this, for it is the moving, vitalizing, energizing principle ill all this change. The scriptures ascribe all this to faith.

We then inquired what is faith, and showed that it was a belief with the whole heart of God's word, and the trust, reliance, and confidence resulting from such belief; and that it was based on testimony and evidence. The scriptures say, "Faith comes by hearing the word of God;" then this great change is produced by faith, or the word. Such was our first argument.

2 No power except through the word is needed for man's conversion. It is a moral change of mind and heart, and must be produced by motives, or by the power of truth. God never employs more means than are necessary; hence he never converts by direct impact. He inspired men in that way, but never converted.

3. Any more powerful influence would destroy man's responsibility. Any influence by direct impact, independent of motive, must irresistibly influence men to be effectual. If it does, man is a mere machine. The case of Balaam shows that men are not responsible under direct impact. He said he was not responsible for what he did.

4. The absurdities of the doctrine of direct impact show its falsity. All men must be converted this way. Why are they not converted? Either because God does not influence all, which charges him with injustice, or because men can resist the direct impact of God's spirit, his almighty power, when exerted in a way in which their wills are not appealed to at all—a palpable absurdity.

5. The Spirit will not do for men what they are conscious they can and should do for themselves. Either God has erred in giving us the intuitive idea that we can and should obey his truth, or we can and should do so; and the Spirit will not do for us what we can do for ourselves.

6. Christ and his apostles always talked as if the conversion of men depended on the word. They never mentioned direct impact. The gentleman never found an instance. It would be a wearisome repetition to repeat the dozens of passages which clearly show this. They always represent the Spirit as operating through the word.

7. We assert that in no land or age has direct contact been a part of man's conversion. Never has a man been converted except through the word. The gentleman found not an instance.

8. The work of the Spirit was to reprove the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. This can be done alone by the use of the truth.

9 The Spirit can not convert the sinner by direct impact, for our Saviour says the world, or sinners, can not receive him.

10. All conversions have ever been through the word. An analysis of all the conversions in the Bible showed this.

11. The law, or word of God, is perfect, converting the soul. So says the Bible. That alone is sufficient. We might have quoted that and stopped.

12. All that is ascribed to the Spirit is also ascribed to the word, showing that the Spirit always operates through the word.

13. Resisting the words of the Spirit in his inspired servants is called resisting the Spirit, showing that in that he exercises his power.

14. God in all ages has accomplished all he has done, by his word. Creation was by his word, regeneration is also.

15. This sectarian figment of speculative theology has been a prolific cause of bigotry, fanaticism, delusion, and crime. Men have claimed this direct impact, and have arrogated to themselves inspiration, sanctification, immunity from sin and error, and have plunged into every abominable excess. Mistaking their own distempered imaginings, and the operations of their own erroneous and sinful hearts, for the direct impact of God's Spirit, they have rushed into the fanaticism of the early ages, the monstrous crimes of the fanatics of Germany, the errors of the followers of Irving, the Jerks of our own country, and the excesses of Methodist camp-meetings and revivals.

Let me adjure you, my hearers, to beware of such lying delusions. Take the word of God, which is able to make you wise unto salvation, and perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works, which is spirit and life, which is perfect, converting the soul, which quickens and makes alive, whose entrance gives light, which begets you, renews you, sanctifies you, which is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and pierces even to dividing soul and spirit, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, and make it a light to your feet and a lamp to your faith. Be guided by its divine precepts. Let them dwell richly in your hearts. Let them be exemplified in your lives, and the spirit of the living God will dwell in you, seal you, and be an earnest of your eternal inheritance. Purify your hearts by obeying the truth, through the Spirit, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever, and when judged by this word you shall receive its exceeding precious promise of eternal life.—[*Time expired.*]



**METHODIST BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.**



# METHODIST BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

---

## PROPOSITION FOR DISCUSSION:

*The Discipline of (he Methodist Episcopal Church contains statements of doctrine and enjoins church usages that are contrary to the word of God.* BRADEN affirms.

## MR. BRADEN'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Permit me to say that I affirm the proposition you have just heard read, with no feeling of enmity toward the organization known as the Methodist Episcopal Church, or its members. I affirm it because I regard it to be true, and as we have been discussing several of the tenets of that body of people, and with an official and recognized exponent of their views, it seemed appropriate that we should review their organization and those things in which they differ from my own brethren, and as I believe the word of God. I hope all partisan feeling will be laid aside, and the simple query, "Is this proposition true?" be the sole subject of thought.

There are several reasons why I should entertain no feelings of enmity toward the Methodist Church. I once had a father and mother whose memory I revere as tenderly as ever a son revered the memory of departed parents. My mother was for many years a Methodist, was until the differences arose concerning the slavery question.

My father was raised a Methodist, and was a worshiper with them much of his life, though not formally connected with them. My venerable grandfather had been a Methodist sixty-six years when he died. I have many relatives connected now with that church. Also I have worshiped with them for years, and acted as Bible-class teacher and class leader for them, and filled the pulpits of their preachers. My name is now on the records of the Elgin Methodist Church, as a member of one of the classes and its leader, though I never subscribed to its Discipline. I then should have no feeling of animosity toward either the church or its people.

I will first read and indorse one article of this Discipline.

SEC. 2, Art. 5. "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought necessary or requisite to salvation."

Paul, in 2 Timothy iii. 15, clearly expresses the same idea: "The Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation; all scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

To this I subscribe. I accept the scriptures as the Christian's perfect, only, and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice; and I believe that what can not be read therein, nor proved thereby, should not be required of any man in church organizations. If read therein and proved thereby, what need have we of anything else besides the scriptures, in which we read, and by which we prove what we require in church organizations?

But it may be asked, how do you read any practice or doctrine in the scriptures, or how do you prove it by them? I know of but two ways:

1. Apostolic precept. Did Christ or his apostles teach it as a Christian doctrine, or enjoin it as a Christian practice?

2. Apostolic example. Did Christ or the apostles sanction it as a part of Christian doctrine, or practice it as a Christian practice?

If a practice or doctrine has not one of these sanctions, it can not be required of any one as an article of faith, or a church usage or practice, without a violation of the scriptures. Some things may be practiced as expedients, but can not be required of any one without a violation of the scriptures. Then our first specification is that the formation and use of this Discipline, as a rule of faith and practice, is a violation of the plain teachings of God's word, and a contradiction of Paul's language to Timothy, quoted above.

My second objection is based on the title to this little book. It reads, "Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church." If these persons are Christians and wish to organize a church of Christ, they have violated the scriptures in the name they have given to their church, and the name they give to themselves and each other. I read of the "Church of Christ," the "Church of God," in the scriptures, but nowhere do we read of the "Methodist Church." We should give to our churches the name the apostles gave to theirs, wear the name they wore, and if we do not, we violate our rule of apostolic precept and example. It is a matter of great moment what name we wear. Husbands expect their wives to wear their name, and if they do not, regard it as a reproach on them of the most serious character. The church is the bride of Christ and should wear his name. If she does not, she is guilty of spiritual adultery, and will be disowned by her spouse as she has disowned him.

If we are followers of Christ, members of the one family, his family, we should wear his name. In Isaiah lxii. 2, God, in speaking of the new church or rather of his church, says:

" 2. Thou shalt be called by a new name which the Lord thy God shall call."

In Acts xi. 26, we first meet this new name:

"26. And the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch."

Did the apostles use and sanction this name? Acts xxvi. 28, 29:

"28. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

"29. And Paul said, I would to God that not only thou, but also all who hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am."

That is. they were Christians. Paul accepted and gloried in the name.

The name disciple, believer, and many others, were also applied, but they can be applied also to the disciples and followers of others as well as to those of Christ. Let disciples of Luther, Wesley, Calvin and Menno, be called Wesleyans, Lutherans, Calvinists, or Mennonites; but let the followers of Christ wear his name alone. In 1 Peter iv. 16, we read:

"16. But if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed."

Here we have apostolic example for this name. In James ii. 7, the apostles ask:

"Do they not blaspheme the worthy name by which ye are called?"

The followers of Christ were called by his name or were called Christians. In Ephesians iii. 14, we read:

"14. Our Lord Jesus Christ of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is called."

The whole family is called by his name. Does Christ regard wearing his name as to be commended? In Revelations ii. 13, he, in his solemn exhortations to the churches, commends the church in Pergamos as follows:

"13. I know thy works, and that thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith." Wearing his name is regarded as essential, as holding fast his faith or doctrine.

But do the scriptures condemn wearing any name but that of Christ? Let us read 1 Corinthians i. 12,13:

"12. Now, this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ."

Or one called himself a Paulite, another an Apollosite, another a Cephasite, and a fourth a Christian. Now Paul condemns wearing party names. He condemns three of these, and one he does not. He asks:

"13. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized into the name of Paul?"

Then they were baptized into the name of Christ, and should wear his name, and that alone. So teaches this scripture as plainly as it can be done. Then this Discipline in giving another name to the church, the bride of Christ, than that of her spouse, and in giving any other name to the followers of Christ than that into which they were baptized, violates clear apostolic precept and example.

My next specification is found also on the title-page. I read "The Doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church." In the scriptures we read of doctrines of men, and doctrines of devils, but nowhere of doctrines of Christ, or of Christian doctrines. The word in the plural is always used in a bad sense. The doctrine of Christ is a unit, is one, a grand whole, a glorious unity. The church of Christ should have the faith, the doctrine of Christ, and if the Methodist Church

has doctrines, it has more than the church of Christ, and more than God through his word gave to his church.

My fourth specification is found in Sec. 2, Art. 1. God is said to be "without body and parts." Now I do not deny the truth of this, but how can it be proved? It is declared "no one hath seen God at anytime;" that "no one by searching can find out or define God." This Discipline presumes to do it. How do our Methodist friends know what they there affirm? It is an attempt to do what the Holy Spirit who searches the deep things of God has not done. It is blasphemous presumption. It is treading on holy ground with sandaled feet. It is running uncalled. It is like all human creeds—an attempt to be wise beyond what is written, and, as such, is a plain violation of apostolic precept and example.

My fourth specification is against another declaration of the same article. It is declared that "in the Godhead there are three persons of one substance." Now to this we object; that is nowhere declared or taught in the scriptures, nor can it be proved by them. It is a human dogma or speculation, and a presumptuous attempt to do what God has not seen fit to do—an attempt to be wise beyond what is written. The scriptures declare that there is a Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that these three are in some sense one, but they nowhere teach or explain how they are one. I do not know how they are one. I do not believe how they are one, for I know nothing about it, and I can not believe what I do not understand. There are only two scriptures that refer to this question, and they only mention it incidentally, and do not even hint a unity of substance. In our Saviour's prayer, in John xvii., he prays that his disciples "may be one as he and his Father are one." Certainly this unity is not a unity of substance. 1 John v. 7, we read:

"7. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one; and there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one."

The first verse is unanimously rejected by all good critics, but admitting its authenticity, it merely affirms that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one in bearing testimony. It does not hint a unity of substance. John x. 30, Jesus says:

"30. I and the Father are one."

There is no unity of substance taught here. Then this doctrine is utterly untaught by the scriptures.

Again there are not two preachers in this house, or in the whole Methodist Church, who will explain that declaration of this article alike. Further it is a contradiction of plain common-sense and the meaning of the words employed. "Three persons of one substance." What is meant by substance? Does not the language materialize God? Does it not contradict the assertion that God is without body? Can there be substance without body? Again we are told by others that "there is but one Being, but in this one Being there are three persons." We quote from another creed. Now what definition can be given of being that will not apply equally well to person. One person and yet three persons. All these jargons show the utter folly

of man's attempting to be wise beyond what is written. We can not understand much less explain the arithmetic of the Infinite Jehovah. Then this article is a palpable violation of apostolic example which has left this subject without explanation, as clear a violation of the apostolic command, "Avoid untaught questions."

Our sixth is found in the second article. "Christ suffered, was crucified, was dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." Here it is asserted that Christ reconciles the Father to us. A more palpable contradiction of the scriptures can not be conceived. Romans v. 10:

"10. When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son."

2 Corinthians v. 18, 19, 20:

"18. All things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation;

"19. To-wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation.

"20. Now, then, as ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

Ephesians ii. 15:

"15. Christ has abolished the enmity that he might reconcile both Jew and Gentile to God in one body by the cross."

Colossians i. 20:

"20. It pleased the Father, having made peace by the blood of the cross of Christ, to reconcile all things to himself."

The Discipline teaches, Christ died to reconcile God to us. The scriptures say he died to reconcile us to God. A more palpable contradiction can not be conceived. God is not changed or reconciled in conversion, but man has to be changed and reconciled to God, whom he has injured or sinned against, for we always hate those whom we injure. This whole theory is based on the idea that God is wrath with man, in the sense of implacability or a feeling of revenge, and he must be placated and appeased, or he must have his vengeance satisfied. It must be gratified on some one. He must see blood flow before he can be appeased and placated and be willing to forgive sin. This idea is the basis of all so-called orthodox theology and doctrines of atonement, from the days of Augustine, its author, down through Calvinism into modern mourners' benches and seekers' circles.

What is the object of all these mourners' benches, these seekers' circles, these long prayers, these weeks and months of mourning and seeking, these long vociferous and importunate cries to God to "come down now," to speak peace to these poor waiting souls, these affirmations that they have done their part and are waiting for him to do his, these fervent shoutings of Charles Wesley's couplet, "We will not let thee go, until thou dost a blessing bestow?" Is it not to placate the wrath of God by penance of prayers and weeping and mourning, till he will relent and pardon? Is it not to weary him by their importunities till he will relent and be reconciled to pardoning the sinner?

The whole thing is aptly illustrated by a circumstance that happened in the town of Johnson, Ohio. A gentleman was looking on

such a scene. They had a large benchful of mourners; they had been praying and shouting and screaming for pardon for hours. Another gentleman approached him and remarked:

"Well, Mr. B———, will they succeed in converting those persons?"

"O," remarked the other, "that is done now. Has been done for hours. Have you not heard them say they had done all they could and were waiting for God to do his? They are waiting for an answer of peace from him."

"Why," said the other, "what are they trying to do then?"

"They have converted the mourners," said the other. "They did that when they became mourners. They are now trying to convert God, and get him willing to do what he has promised to do, and declared himself infinitely willing to do."

Was not the criticism just? Is not this the very idea contained in this idea of reconciling God to us? Nowhere in the scriptures, nowhere in the worship of God, as there recorded, do we read of such an idea, or of such scenes as these mourner's bench scenes.

They have but one parallel. In 1 Kings xviii. we read of similar scenes, but it was in the worship of Baal, and like Elijah, we have been tempted sometimes at such scenes, to say to those engaged:

"Cry aloud, for he is talking, or he is on a journey, or he is pursuing, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked."

How different the prayer and worship of the prophet of God. How incompatible with the character of God, as presented in the scriptures, such scenes:

"As I live I take no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that he should turn to me and live."

"All day long have I stretched out my hand to a gainsaying people. Lo! I stand knocking at the door, and if any man will open I will enter."

In Hebrews ii. 17:

"17. Wherefore it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in all things pertaining to God, and to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."

1 John: "We love God because he first loved us."

Then God has not to be placated or reconciled unto us. He first loved us, and gave his Son to die for us, and is waiting with a love that passes all understanding, and beseeches us to be reconciled to him, and we are adjured to approach him. Hebrews iv. 15:

"15. For we have not a High Priest who can not be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted, like as we are, but without sin. Let us, therefore, come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy."

Then we have clearly showed that this doctrine of the Discipline is contrary to the word of God.

The practice based on it is as palpable a violation of God's word. The apostles had no such scenes. We do not read of them at all in the scriptures. They preached the gospel, men believed, and they told them what to do, led them forward to do it, and sent them on their way rejoicing the same hour.

My next specification is in article 6, where we are told, "they are not



to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises." Now we affirm that there is not a single promise in the books of the Mosaic law and commands that reaches beyond this life. The later prophets unfolded the future world to some extent, but its existence is not suggested in the commands, rewards, threats, and punishments of the books of the Mosaic law.

My next is in the latter part of this article, where it is said that "no Christian whatsoever is freed from obedience to the commandments that are called moral," meaning the ten commands of Moses. Now we affirm that these commands are called the covenant by Moses, and that Paul tells us in more than a dozen places that this old covenant is done away. This whole system of orthodoxy Judaizes the Christian religion, and subordinates it to the Jewish law, which was abolished by Christ. It attempts to put the new wine of Christianity into the old bottles of Judaism, to sew the new cloth of the kingdom unto the old worn-out garment of Judaism. These are done away and we have nothing to do with them, except as is affirmed in the law of Christ.

My next specification is found in article 7, concerning "Original or Birth Sin." "Original sin standeth not in the followers of Adam (as the Pelagians vainly teach). It is the corruption of the nature of every one that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil and that continually."

There is no doubt from the preaching and writings of those who framed the article that it was intended to teach positively, as language could, the doctrine of total hereditary depravity; but many of our modern Methodist divines explain it away till they make it almost identical with "what the Pelagians vainly teach." Another illustration of the efficacy of a creed to perpetuate in a church the views of its authors, and to secure uniformity of opinion among those who adopt it. I am somewhat curious to see what particular phase of this doctrine the gentleman will set forth from that article. The doctrine used to be stated in this way:

"That in consequence of Adam's transgression, and the depraved and corrupt nature we inherited, we have become so corrupt as to be utterly incapable of originating a single good thought, impulse, or volition, and our every thought, impulse, volition and action is evil, and evil only, and that continually."

That is taught by this article. Now we object to it, that it is untaught, unaffirmed in the Bible. We object to it, that the very fact that God presents to man a scheme of redemption, and exhorts him to accept it and to obey him, or do what is right, shows that man is not totally depraved; that there is something good in the human heart and human nature to which God appeals, when he presents the gospel, on which he bases his expectations that man will accept and be saved, and which justifies him in condemning man when he does not accept it, or it would be a tremendous force, a stupendous piece of mockery, a hideous cruelty and insult, to present to man what he can not accept, for man can not accept the gospel unless he can originate a good impulse.

We object also that no one believes this doctrine. We do not regard our unconverted children, friends and neighbors as totally depraved. No one does, or we would look on them with fear and horror. Think of a Methodist preacher taking to his bosom a mass of total depravity, such a mass of corruption as this article makes an unconverted person in the person of an unconverted wife. Again did Christ, when he set a little child before his disciples, and told them that unless they were converted and became like that child, they could not enter the kingdom of heaven, intend to teach that they must become like one, who this article declares "is of his own nature inclined to evil and that continually?" No, the whole doctrine is a palpable contradiction of the word of God, our common-sense and the instincts of our hearts wrought in us by God himself.

My next specification is based on the 8th article. It is declared that "the condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such that he can not turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and works to faith and calling upon God, wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will."

Now if that meant merely that man could not devise the scheme of redemption, and could not without revelation emancipate himself from sin, we would cordially subscribe to it. But it means that when God has given revelation, presented to man the gospel as the power of God unto salvation, in consequence of our own sin and Adam's transgression, we are so depraved as to be utterly incapable of originating a single good thought, impulse or volition in response to God's appeals in the gospel, until, by direct impact of the Spirit of God, we are made able to believe the gospel and will to obey it. Now we object to this that it violates and contradicts those exhortations of God, Christ and the servants of God, when they exhort men to make unto themselves a clean heart and renew within themselves a right spirit, which declare that man's condemnation is because he can believe the gospel, and can will to obey it, and will not.

Again it teaches the repulsive doctrine of reprobation; for if man can not originate a good impulse, why do some men do so and why do others never do so? Because God does not give them this ability. Why does he not? Our Methodist friends dare not answer. Either because he will not, and thus passes by a portion of mankind as decreed to eternal wrath, which is Calvinism; or because men can accept or resist the influences of his Spirit, or can originate good actions or can have a good will. This doctrine contradicts the whole theory of the scheme of redemption and every exhortation contained in God's word.

My next specification is in article 9 and reads: "Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a very wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort.", I know that in assailing this I am assailing the keystone of Methodist theology—what is as dear to the Methodist, as the apple of his eye—but truth compels me to say that it is a most palpable contradiction of God's word. Let us compare them:

"Man is justified by faith only."—Methodist Discipline.

"By works a man is justified and not by faith only."—Bible, James ii. 22.

Can there be a more palpable contradiction? This little book says a man is justified by faith only, or faith without work. God's word says he is justified by works and faith, or the obedience of faith. Which will you accept?

Our next specification is in article 17, "Baptism is a sign of regeneration or the new birth." This is nowhere taught in God's word. It contradicts the teachings of my opponent. He says with Peter that it is the seeking of a good conscience toward God, or that, in baptism, we seek a good conscience toward God. This book says it is a sign of the new birth, and thus contradicts God's word.

Our next specification is that it tells us that "the baptism of infants is to be retained in the church." Now such an idea, as we most triumphantly showed on the third proposition, is utterly untaught in God's word, and also in direct violation of the law of baptism, which limits that ordinance to penitent believers.

Now we have shown you that in teaching that Christ reconciles God to us, and that man is justified by faith only, this book flatly contradicts God's word as flatly as it can be done. We have shown many other contradictions. We have shown that it presumptuously attempts to teach what God has left untaught, and lead to confusion, error and absurdity.

We do not say that such was the intention, but such most palpably has been the result. If this book does not contain statements of doctrine contrary to God's word, there can be no such doctrines. If a plain and positive affirmation of what the word of God most explicitly and positively contradicts, does not amount to stating the doctrine contrary to God's word; it can not be done. I have most completely sustained my affirmative.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will notice the last charge that the gentleman has made against the Discipline while it is yet fresh in my memory. He objects to the Discipline because it asserts that baptism is a sign of regeneration. You will remember that we discussed this point on a former proposition, and I proved, I think conclusively, that the position of my friend was untenable, and that baptism is a sign of regeneration. This question has been finally settled.

The gentleman quotes the language of Peter again: "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh), but the answer of a good conscience toward God." He tells us again that *eperootema* signifies the demand for a good conscience, in the sense of the condition upon which a good conscience is bestowed. But on a former proposition I showed you clearly that *eperootema* has no such signification. It means the answer of a good conscience, the seeking for a good conscience, etc., but it never means the condition upon which a good conscience is bestowed. It answers to a good conscience made good by something outside of

itself; it seeks for a good conscience, but seeks it outside of itself; it never makes the conscience good, as the exposition of my opponent makes this passage affirm. But this question was also settled on a former proposition, and I will let it rest there.

My opponent objects to the Discipline again because it teaches the doctrine of justification by faith only. This, he tells us, is a positive contradiction of the word of God, which teaches that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only. Here he quoted again the passage in James ii 21-24:

"21. Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?

"22. Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

"23. And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.

"24. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

But, as I showed on a former proposition, James is talking about the justification of a righteous man, in the sense of approval, while the Discipline is speaking of the justification of a sinner, in the sense of pardon. The only question between us here is, when were Abraham's sins pardoned? When was he justified in this evangelical sense? Was it before he was circumcised, or was it after he was circumcised, when Isaac was a young man? I say that Abraham was justified, that his sins were pardoned, before he was circumcised, before Isaac was born; while Mr. Braden says he was not justified, his sins were not pardoned, until he offered up Isaac on Mount Moriah. Now which of us is right? Now let us examine Paul, and see what he says about it. Paul, there is a question between Mr. Braden and I in regard to the manner and time of Abraham's justification. He says that Abraham was justified by works, and not until he offered up Isaac on Mount Moriah, while I say he was justified by faith alone without works, and that before he was circumcised—before Isaac was born; and I want you to settle this question for us. Paul replies, Romans iv. 2-8:

"2. For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God.

"3. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.

"4. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.

"5. But to him that worketh not, but believeth *in* him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

"6. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,

"7. Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

"8. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

Here Paul decides the first question in my favor. He tells us that Abraham was justified by faith without works. If this is not justifica-

tion by faith only, I would like to know what it is. How can a man be justified by works, when "he worketh not?" How can a man be justified by works when faith is counted for righteousness unto him without works?" Will the gentleman tell us? But, Paul, when was faith reckoned to Abraham for righteousness? To this Paul replies, Romans iv. 9-12:

"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.

"10. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

"11. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:

"12. And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised."

This settles the question. Paul decides that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness before he was circumcised. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. Here Paul declares that Abraham was justified before Isaac was born, and that circumcision was given to him as a "seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." This forever settles the question in regard to the time when Abraham was justified, and also as to the manner of his justification; and as Paul assures us that all sinners are justified as Abraham was, that the same faith is imputed unto us for righteousness who believe in Jesus Christ, the doctrine of the Discipline is thus proven to be scriptural, while the doctrine of Mr. Braden is proven to be flatly opposed to the word of God. Now, Mr. Braden, can you see how this little book and the Bible harmonize on the doctrine of justification by faith only? I think you can after this without any difficulty whatever.

I will now review the gentleman's speech in the order of his arguments. He tells us that he has no feeling of hostility toward us. I can also say that I entertain no feeling of hostility toward him or his church. But I have a feeling of hostility against his errors, and the heresies of his church, and I suppose that he has a hostility against the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from the manner in which he talks about them.

His first objection to the Discipline is to the name—"Methodist Episcopal Church." Why, he asks, do we assume this name, and not the name Christian? I answer, because the household of faith is divided into different denominations, all bearing the name of Christ; but each one must have some particular appellation by which it can be distinguished from the rest; and we, as one part of the general church of Christ, are known and distinguished by the name or title of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The name Christian applies equally to all bodies of evangelical believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, although they may be known and recognized among men, and among each other

by different names. Evangelical Christians all teach the same fundamental doctrines, and practice the same gospel morality, and are all equally entitled to the name Christian, and all wear it; but they are recognized among each other, and before the world, by different distinguishing titles, and there is nothing either unscriptural or improper in it; and all this harping about the name Christian amounts to nothing; and only shows that those who make so much ado about the name, feel that they are deficient in the substance of Christianity, and they want to make up this deficiency by glory in the name.

The gentleman tells us that no man has a right to wear any other name but that which was originally given to believers. But how was the name Christian first given to the disciples? Was it assumed by the apostles, or was it given as a term of reproach? It was given as a term of reproach to distinguish the followers of Christ. This name was attached to the followers of Christ, just as the name Platonists was applied to the followers of Plato, and Arians to the followers of Arius. It was in this way that the name originated; and the disciples accepted it because they acknowledged themselves the followers of Christ.

But is this the new name that was to be given to the church under the gospel? Most certainly not. What; then, is the new name that God had promised to his church? Under the Old Testament dispensation the worshipers of God were called servants. This was the name by which they were known and distinguished. Under the gospel the worshipers of God are no more called servants, but sons; and this is the new name which the mouth of the Lord has promised to name his servants under the gospel of Christ, and which specifically points out the change of relation from servitude to sonship.

But my opponent tells us that the use of any other name than Christian is condemned. But do not the scriptures themselves use other terms in speaking of the followers of Christ? Christians are called "disciples," "believers," etc. The use of such names is surely not condemned. Christians are not forbidden to distinguish themselves by names or titles by which they may be distinguished from others, and their peculiar and distinctive views and operations may be known and set forth in the present divided state of the church, while they bear the general name, Christian, and acknowledge Christ as their only Lord and Lawgiver. This the gentleman assumes without the shadow of reason or any authority; and then bases his objection upon his assumption.

His second objection to the Discipline is, that in our first article of religion it attempts to teach something that we can know nothing about, when it declares that "God is without body or parts." I doubt not that my opponent fully agrees with the Discipline on this article, notwithstanding his objection to it. Many persons have believed and taught that God possesses body and parts, that he is a material being; and this article sets forth the true doctrine of divine revelation, in opposition to this heretical materialism in regard to the nature of the divine essence. It is not unscriptural to set forth what the scriptures teach, in opposition to the teachings of error. It is not unscriptural to set forth what the common-sense of mankind and the express dec-

larations of the scriptures themselves declare to be true—that God is a Spirit, and consequently without body or parts. God is omnipresent; but a body can be present only in one place at a time; therefore God is not a body. Thus we prove that the Discipline does not attempt to teach what we know nothing about; but that in this article it sets forth what both common-sense and the word of God declare to be true—that God is a Spirit, without body or parts.

His third objection to the Discipline is its teaching in regard to the trinity of persons in the Godhead, united in one substance. Here he objects again that we know nothing of the nature or mode of the divine existence. But we do know that there is one God, and that he has revealed himself to us as existing in the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and we know that in these three persons there is but one substance, one nature. This is all expressly revealed in the scriptures; and here our Discipline is again supported by the word of God, in its teachings, in opposition to heretics.

His fourth objection against the Discipline is brought against the doctrine of reconciliation, set forth in our second article, which declares that Christ "was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." I proved to you, in discussing the preceding proposition, that my opponent was a Universalist in his doctrine on satanic influence; and now he has taken the Universalist position on the doctrine of reconciliation! My Universalist friend, Mr. Beard (the Moderator), will have to take him yet, in spite of himself. [Laughter.] He told us, on the former proposition, that there is no satanic influence in operation on the hearts of men at all; that there has never been a man tempted of the devil since the days of the apostles. And now he tells us that Christ did not die to reconcile God to man, but only to reconcile man to God. How does he prove this? Why, he tells us, "God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." This is true; but how did God get into Christ, reconciling the world unto himself? Is God reconciled to the world anywhere else but in Christ? Was God eternally reconciled to man? If so, what was the necessity of the death of Christ? According to the doctrine of my opponent, there was no necessity for the death of Christ at all. But the death of Christ was a propitiation, a satisfaction for sin. Whom did it propitiate, God or man? Hosea Ballou, the father of Universalism, tells us that man is the injured party by sin, and consequently satisfaction must be made to him! The inevitable conclusion from this is, that the death of Christ was to propitiate man. And Mr. Braden's position will drive him irresistibly to the same revolting and blasphemous conclusion. The nature of the divine government is such, that God can not pardon sin without the claims of justice being met and satisfied. That satisfaction, that propitiation, is the blood—the death of Christ. God is not vindictive or implacable; but as a moral governor he can not pardon sin and ignore the claims of justice; therefore the death of Christ was necessary as a propitiation—a satisfaction to the claims of justice, "that God might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." This is precisely what is declared in our second article—that the death of Christ was for the purpose of reconciling his Father to us, in this sense and in this only.

In Colossians i. 19, 20, we read:

"19. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell;

"20. And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself: by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven."

I have frequently asked Universalists, when in discussion with them, what are the things which Christ reconciled in heaven through the blood of his cross, but I have never found one that could tell me. They admit that men must be reconciled to God before they get to heaven. God, they say, is eternally reconciled. What, then, I ask, was it that Christ reconciled in heaven? Nothing at all, according to Universalism and Mr. Braden. Go to the typical atonements of the shadowy dispensation of the past, and you will find in its types a full explanation of this passage of scripture, and what the things are that are reconciled in heaven. The high priest, "on the great day of atonement," entering the most holy place with the blood of the slain victim, and sprinkling the mercy-seat, and thus reconciling the most holy place, represented Christ entering the true "Holy of Holies," with his own blood, to make reconciliation for the sins of the world, so that through the reconciling blood of the slain Lamb of God, God can now be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. To whom, I ask, is this reconciliation for the sins of the people made? It is not to the people, but for the people; consequently it is to God that reconciliation is made by the death of Christ. Here the Discipline and the word of God agree again exactly; so this objection falls to the ground. Here again the gentleman has placed himself in direct antagonism to the word of God. Christ has entered into heaven to reconcile nothing, according to my opponent; for he tells us there is nothing in heaven to reconcile. What my opponent says is in direct opposition to the word of God, I prove to be expressly taught in the word of God. He flatly contradicts the word of God here, as he did on the question of chronology on a former proposition.

*Mr. Braden*—I call the gentleman to order. We are not now debating that question.

*Mr. Hug hey*—I am not debating that question at all. I simply referred to it as an illustration. What, I ask, did Christ reconcile in heaven when he entered into it with his own blood? He reconciled the government, the justice of God, by the propitiation of his own blood, to the pardon of the sinner, so that sin can be pardoned, and the justice and integrity of the divine government can be maintained, as Paul teaches in Romans iii. 24-26.

The gentleman tells us that the doctrine contained in our second article is the foundation of our mourner's bench, etc., and he objects *to it again on this account. I expected him to attack our custom of praying with and instructing penitent inquirers after the way of salvation, for this is so opposed to the very fundamental principles of his system that he could not well avoid it. According to his teaching there is no necessity of praying at all for pardon, nor indeed for anything else. There is no room left for prayer at all in his entire system. The sinner need not pray, for God is already reconciled, and all*



that the sinner has to do is to cease sinning, and the reconciliation is perfect. There is no need for the Christian to pray, for there is no spiritual influence exerted on the heart except through the truth addressed to the understanding; and as there is no spiritual influence there is no need of prayer. God, says my opponent, has done all for us he intends to do, and men must do the balance. If this is true, what need is there of prayer, either before, in, or after conversion?

Justin Martyr, A. D. 130, says:

"As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray, and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them."—Justin and Atemagoras, p. 51).

It seems from this that they had a mourner's bench in the very next generation after the apostles. It is rather an old institution, Mr. Braden; it is none of your new-fangled notions of modern times. My opponent differs widely from Justin Martyr and the apostolic Christians. He objects to unconverted men praying for pardon, or Christians praying with them. But the apostles themselves had a mourner's bench. After Samaria had received the word and Philip had baptized them, the church at Jerusalem sent "Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Here the apostles erected a mourner's bench, and prayed for the spiritual conversion of these baptized penitents. Such a proceeding was never known in the Campbellite Church! I shall make no reply to his remarks concerning our protracted meetings. Such remarks are fit only to come from a scoffing infidel, and ought to be treated with silent contempt.

The gentleman's fifth objection to the Discipline is, the scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith, and therefore the Discipline is unnecessary. When we reach the creed question I will then discuss it, but I prefer not entering into that question in advance. We do not have a Discipline to teach us the doctrines of the gospel; nor do we use it as a rule of faith, but to let the world know what we, as a people, understand the scriptures to teach on the fundamental principles of the gospel, and to distinguish us from those heretics who claim the Bible alone as their creed, and yet deny its holy doctrines. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is our rule of faith, and we recognize no other. Our Discipline itself declares that the word of God is the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice. But the position assumed by the gentleman's church, and others like his, has made it necessary that we should give to the world just such a statement of what we understand the scriptures to teach, as is found in our Discipline, in order to show that we are not heretics, but evangelical in our views and teachings.

His sixth objection against the Discipline is to our sixth article of religion, which affirms that the moral law is still binding upon Christians. The gentleman tells us this is a mistake, that the moral law was repealed by Christ, and we are not under obligation to obey it now. This is certainly a new position. I had supposed that the ten

commandments, written upon the tables of stone by the finger of God, were designed to be of perpetual obligation, but my opponent says this is not the case. The scriptures everywhere teach, and the whole church has always believed, that the moral law is of binding force now, and in the nature of things must ever be. This law—the ten commandments—constitutes the fundamental law of God's government over men; and they are expressly reaffirmed, the whole of them, by our Lord Jesus Christ, where he says: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." This, he tells us, embraces the whole law, and he lays it down as the fundamental law of his kingdom.

What part of the Old Testament was repealed by the gospel? I answer, the ceremonial and civil law of Moses, and this alone. The ceremonial law, with its types and shadows, pointing to the sacrificial offering of Jesus Christ, passed away when they were fulfilled. The civil statutes of the law passed away with the nation of Israel, but the obligation of the moral law, which prohibits idolatry, murder, theft, adultery, blasphemy, covetousness, etc., is still as binding on the consciences of men as when Moses descended from the cloud-capped summit of Sinai, with the tables of stone in his hands. Here again I prove that the Discipline and the scriptures are in perfect harmony, while my opponent stands squarely against the scriptures.

My opponent contends that we ought to observe the seventh day of the week for Sabbath, to be consistent with ourselves. But he certainly knows that a change of the day does not work a repeal of the law of the Sabbath. While in the New Testament the moral law is reaffirmed, we have apostolic example for the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and this is ample authority. Mr. Braden himself admits that apostolic example is sufficient to prove any practice scriptural; and it is notorious that the apostles observed the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath after the resurrection of Christ. Thus, while we have scriptural authority for the change of the day, we have none to sustain the position of my friend that the moral law has been repealed.

His seventh objection to the Discipline is to the doctrine of original sin, as set forth in our seventh article of religion. He denies the doctrine of native depravity, and holds that man has native ability to do what is right, and if this be not the case, he says it destroys man's free agency. When we say, "man is by nature depraved, totally depraved," we do not mean that he came into the world totally destitute of all good; but we do mean that by nature there is no good in him, and that whatever good he possesses, let it be much or little, it comes from Christ, and is not native, but gracious: it comes from the second, not the first Adam. Whatever good man possesses comes from grace, and not from nature, and consequently the doctrine of total native depravity is scriptural. Man is by nature "a child of wrath, dead in trespasses and in sins," but grace furnishes him a new capital to begin life with.

The reason everywhere assigned in the scriptures why man must be born again, is, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," either

in this language or that which is equivalent. Man, by his natural birth, is opposed to God, and hence he must be born of God, in order that he may be brought into harmony with God. Pardon puts away the guilt of actual transgression; regeneration cleanses us from spiritual pollution. The one finds its necessity in the fact that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," the other in the fact that our nature is corrupt, and must be renewed; so the necessity for a second—a spiritual birth—is found in the fact that by his natural birth man is depraved in heart and opposed to God.

His eighth objection to the Discipline is, that this doctrine of man's native inability destroys his moral agency. This is wholly untrue; for while man has no native ability to do right, he has gracious ability, and this restores the freedom that was lost by sin; for Christ is "the true light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." Here again our little book and the Bible agree perfectly—they stand side by side, and go hand in hand. My opponent would have us believe that there is no such thing as a sin of nature; or at least every argument that he has advanced goes to prove that he denies that there is any such thing as depravity of heart at all. I think I have some little logical acumen, but if there is any such thing in his argument as the corruption of nature, I have been unable to discover it. If I am wrong, I hope the gentleman will set me right. I have been unable to discover any sin in his argument, except the overt acts of actual violation of the law. Mr. Campbell, however, differs with Mr. Braden, and comes over to my side of the question, and tells us "there is a sin of nature." Mr Campbell says:

"There is, therefore, a sin of our nature as well as personal transgression. Some inappositely call the sin of our nature an original sin, as if the sin of Adam was the personal offense of all his children. True, indeed, it is; and our nature was corrupted by the fall of Adam before it was transmitted to us; and hence that hereditary imbecility to do good, and that proneness to do evil, so universally apparent in all human beings. Let no man open his mouth against the transmission of a moral distemper, until he satisfactorily explain the fact, that the special characteristic vices of parents appear in their children as much as the color of their skin, their hair, or the contour of their faces. A disease in the moral constitution of man is as clearly transmissible as any physical taint, if there be any truth in history, biography, or human observation."—Christian System, pp. 28, 29.

The difference between Mr. Campbell and myself on the doctrine of depravity is this: "Mr. Campbell held that while man's moral nature is tainted—corrupted by sin, still he has something good remaining in him, and this good he seems to hold is native good; while we hold that the good there is in man is not native, but gracious; not inherited from the first, but from the second Adam. But according to Mr. Braden there is no such thing in existence as corruption of nature; the only sin he seems to have any knowledge of, is actual, overt transgression.

I have now reviewed the gentleman's entire speech, and answered every argument he has advanced, and shown you the utter impotency of his attacks upon our Discipline. He may proceed with his indict-

ments, but I will show you in every instance that they will fall to the ground. You will find every doctrine contained in our Discipline fully sustained by the word of God; and the blows from the puissant arm of my opponent will only the more fully develop the fact that every doctrine of that little book is sustained by the Holy Scriptures.

—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I know this intelligent audience will not take what Mr. Hughey says he has proved as what he has actually done; but they will claim the right to weigh his words, and decide for themselves. He seems very much afraid you will not know enough to see and appreciate what he has done, unless he tells you of it in almost every breath. In this he seems to be in the condition of a young boarding-school Miss I once heard of. Her mother asked her to show her some example of what she had learned at school. The daughter brought and held up before her mother a large sheet of Bristol board. The old lady put on her "specs" and gazed at it intently for some minutes. At last she exclaimed:

"Well, darter, what is that?"

"Why, mother," replied the daughter, "can't you see? It is a horse "

"Well, raly, darter," said the old lady, "you had better just write under it, 'this is a horse,' for sartinly no one would know it unless you do."

In like manner my friend's many words bear no more resemblance to an argument than the young Miss's daub did to a picture of a horse; and he has, to write under each, "this is an argument," "this proves my point," or you never would see it. My good sir, this audience is able to decide what you have done without you spending so much breath and time telling them. Do more and talk less about What you have done.

The gentleman attempts to evade the issue I showed to exist between his position on the design of baptism and the Discipline by dodging out of what he said on the second proposition. He did say that baptism was a seeking of a good conscience, and that *eperootema* meant that in the passage.

"But," said he at last, "if baptism be the seeking of good conscience it must be a sign of it."

What a preposterous notion. "That by which we seek aching be a sign of its existence after we obtain it." No, the gentleman, unfortunately for him, quoted the scriptures once to answer a question asked, and he can never extricate himself out of the comparison into which it has driven him. Be admonished, my friend, abandon your little book and theories, and take God's word always, and you will always be consistent.

"Baptism," says the Discipline, "is a sign of regeneration," thus contradicting the word of God, and my opponent when he quoted it in saying it is the means by which to seek a good conscience or regeneration.

We will next take up the subject of faith alone. We object to my opponent's reply.

1. That he entirely misconceived or deliberately evaded the issue on James ii. He foists in the question of the time of Abraham's justification. We read from the Discipline the affirmation that "a man is justified by faith alone." We then read from the Bible the positive declaration that "a man is not justified by faith alone." The gentleman, to evade the issue, sets up a man of straw, the time of justification.

2. He scraps the word of God, evades the context in James, and runs off to Paul. The same Spirit inspired both apostles. Why not let James settle the whole matter? James declares Abraham was justified by his works and his faith when he offered Isaac on the altar. His faith wrought with his works, and by works was his faith made perfect, and he then declares that "a man is justified by works, and not by faith only," as the Discipline declares.

3. He attempts to array Paul against James, and thus make the scriptures contradict themselves by placing one scrap of scripture in opposition to another.

4. He then interpolates what is necessary to his position by assuming an "only" where there is none in Paul's language. We are nowhere said to be justified by one single thing, but eleven things are mentioned in God's word by which we are justified.

But it is urged that James speaks alone of the saint. He is justified by works and faith. Will that help the matter? The Discipline declares "we," the members of the Methodist Church, who are saints, are justified by faith alone. James, by the tacit admission of my opponent, declares saints are not justified by faith alone, but by works and faith. That dodge does not help the matter a particle. But the apostle's language admits of no such restriction. He lays down a broad general principle, as broad as mankind, that man is justified by works and faith, and not faith alone. The language could not be more general. It includes saint and sinner, all men.

But the gentleman has found one passage that disposes of the whole matter. Romans iii:

"Wherefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

Unfortunately there is no "only" in this passage. Even if there were, the only advantage the gentleman could reap would be to destroy the scriptures, making them contradict themselves. But does not Paul say that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law? Does not that exclude all works? That depends on what law he is talking of. If he means all laws, he means all works, as my opponent claims, and the Spirit of God in James contradicts the Spirit of God in Paul. What law does he mean, what deeds?

*Mr. Hughey*—Read the ninth and tenth verses of the fourth chapter which I read and you will see.

*Mr. Braden*—We will dispose of that in good time. By interpreting this passage to mean all works, as those who preach justification by faith alone do, and must, to sustain their dogma, the Apostle Paul seems to contradict James, and so palpable did this seem to Luther that he was

about to reject the epistle of James, calling it an epistle of straw. Paul speaks of several kinds of law in his epistles, the law of commandments given the Jews, the law of the flesh in his members, the law of Christ, the law of the Spirit, etc. Now which of these did he mean, or did he mean all kinds of law? We can decide only from the context. In this epistle Paul lays down in his introduction, chapter i. 16, his proposition:

"16. The gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it; for in the gospel is God's plan of justifying men by faith, revealed in order that they may have this faith, and be justified."

He then proceeds to prove that men are sinners and need salvation. He does this by showing that the Gentiles had from nature enough light to render them accountable, and that the knowledge they had of him from tradition and the history they should have retained of his revelation, they willfully threw away because they did not like to retain him in their thoughts; hence they went voluntarily into idolatry and were without excuse, or were sinners. He adds, having sinned without the Jewish law or revelation, they will be tried without it, being a law to themselves.

He tries the Jew and convicts him of sin, because he had not kept the law God had given him. He next shows that the Gentile can not save himself, or emancipate himself from idolatry. That the Jew can not be saved or justified by the law, for he did not keep it, and also Christ had abolished the law. How then are we to be saved? Paul then tells us in the third chapter:

"Men are freely justified by grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation for our sins, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believes in Jesus. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

Now of what law? Why, the law Paul has been discussing, the Jewish law. He nowhere refers to or excludes works of obedience to the gospel, or law of Christ, for faith itself is a work of obedience to that law. We object to the gentleman's position that this expression includes all works:

1. That it is not in the apostle's language. He says the law, not all law.

2. This argument is confined to the Jewish law, hence he means that and that alone.

3. The restrictive word "only" is not expressed, or even implied in the text

4. He makes the Spirit of God in Paul, contradict himself in James.

5. Paul exhorts the sinner to works of obedience to the law of Christ, and the saint to continue in this obedience as means of justification.

He says we put off our old man in obedience or works of the law of Christ, that when we obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine,

we are made free from sin or are justified. In the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters, he positively condemns this idea of justification by faith alone, especially in the sixth chapter.

But the gentleman denies that there are works of obedience to the law of Christ to be performed by the sinner. Is not the sinner required by that law to hear the gospel, believe it, repent, confess his sins and Christ as his Saviour, to obey him in baptism? Are not these works, works of obedience? Paul nowhere condemns or excludes these. On the contrary, he commands them, gives them as necessary to our salvation or justification, condemns the idea of justification by faith, a single one, without the rest. He teaches that the saint continues justified by observing all things whatsoever Christ commanded. He nowhere teaches the doctrine of justification by faith alone, but he teaches as clearly as James that a man is justified by faith and works. The apostles agree, notwithstanding the attempt of the gentleman to array the Spirit of God against himself. James wrote his epistle against just such men as my opponent, and such books as this, and Paul agrees with him.

Now we come to the fourth chapter.

"But," exclaims the Jew, "how can a man be justified unless he obeys the law which God gave."

Paul takes the case of Abraham. He refers him to Genesis xv. 6, where it is said :

"6. Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness."

"Now," reasons Paul, "this was before the law was given, or before he was circumcised, or had done a single thing required in the law. Then, if God could justify Abraham before the law and without it, he can now justify men after the law, when it has been abolished, by faith in Jesus, just as he justified Abraham for faith in himself without the law before it was given."

But was he not justified by faith alone without any works? Paul does not so reason. Had he believed God and remained in Ur of the Chaldees, would he have been justified by faith alone? I trow not. No, it was his faith and his obeying God and going out to where God commanded that justified him. Some seem to have run to the extreme of my friend and this Discipline, and James writes his letter against them, and sustains Paul in his teachings in the sixth chapter of Romans, and condemns this doctrine. So the fourth chapter does not sustain the gentleman.

The gentleman wants to know how we came by the name Christian. By being followers of Christ, by believing in him and being baptized into his name. If we are baptized into his name, we should wear it. If we are members of his family, we should wear his name, the family name. If the church is his bride, she should wear his name, or she is an adulteress. We can all agree to wear that name, no matter how much we differ concerning men's opinions. It is not necessary, because we agree with certain men in opinion, that we separate, throw off the name of Christ and wear their names. Why did not the apostle exhort and allow the people at Corinth, who agreed with Paul, Apollos,

and Cephas, to throw off the name of Christ, and organize churches wearing their names"?

The apostle forbade it, and exhorted them to wear the name into which they were baptized. God does here command all to wear the name of Christ, and to reject all others. In this the Discipline violates a plain precept of God. The gentleman can not avoid this palpable issue. Let all who are of Christ wear his name and his alone.

My opponent conies next to our objection based on the attempt to define and describe Jehovah. He does not say that the scriptures declare this. Then why should your Discipline? But the Bible says, "God is a Spirit." Then why not rest satisfied with that? But a spirit must be without body or parts. How do you know? I do not affirm that it has, but I leave the matter unexplained, undescribed, as the word of God leaves it. Your Discipline is violating the command, "Avoid untaught questions."

He comes next to the attempt, to do what the Holy Spirit never did, to define the divine substance, personality, and union of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He attempts to define the difference between personal substance, and person, one person in substance, yet three persons. As metaphysical as the attempt was, it was an utter failure. The Holy Spirit is silent on it. We should be also. Another violation of the same apostolic command.

He next attempts to evade the palpable contradiction of many passages of the scriptures, when the Discipline declares our Saviour died to reconcile God to the world, when the Bible in a dozen places declares he died to reconcile the world to God. His evasion is to quote the expressions that Christ made a propitiation for our sins, or expiation as it should be. He died to expiate what? To placate God's wrath? So orthodoxy teaches. God is wrath and must be placated, appeased. His vengeance must be satiated. He must thus be reconciled by this means to man's salvation. Now the Bible teaches that "God so loved the world he gave his only begotten Son, that all who believe on him should not perish;" that he takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked; that so far from needing, appeasing, and reconciling, he only waits and pleads with the sinner to be reconciled, and come to him and live. God does not need appeasing and reconciling.

But what did Christ expiate? Not God's vengeance, not his retributive justice, but his administrative justice. The death of Christ was not for God's benefit, or demanded by his vengeance, but for man's benefit alone. It is an act of pure grace. It demonstrates God's regard for his law, his abhorrence of sin, and his love for man. Christ made expiation to the demands of the law, not God's feeling of vengeance.

But there was a reconciliation in heaven. What of it? Was God reconciled? No. It says God reconciles all things to himself, not himself to them. But what does this reconciliation in heaven mean? Hebrews ix. 14:

"14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God? For this reason he



is the mediator of the new covenant, that by means of his death for the redemption of the transgression under the old covenant, they which were called might receive an eternal inheritance."

Hebrews x. 12:

"12. After he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, he sat down on the right hand of God, for by one offering he perfected forever them that are sanctified."

All sin of those who lived under the old covenant and were then in heaven, and of those on earth was expiated by Christ. He made one expiation for the whole human race. In this way did he reconcile all in heaven and earth to God. There is nothing that sanctions the theory of the Discipline. It is a palpable contradiction of God's word. We are asked why the Christian should pray. Because God commanded, and has made it a condition on which he will bless the Christian. But why not the sinner pray also? He should and will pray, but God has not commanded it, nor does he give prayer as a means or condition of the pardon of the sinner. I can give but two reasons why he has not commanded it.

1. It would be wrong or useless at least.

2. The penitent believer will pray anyhow, and no command is needed.

Then let the sinner pray, but let him go forward and obey the law of the Lord, calling on his name.

There is a difference between the idea that God is wearied out, or coaxed by our prayers, mourning and importunities, and can be coaxed, placated, and appeased like a weak human parent; and the scriptural doctrine that he has made prayer a condition of certain blessings to his children or saints. He nowhere makes it a condition of pardon to a sinner—alien sinner. If the gentleman will affirm such an idea as his whole practice declares, we will give him a negative.

We are informed that Justin Martyr prayed for the remission of sins. We have no objection to that, but we do not believe in praying and neglecting to obey God's command at the same time. We do not believe in persons sitting down on the mourner's bench, and praying, and shouting, and imploring and beseeching God to pardon them, and all the while refusing to obey his commands. He asks nothing of this kind at our hands, it is only obedience that he asks.

Learn, believe and obey the perfect law of truth; you will have confidence to go into the presence of God, as John tells us; you will have confidence that he will grant what you ask without this long intercession with him. Let the penitent come forward and obey God's commands, and not sit importuning God upon the mourner's bench, and he will receive pardon. There is nothing in the Bible to authorize the belief that God will pardon the sinner simply on the condition of prayer alone. Paul prayed for conversion, but he was told to be baptized, and obey God's commands before his sins could be washed away. But the Samaritans received the Spirit after prayer; but not to pardon their sins, for they were already baptized and pardoned. The apostles prayed and laid hands on them that they might receive the miraculous gift of the Spirit, and not that they might be pardoned. The instance has no connection with the case in hand.

My opponent says they use the Discipline just for the purpose of distinguishing themselves from such heretics as I am, and that they may know how and be able to keep me out of their church. The heretic is one who causes divisions. The gentleman does that with his creed, by his own showing. I want all to unite on the perfect word of God. Who is the heretic? His creed accomplishes its purpose. It keeps me, and all who take the word of God alone, out. The word of God would not do it. He must have the Discipline. He does not use his Discipline to make Christians, but to make Methodists. Why not weigh me by the standard—God's word? Why take a human guess at that word—the Discipline? It reminds me of the way they once had of weighing pork in a certain locality. They balanced a rail across a log, placed the pork on one end, and a pile of stones on the other, and then guessed at the weight of the stones. Why not, says common-sense, have a legal perfect standard? So we say to my friend. Why not weigh me by the perfect standard—God's word? Why weigh me by a human guess at the meaning of that word? So long as the gentleman condemns me by, his Discipline, and not by God's word, I care little for his exclusion.

The gentleman denies that the ten commandments were abolished. Why does he not observe the Jewish Sabbath then? We will show that the ten commandments were abolished in Deuteronomy ix. 11—18. The ten commandments written on the two tables of stone are called the old covenant, or the covenant God made with the children of Israel. Hebrews viii. Paul declares the old covenant is done away. Hence the Discipline contradicts God's word when it says we are to obey what is abolished.

My opponent attempts to patch up the article on original sin by asking if there is no sin without actual transgression of the law. There may be physical outward or overt transgression, and also there may be an inward or mental violation of it. But there must be one or the other to produce sin and guilt. Is there any such violation of the law in the case of infants? There can be neither overt nor mental act of transgression, hence there can be no sin, no guilt. Corruption of nature, even if we admit it, is no sin, no cause of guilt. Sin is a transgression of the law, says the Bible. There may be sin without violation of the law, says the Discipline. It contradicts God's word, and teaches what is utterly unknown to it.

But there is no goodness in man, except what the gentleman calls a gracious goodness that comes through Christ. Now I can understand how a man obtains this goodness, but how does the infant obtain it? How in the name of reason does the gentleman know that the infant has obtained any such thing? How does he know the operations in the infant's mind? A more baseless absurd assumption was never made. Of a like character is his sin of nature. What sort of a non-descript is the sin of nature? Sin is a transgression of the law. What is a sin of nature?

We proceed now to our next specification. Where does my friend find authority for his quarterly communion? The scriptures teach, as Wesley clearly shows, that the Lord's Supper should be partaken of every Lord's day. The Discipline violates this example.

But the next specification tells when they obtain it. Art. xxii:

"It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, for they have always been different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, provided nothing be ordained against God's word. Every particular church may ordain, change or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification."

It is here claimed that rites and ceremonies in the church may be abolished, or changed, and that it can be done without doing any thing contrary to God's word, in some cases at least. Now we take this position that as the scriptures were given to legislate for man on matters concerning which we could not legislate, for we had neither the authority nor ability, we have no right to alter or change or\_ abolish by subsequent legislation. Christ is our lawgiver. We must obey, but can not change or abolish his laws

The Discipline itself says, "Whatever can not be read in the scriptures, nor proved thereby, should not be required of any man." Art. v. Then any rite or ceremony, which can not be read in or proved by the scriptures, should not be required of any man, and what right has this church, or any to change or abolish what can be read in and proved by the word of God?

As all our specifications now will be apologized for under this article xxii. we will lay clearly before you the law of the Lord. Hebrews viii. 5, we read that "the priests who offer gifts according to the old law, who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for, said he, see that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount."

Now if God was thus particular concerning the rites and ceremonies of the old covenant, which was transitory and soon to be abolished, is it not reasonable that he would be more particular concerning the rites and ceremonies of the church of Christ which is to endure for all time. We too are to do all things according to the patterns left us by the apostles. We can not abolish or change ordinances. 1 Peter iv. 11:

"11. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God speak."

Even our speaking must be like the oracles of God. 2 Timothy i. 13:

"13. Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus."

We are to hold fast even the form of words. No change of forms or ceremonies is allowed by this. 2 Timothy ii. 2:

"2. The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men who shall be able to teach others."

Even the very words, all things which he taught concerning doctrine or practice were to be treasured up, not what they thought ought to be taught. 2 Thessalonians ii. 15:

"15. Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle."

What were these traditions? All things he taught them concern-

ing their doctrine or practice. Their faith and practice including the rites and ceremonies of the church. 1 Corinthians i. 10:

"10. Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same things."

There was not to be a diversity even in their speaking, especially in the names they wore, as we learn from the context. Could they then have rites and ceremonies different from each, and from what the apostle had given them? 1 Timothy vi. 3:

"3. If any man teach otherwise (than what the apostle taught), and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine, according to godliness, from such an one, withdraw thyself."

Finally, as a summing up, we will read 2 Timothy iii. 15:

"15. The Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Now I submit that these scriptures establish these positions.

1. Man had and has neither the ability nor authority to legislate concerning the rites and ceremonies of the church. Christ is the sole lawgiver.

2. We must make our churches in rites and ceremonies and doctrines like the patterns the apostles have left us. We can not add to nor take from the divine model.

3. We must have the same rites and ceremonies as the Holy Spirit has given us, and no more and no less.

4. Our doctrine must be in the words of the Spirit, or we must take the scriptures. Our preaching must be in accordance therewith. We must call Bible things by Bible names.

Then this Discipline itself is a violation of God's word. Many of its doctrines are, and in presuming to change ceremonies, it is a palpable violation.

My next specification is, that this Discipline allows three entirely different acts, which it calls baptism, or three baptisms, if all are baptism. The scriptures say there is but one baptism. They allow no choice or will worship, as does this Discipline. This is an illustration of the assumed power to change the ordinances of the church.

Our next specification is, that this book requires all converted persons to take a kind of deck passage for six months before receiving them into the church—keeping them out six months on probation. This is a most unwarranted innovation—a most positive violation of apostolic example. In the days of the apostles men heard the word, believed with their whole heart, immediately confessed Christ, and were the same hour immersed into Christ, into the church, and went on their way rejoicing. From Acts ii. to the last verse of Revelation there is not a suggestion of such practice as this. On the contrary, it is as willful a violation of God's law, left for us in apostolic example, as can be conceived.

My next specification is that papal relict, infant baptism. We will read:

"We hold that all children, by virtue of the unconditional bene-

fits of the atonement, are members of the kingdom of God, and therefore graciously entitled to baptism. We regard all children who have been baptized as placed in visible covenant relation to God." Now we object to this.

1. The atonement does not make any one a member of the church. It renders it possible, as Paul tells us, for God to justify him that believes on Jesus, and for the justified person to become a member of the church.

2. The benefits of the atonement are unconditional to no one.

3. Infants are not church members. Christ was to rule only over willing subjects—those who had accepted him. Psalm cx. All in the new covenant were to know the Lord. Jeremiah xxxi. 31. Infants are neither willing subjects, nor do they know the Lord. They are not members of the church.

4. The law of baptism requires faith and repentance, as is clearly shown by the great commission. Infants can exercise neither. They are not subjects of that law.

5. The persons entering into the new, or Christian covenant with God, were those who knew the Lord, who did not need to be taught, for they had been taught. This book reverses the scriptural order of teaching, and then covenanting. It covenants the unconscious infant, and then teaches him so that he can know the covenant he is supposed to have made! These persons under the new covenant had the law of the Lord written in their hearts, and he had forgiven them their sins. Now infants have none of these qualifications. They can not be placed under the new covenant. That introduces only penitent, believing, obedient subjects into the kingdom.

Lastly, look at the gross absurdity of children being in visible covenant relation to God. A child make a covenant! But the parents make the covenant. Then why baptize the child? Confine your work to parents. What business have parents to make a covenant for an unconscious infant? The framers of this book seem to be conscious of this, for they attempt to patch up this tattered piece of will worship by saying, at the bottom of the thirty-eighth page: "Persons baptized in infancy must assent before the church to the baptismal covenant," when admitted into the church. They must now enter into a covenant they were supposed to have made years before.

If in the church, why are they now required to be converted, go through six months' probation, and then make the covenant they made years ago? The whole thing is as contradictory as the fancies of a crazy man. Infant baptism, infant membership, infant covenant making, are papal superstitions. There is, not twenty miles from this place, a man who was led by force up to be sprinkled, and had the water dashed on his forehead while he had to be held, and was struggling and cursing and swearing and screaming at the preacher. Did he enter into a visible covenant relation to God?

My next specification is the confession required of adult subjects of baptism. When the apostles baptized they asked one simple question: "If thou believest thou mayest." The candidate confessed, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." On that sublime confession they were immersed. Contrast with that the hu-

man contrivance of nearly two pages recorded on the 149th and 150th pages of the Discipline. What a mockery and distortion of the simple ceremony left us by divine authority!

My next is the long rigmarole recited when a person is admitted into the church. It is utterly unauthorized, and a plain violation of apostolic example. Persons believed, repented, and were baptized into the church. By this they were added to the saved in the apostles' day. Fancy Peter requiring such a rigmarole of the entire three thousand on the day of Pentecost. He certainly would not have had time for that. He did not organize a Methodist church there.

My next specification is the unscriptural oath required of preachers and deacons. They solemnly swear to obey—what? The Holy Scriptures? No, the persons who are in authority over them. Here it is:

*"The Bishop*—Will you reverently obey your chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions and submitting to their godly judgments?

*"Answer*—I will do so. God being my helper."

Take out "chief ministers" and insert "holy father and your superiors," and you have the oath of the Jesuit in substance and almost verbatim. No apostle or member of apostolic churches ever took any such oath. What it requires is slavish, and odiously unscriptural.

We are not done yet with this book, but must reserve our further charges until our next speech. We have already presented enough to condemn this arrogant usurpation, the Methodist Discipline.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. HUGHEY'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The gentleman tells us that I am like the pupil who drew the picture of a horse, and for fear that no one would know it was a horse, wrote under it, "This is a horse." He tells you that I am fearful that you will not know that I have proved anything, unless I tell you that I have proved it Well, if I have been writing horse under my arguments, I think, ladies and gentlemen, I have not been alone in this part of the work, at least; for Mr. Braden has written horse quite as often as I have. When he has stated my arguments, and then, without attempting to reply to them, has stated so emphatically, as he has so often done, "Not a whit of it, sir, not a whit of it," what was this but writing horse, and that in capital letters. [Laughter.] When I have established a point beyond the possibility of successful contradiction, you ail know what tremendous efforts he has made to convince you, with the most positive declarations, that I have not proved anything at all—that my argument did not touch the point. "Not a whit of it, sir, not a whit of it," the gentleman would most solemnly affirm. What was this but writing horse? [Laughter.] If he chooses to do so, he can keep on writing horse; but I rather think you will fail to

recognize the horse, though he may write horse in capital letters under each of his arguments. [Continued laughter.]

Baptism, he tells us, seeks a good conscience. But if we understand the term *eperootema* to mean the seeking of a good conscience, yet still it seeks the good conscience outside of itself; it does not confer the good conscience, nor is it the condition upon which the conscience is made good, as I proved conclusively on a former proposition; but it is the answer of, or to, a good conscience, which has been made good through faith in a risen Saviour; hence this passage is an express declaration that baptism is the sign of regeneration, or of a new heart.

The gentleman's attempt to reply to my argument on justification by faith only was indeed amusing. The question between us all the time has been, "When was Abraham justified? When was faith imputed to him for righteousness? Was it before he was circumcised, or was it after he was circumcised?" I have contended all the while that he was justified, in the sense of pardon, when he believed in God, and it (his faith) was imputed to him for righteousness. But my opponent has contended all the while that he was not justified—that his sins were not pardoned, until he offered up Isaac on Mount Moriah. I showed that Paul, in laying down the method of the sinner's pardon, says: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness." Now, if the ungodly are justified without works, but by simple faith, as Paul here expressly affirms, then are they justified by faith only, and the Discipline is right and Mr. Braden is wrong. But, he asks, is not the sinner required to do something, to perform some act of obedience, in order to obtain remission of sins? I answer no. He is required to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, as this is all he can do, and all that God requires in order to pardon. Paul, in this passage, lays down a great principle that holds good in every case. He takes the example of Abraham's justification, and holds it up to illustrate the justification of sinners in all ages of the world. Just as Abraham was justified, so are sinners justified now. Abraham was justified without works, and by simple faith; and so are sinners justified now by faith, without works. How did I prove that Abraham was justified before he offered up Isaac on the altar? Why, I proved from Paul that he was justified, his faith was reckoned to him for righteousness, before he was circumcised. "How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Here Paul expressly declares that faith was reckoned to Abraham—that he possessed the righteousness of faith, that he was justified by faith without works, before he WAS circumcised. You remember when the gentleman began to read from the first part of Romans iv., that I told him to read the ninth and tenth verses of the chapter, and he dropped his eye down on them but did not read them, but said he, "Oh, that matter is already settled." Yes, Mr. Braden, that matter is settled; and, thank God, it is settled by proving by a positive "thus saith the Lord," that Abraham was justified before he

was circumcised, that he was justified by faith without works, and that all sinners are justified now in the very same way. Abraham was justified by faith only, and not by works. Paul says faith was imputed to him for righteousness before he was circumcised, but Mr. Braden says Paul is mistaken, Abraham was not justified until he offered up Isaac on Mount Moriah. You can believe Paul or Mr. Braden, just which you please. I shall most certainly believe Paul. Now I hope we will hear no more of Abraham's being justified by works when he offered up Isaac on Mount Moriah, for this matter, says Mr. Braden, is settled. Doubtless he does not wish to have it settled in this way; but he knows it is settled, nevertheless, and he can not help himself.

He tells us that when Paul says Abraham was not justified by works, he had reference to the works of the Mosaic law. But the law was not then in existence, and how could Paul refer to the works of the law four hundred years before the law was in existence? This only increases the gentleman's difficulties and confusion. But Paul here speaks of good works in a general sense, and declares that Abraham was not justified by works, just as he declares in Ephesians ii. 8-10 that sinners are not justified by works now:

"8. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.

" 9. Not of works, lest any man should boast.

"10. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

Here we have the relation that exists between justification and works fully set forth. We are not justified by works, but through faith, and then good works follow as the fruit of faith, and prove that we are justified. Thus we have reached a final settlement of the question of the method of the sinner's justification before God.

We come again to the new name given to God's people. He may say the new name is the name Christian, which was applied to the followers of Christ by divine direction. I should like to see him prove this by the Scriptures. All the circumstances connected with the giving of this name to the followers of Christ, show that it was applied to them first as a term of reproach by their enemies, and up to the time this name became general, the followers of Christ were called disciples, and they were so called by Christ himself. The new name, however, is son, in contradistinction from servant, the appellation always applied to the worshipers of God under the former dispensation. This name was given by the Lord himself, and is the new name which imparts the new relation between God and his servants under the gospel. The gentleman can not prove that there is anything unscriptural in wearing a name or an appellation which points our distinctive doctrinal views, unless we should reject the name of Christ; but by whatever names we may be known among men, God knows and recognizes us only as sons, and heirs of eternal life.

It is hardly necessary to spend time in replying to the gentleman's remarks on our first article of religion, for none but a gross materialist would contend that God has body or parts. It was against the Mani-



clean heresy, which materialized the Divine Being, that this article was aimed. I once had a conversation with a man claiming to be a member of Mr. Braden's church, who contended that God is a material Being, with body and parts, so large that while seated in heaven, his throne, his feet reached to earth, which is his footstool! In opposition to such heretics we declared that God is without body or parts, which I proved was true in my former speech.

We are not now debating the doctrine of the Trinity. If we were we must necessarily get into a lengthy metaphysical discussion. As I stated before, God has revealed himself to us as one God, yet as three persons—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The mystery of the divine existence the scriptures do not pretend to explain, nor could we comprehend it if they did; yet the fact is very clearly revealed that there are three persons in the Godhead, but one substance, one nature only. This our Discipline declares, in opposition to Arians and Unitarians, and it is easy to demonstrate this is the universal teaching of the Bible.

On the doctrine of reconciliation taught in our second article on religion, the gentleman reiterates what he said in his first speech. But there is one point to which I wish to call his attention in particular, and that is this: It was necessary that Christ's blood should be shed as a propitiation for sin. To whom, I ask, was this propitiation made? Was the propitiation made to God or to man; for it was certainly-made to one of these parties? Mr. Braden will not take the blasphemous position of Ballou, that the satisfaction must be made to man, because he is the party injured by sin. He admits that the death of Christ was a propitiation to God, not as our Father, but as our Governor and Judge. Now, if the blood of Christ is a propitiation for sin to God, did not his death reconcile his Father to us, so that God can now "be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus?" We know that the death of Christ was a propitiation for sin to God, for the very especial purpose of removing the legal difficulties out of the way, so that divine love and mercy could leach and save our fallen race. God, as our Father, is ever ready to receive the repentant prodigal; but, then, he is the moral governor of the universe, and he is just, and he can not pardon sin without an atonement, without satisfaction. This the death of Christ furnished, and reconciles the justice of God to the pardon of the sinner; and it is in this sense, as I told you, that our Discipline affirms that the death of Christ reconciled his Father to us, and became a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men.

Ha wants to know what things were reconciled in heaven? I answered this question fully in my former speech. It will not be contended that unreconciled persons get to heaven. Universalists even will not contend for this. Men must be reconciled before they enter heaven. The Old Testament saints had their sins pardoned, and were reconciled to God, when by faith they laid hold of a coming Saviour, who was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Christ entered into heaven with his own precious blood, not to reconcile the inhabitants of heaven to God, but to reconcile the justice of God to the pardon of sin by the propitiation which he offered to divine justice

by his death. This was typically set forth in the great annual atonement under the law of Moses. In this way, and in this way alone, did Christ reconcile things in heaven.

We come now to the mourner's bench again. The gentleman admits that men must pray, but that prayer will do no good before obedience, for pardon can be obtained only by obedience, that is, by baptism. When I get through discussing a proposition I am generally satisfied with it, and am willing to let it alone. But my opponent is not at all satisfied with the debate on the second proposition, and wishes to discuss it again. I showed you most conclusively in the discussion on that proposition that baptism is not a condition of pardon—that God requires no such obedience as this in order to remission of sins. This ought to have satisfied him; but it did not, and he raised the question of justification by faith only, this morning again, and I proved demonstrably that Abraham was justified by faith without works, and that sinners are justified now just as Abraham was—faith is imputed to us for righteousness just as it was imputed to Abraham for righteousness. Thus I proved by the word of God that the moment the penitent sinner puts his trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thus believes with the heart, then and there, without further acts of obedience, he obtains remission of sins, and I am now ready to let this question remain settled, which Mr. Braden told us was settled this morning. But my opponent does not want this question settled in that way, and hence he goes to talking about the mourner's bench, and how long it takes the sinner to get through, as he calls it, after this plan. When the penitent comes to Christ with a broken and contrite heart, with confiding faith, there is no delay on the part of God in bestowing the blessing of pardon, and when persons come to the mourner's bench, and do not receive the blessing of pardon, the reason is to be found in their want of faith, their want of confidence in the divine promises. It is not because God is not willing to pardon them, but because the hardness of their hearts prevents them from receiving the Lord; and we do pray with them, and instruct them, that they may be able, with the help of divine grace, to overcome their unbelief, and take God at his word, and be saved by faith in Christ.

But he tells us the Samaritans, for whom Peter and John prayed, had been baptized. But this does not change the case at all; for they were still unpardoned, unregenerated, and the apostles prayed that they might receive the blessings of pardon and regeneration. Baptism did not confer these blessings upon them, and therefore the apostles prayed with these baptized penitents that they might receive the Holy Ghost and be born of God.

But the gentleman wants to know why we do not take the Bible alone for our Discipline, if we draw all our doctrines and moral teachings from it? I stated the reason in my former speech. But he tells us our Discipline is like the custom said to prevail in certain parts of Iowa in regard to weighing pork. Not at all, Mr. Braden, we do not "guess at the weight of the rocks," we have them already weighed. But in the gentleman's church they have to guess at the weight of the rocks every time they try a man for heresy. Suppose a man is brought before the church on a charge of heresy, and he denies

the charge and appeals to the Bible, what must they do? The case is submitted to the church or congregation, and they take a vote on it, and the question is decided by a majority of votes; and thus in every church trial they have to guess at the rocks. The difference between us is, we have a written creed, and we know exactly the weight of the rocks, but the gentleman's church has an unwritten creed, and they have to guess at the rocks every time they try a member for heresy. [Laughter.] I wonder if they have expelled my old friend J. K. Spear, with whom I debated at Bridgeport, yet, for his materialism, and if so, I would like to know how they convicted him of heresy.

He tells us the ten commandments, written on the tables of stone, were called a covenant. Deut. ix. 9. But I ask the gentleman if this covenant, written on the tables of stone—the ten commandments—was repealed at the coming of Christ? It was not the moral law that was repealed by the coming of Christ, but the ceremonial law, which was given at Mount Sinai, which was repealed. This law was typical in its character, and was ordained for a specific purpose. It "was a shadow of good things to come;" "it was a schoolmaster to bring Israel to Christ," and when Christ came it of course passed away, as it was designed to do; for it was only ordained for a time, "until the seed should come, to whom the promise was made." It therefore passed away when Christ, its great antitype, appeared. But the moral law was not repealed. Its great principles of eternal justice are as binding now as when first engraven in the tables of stone by the finger of God, and ever will be. My opponent tells us they were repealed, and then re-enacted again under the gospel. Well, if this be true, are they not binding on the consciences of Christians, and is not our Discipline right, and Mr. Braden wrong, according to his own admission? But where was the necessity of repealing the moral law and then immediately re-enacting it again? Can my opponent show any reason for such a strange procedure? The law of rites and ceremonies was repealed by Christ, but the moral law, the great principles of eternal justice and truth, instead of being repealed, was reaffirmed by Christ, and epitomized in the law of love, and constitutes the great moral constitution of the church of Christ.

I asked my opponent if there is not a sin of nature? He admits that there is a corruption of the nature; but then he says this is not sin, for sin, he tells us, is a transgression of the law. But I proved demonstrably, on a former proposition, there is such a thing as sin without any overt transgression of the law. But if there is impurity of nature in us, must we not be cleansed from that impurity; and how can this be done except by regeneration? If there is moral corruption of nature, that corruption, that impurity, must be removed, or the subject of it can not enter heaven. The provision made by the gospel for removing this moral impurity from the soul, is the regenerating—the renewing power of the Holy Spirit. This, and this alone, will take out of our nature the moral taint, the moral corruption of sin, and restore that purity without which no man can see God.

His eleventh objection to the Discipline is founded on our twenty-second article, which speaks of the rites and ceremonies of the church.

He read the following part of the article, and then stopped right in the middle of a sentence. The following is the part he read:

"It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times and even manners."

The very next words that follow, after the pause of a comma, are: "So that nothing be ordained against God's word." He thus attempted to put a meaning on this article directly the opposite of that which he knew was expressly taught by it. He tried to prove by (his article, by suppressing a part of it, that we claim the right to change the ordinances of the church, as does the Church of Rome, when he knew that this article expressly denies the right to change or ordain anything contrary to the word of God. Such duplicity I would never be guilty of, for a good cause needs no such defense. Now I ask every intelligent person present, if it were honest in Mr. Braden to read a part of this article so as to make the impression that we claimed the right to change and ordain things contrary to the word of God, when he knew that the very sentence from which he read expressly repudiates any such claim? Was there anything honest in it? Shame on a disputant who would adopt such a dishonest course to sustain his proposition. By rites and ceremonies we do not mean sacraments or divine ordinances, as the gentleman very well knows; but we mean the ritualistic part of divine worship, which is wholly of human origin, and consequently under the control of the church, and which is only binding for the sake of order, and may be changed or abolished, as the enlightened judgment of the church may dictate, so as nothing is done contrary to the word of God. Here again the Bible and the Discipline agree.

His twelfth objection to the Discipline is, it teaches infant church membership. This still troubles the gentleman. We discussed this question two days, but I see he is not satisfied with his argument on this question, and wishes to try it again. Our Discipline says:

"We regard all children who have been baptized as placed in visible covenant relation to God, and under the special care and supervision of the church."—New Discipline, p. 40.

My opponent objects to this, and tells us infants can not enter into covenant with God at all. In Deuteronomy xxix. 10—15 we have an account of the covenant made with Abraham, and afterward confirmed with him, and with Isaac and Jacob by the oath of God, ratified with Israel, into which their little ones were brought. Here is the passage:

"10. Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your Captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel.

"11. Your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water:

"12. That thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day:

"13. That he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as

he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.

"11. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath;

"15. But with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day.'

Now, I ask, can children enter into covenant with God? God says they can, but Mr. Braden says they can not! God put infants into the covenant of circumcision at eight days old, but Mr. Braden says infants can not enter into covenant with God. The judgment of the Almighty and that of Mr. Braden differ very widely on this question, and you can follow just which you think is correct. Throughout the Old Testament dispensation, wherever God entered into covenant with parents, he always included their children. It was so in the time of Abraham, it was so in the time of Moses, and it is still so. But Mr. Braden says no, children can not enter into covenant with God at all. Our Discipline and the Bible agree exactly again. This objection of my opponent bears equally as strong against the Bible as against our Discipline, and every body but Mr. Braden sees it as plain as the light of day.

The gentleman's thirteenth objection to our Discipline is brought, against our custom of receiving members on probation. I have been listening for this for some time, and he has reached it at last. He says our probationary system is against the Bible. Will my opponent please just show us wherein it is opposed to the Bible? 'There is not a word in the Bible against it, nor can it be condemned by the teachings of the Bible. What are the rights and privileges of a church member that are denied to a probationer? They are admitted to the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and all the spiritual privileges of membership. There is but one right denied them, and that is a voice in the government and discipline of the church, until they prove by their faithfulness for six months that they ought to be trusted with this prerogative; and in this Mr. Campbell himself is with us, for he tells us the government of the church must be conducted by the elders or seniors, that is, persons of sufficient age in the church to safely exercise this right or privilege.

Here, then, is our probationary system, and it amounts to simply this: We take persons into the church, we baptize them, we admit them to the Lord's Supper, and only withhold from them the right to take part in the government of the church during the term of their probation. This the church certainly has a right to do, so long as she does not deprive them of the sacraments or spiritual privileges of the church. Is any person a member of any particular church or congregation by baptism? No, sir. Some church action is necessary to admit a baptized disciple into the rights and privileges of the church, and we have adopted this plan in receiving persons into full membership in the church of Christ, and it is sustained by the general teachings of the word of God. The gentleman has been able to find no condemnation of the Discipline in the word of God yet.

His fourteenth objection against the Discipline is against our different orders in the ministry, and the oath that every minister takes at his ordination. We have just two orders in the ministry, bishops or elders, and deacons, and the New Testament recognizes both these

orders. Our bishops are not a distinct order, but they are officers belonging to the order of elders, as the gentleman ought to know. But he tells us that every man that is ordained in our church must take an oath of obedience to his superiors. We take no oath at all, sir. Our ordination vow is simply a solemn pledge or vow that we will faithfully perform the duties of our ministry. Let us turn to the Discipline and see what the nature of our ordination vow is, and whether there is anything wrong in it or not. Here is the question and answer to which the gentleman refers:

*"The Bishop*—Will you reverently obey your chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, submitting yourselves to their godly judgments?

*"Answer*—I will do so, the Lord being my helper."

Now is not this required in every organization? Whenever an individual comes into any organization does he not promise to obey the laws of that organization? This requirement of our Discipline does not deprive a man or minister of any liberty which is in accordance with the gospel of Christ. It simply requires that we should give heed to the godly and proper admonitions of those who are appointed over us, for the sake of order and good government. I have taken this vow, or "oath," as Mr. Braden calls it, yet I am to-day as free a man as he is; for I have promised to do nothing but what God's word requires of me. If he can show that there is anything unscriptural in this he is a great deal smarter than he has shown himself to be yet. But what does this vow mean? It means that there must be Order and subordination in the house of God; and if a man tan not submit to faithful and good government, that is according to God's word, he does not deserve to be placed in the responsible position of a minister. Do not the scriptures say, "Obey them which have the rule over you, whose faith follow, remembering the end of their conversation?" All the rules and requirements of our Discipline are in accordance with the precepts of God's eternal truth. And just such a vow as this any man that is loyal to the word of God can take. When a man enters the service of his country he takes a solemn oath to submit to the proper authority, and when a man enters into the church of God, or into the ministry, he ought to be willing to take a vow to perform all the obligations that the law of heaven requires at his hands.

But the gentleman tells us that our church government is a great political machinery, and that it presents temptations to the ambitious to seek for the pre-eminence in the church. As to its being a political machinery, this is wholly false. Every shade of polities is represented in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and always has been. It is not a political institution. As to the inducements it offers to aspirants, I remark that there is nothing good that may not be perverted to bad purposes. I know not who the bishop is to whom the gentleman refers, nor do I know whether his statement is true or false; but I do know that our bishops, as a class, are as pure men as can be found in any church— not a blemish has ever yet been found upon the Christian character of any one of them. Methodist preachers I know are as free from undue

aspirations after positions as any class of men, and while the spirit of vital piety remains with them they will continue so. If they should lose the spirit of vital piety, then they will become aspirants for office and place, and not until then. I have filled all the various positions of the ministry, from the lowest up to the next to the highest—there is only one round higher in the ladder above the presiding eldership, and yet I never have aspired after anything only to be a useful minister, nor do I ever expect to aspire after anything else, and this, I am certain, is the experience of most Methodist preachers.—[2V»te *ex-fired*.

ME. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—We will commence what we have to say in our present speech by disposing of that bone of contention between my opponent and myself, the "justification of Abraham by faith." This is a favorite topic with the gentleman. I do not see how he would fill up his time without it. The gentleman's course of argument is of the most objectionable character. I read from the Discipline "a man is justified by faith only." I read from the Bible "a man is not justified by faith only." I show a most palpable contradiction. Instead of showing that the teachings of the Discipline can be reconciled with the teachings of the Holy Spirit speaking through James, by an examination of the context, he runs off to where the Spirit speaks through Paul, and quotes his language there, puts a gloss on it that will agree with the Discipline, and thus attempts to make a liar of the Holy Spirit by arraying his declarations against each.

Again the "only" is not there in Paul's language. The expression "without deeds of the law" is not equivalent to "only" at all. But Abraham was justified by faith only. The Holy Spirit in James most positively says he was not. He declares that proposition to be false, argues it, and proves it to be false. But Paul says so. Paul does not. On the contrary, Paul condemns justification by faith only, and teaches justification by works of obedience to the law of Christ. We said Abraham was justified when he offered Isaac. So says the Holy Spirit in James. But that was in the sense of approval as a child of God. Well, is not your Discipline talking of the justification of children of God? What does "we" mean but "us," the children of God?

We will now renew Paul's argument again and show what he did teach. He was proving that men could not be justified since Christ's death, without faith in him. He proved that ail needed justification, for all were sinners The Gentile because he had not retained what knowledge he had of God, and had not lived up to the knowledge he had of God in his works, for his eternal power and divinity could be clearly seen in his works, so that the Gentile was a sinner, and without excuse in his idolatry. He had sinned against the light he had, and without the Jewish law, and should be tried without and condemned without it.

He next calls up the Jew and proves him to be a far greater sinner,

for he had the law, but did not keep it. All were sinners then and need justification before God could save them. He shows that the Gentile could not emancipate himself from his degraded condition, could not save or justify himself. Neither could the Jew. Then how can man be justified, so that God can be just and save him? He then introduces the expiation of Christ, and shows that he had met the demands of God's government, and shows that we avail ourselves of Christ's expiation by faith in him. The Gentile is justified without the deeds of the Jewish law, for he never had it. The Jew without these deeds, for he could only be justified by them, when he had from the heart obeyed every particle of it. This he never did. Both are justified by faith in Christ without the deeds of this law, concludes the apostle.

"But," says the Jew, "God has given us a law and you now destroy it."

"No," says Paul, "I fulfill it, for Christ is the end, the fulfillment of the law to all who are saved."

"But," continues the Jew, "how can God justify a man without the law, when he has given a law by which we were to be tried and justified? How can he abrogate a law without contradicting himself?"

Paul replies by proving to the Jew that he himself believed that Abraham was justified without the Jewish law. He refers him to Genesis xv. 6:

"6. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness."

"Now," says Paul, "this was not only before the law of Moses, but even before he was circumcised, or had obeyed a single item of what was afterward the Mosaic law. Abraham was then justified, and without deeds of the Mosaic law, for his faith in God. If God could justify men before the law, and without its deeds, for faith in himself, he can now justify men, after the law is abrogated, without its deeds." He merely shows then to the Jew, with whom he was arguing, that Abraham was justified without the deeds of the Mosaic law, and that all men must be justified, without the deeds of the Jewish law, by faith in Christ.

But he nowhere declares that men or Abraham are or were justified by faith "only." That word my opponent interpolates. He nowhere condemns any deeds but the deeds of the Mosaic law, for he is discussing that alone. He clearly enjoins works of obedience to the law of Christ, hearing, believing, repenting, confessing Christ, and obeying the command of Christ in baptism. He clearly teaches, in Romans vi., we are justified by these, in connection with our faith. He as plainly, in the same chapter, condemns the doctrine of justification by faith alone. He explicitly mentions that doctrine in the 15th verse and solemnly condemns it.

James mentions this doctrine in his second chapter and condemns it, and proves its falsity from the word of God. He shows that Abraham, the great ancestor of the Jews, whose faith was pre-eminent, was not justified by faith only.

"Now," says he, "if Abraham was not, whose faith has never been equaled, how can any man be?"



He then lays down the broad general principle, as broad as the human race, that man, all men, are justified by faith and works, and not by faith only. Their works must make their faith alive, or it is dead, and of no benefit in their justification. So says common-sense also.

One quibble more and we have, we think, settled this forever. When it is said in Genesis xv. 6: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness," was not that justification without works? Most clearly not. God told him he would make him a great nation, give him a great inheritance, and in him should all nations be blessed. Without works, for faith alone? No; if he would have that land, and go into one he should show him. Had he believed and remained where he was, he would never have been accepted in covenant relations with God, or justified. He was justified in that case by his living faith, faith made alive by works, faith and works, not faith alone, a dead faith.

But Abraham was justified as a sinner in Genesis xv. 6, to which Paul refers in Romans. How does my opponent know that, and beside he was not justified without works even if he were a sinner. Also your Discipline is not talking of the justification of sinners when it says "we," the children of God, are justified by faith only. The dodge makes no figure in the case anyhow.

No, sir, your little book, which you exalt above the word of God, says men are justified by faith alone, which God's word says is a dead faith. The word of God says we are not justified by faith alone, or a dead faith, but by a faith made alive by works. So says James, so says Paul, so teaches the whole word of God. Your Discipline gives the lie direct to God's Holy Spirit. There is no evading it. There can not be a more flat contradiction.

My friend tells us that the new name that is called upon us is "son;" this is the new name that had never been called before. Unfortunately for this theory there were "sons of God" in the days of Adam. Here we have a very early instance of the "new" name which my friend says was called upon the followers of Christ. This name, it is assumed, was put on them instead of "servant," the name which they had worn before. Paul calls himself a servant, so it seems he did not drop the old name. Persons were called "sons of God" even in patriarchal days, and the term servant was retained by the apostles.

I will tell you what this new and peculiar name is. I will read you from Ephesians iii. 14, 15:

" 14. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

Here it is said that the whole family in heaven and earth is called after the name of Christ. Again, also, in Revelation iii. 8 we read:

"8. I know thy works: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut; for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name."

Here the church in Philadelphia is commanded to retain the name of Christ upon them.

There is another thought that we wish to call your attention to. Christ is spoken of as the husband, or spouse of the church. If Christ

is the husband of the church, I want to know whose name should be worn? Whose name does the wife wear, and the church is placed in this relation to Christ? I presume my friend would slightly object to his wife's wearing the name of another person. The church is to obey Christ in all things; we are to obey his ordinances and wear his name.

My friend speaks about things pure and impure. He would have us understand that infants were impure. I object to that phraseology; I object to using the word "impurity" in the sense of actual guilt or sin. Infants may be imperfect, and yet not impure in the sense in which we use the word "sinful." There must be actual transgression where there is sin. Wherever there is opposition to God there is sin. There can be no opposition to God in the heart of the unconscious infant; nothing can be more certain than this.

We come again to that portion of the Discipline where it speaks of changing the rites and ordinances. They can not be changed, it is said, if they are in accordance with God's word. How can you change ordinances without coming in conflict with the word of God? If your ordinances are once in accordance with the Bible, they will remain in that relationship, and there is no further need of change. But I am told that the word "ordinance" is not here. What is a "rite" but an "ordinance," I ask. If the rites of my friend's church are in accordance with the Bible, why change them? Why is not the word of God considered sufficient in this matter? Why do they get something else to assist them? The Discipline is a gratuitous explanation of God's word which we can all understand for ourselves.

Infants can make a covenant with God, so my opponent informs us, and reads from Deuteronomy xxix. 10. My friend has helped me right out of a difficulty himself. You remember when I pressed upon him this "all," in the case of the jailer's family, that when all in the house of the jailer rejoiced, and the household was spoken of collectively, it could not include infants, because infants could not rejoice. So when all the people were standing, and making a covenant before God, it was not necessary to suppose that the infants made a covenant, for they could not. It is no more necessary to include them in one case than in the other. They are no more to be included in the making a covenant than in the "stoning," when it is said all the people shall stone the culprit. Common-sense would teach that children can not stand and make a covenant. Common-sense would also teach that children can not rejoice. Common-sense would teach that children can not stone a culprit.

We are told the deacons are to obey the word of God. Why does it not say so then? It says they are to obey those who rule over them; it does not say that they are to obey the word of God.

My friend says there has been a great deal of fault found with keeping men out six months on probation, and the matter is not very well understood. There are many things connected with this subject that men do not understand. The idea of having a man go through days, and weeks, and perhaps months anxious seeking, and after God has accepted him, he can not be accepted by the church until after six months more of trial. It takes more to get a man into the Methodist

Church than into heaven. A man may be converted and ready for heaven, but he must wait six months before he can get into the Methodist Church. Look at it in what light you please, and it is absurd, contradictory and unscriptural.

The gentleman is sadly bothered over his Discipline's contradicting God's word in saying God must be reconciled to man. He also is troubled with the utter incongruity that exists between the mourner's bench practices of his church, the long prayer, the shouts at God, and Babel of confusion at such scenes, and the simple plain accounts of apostolic conversions. He attempts to retort by speaking of "water salvation." Let us compare our theories and practices with God's word. It is universally conceded that the parable of the prodigal son illustrates God's willingness to accept the returning, repentant sinner. Let us examine it. You remember the prodigal was in a far country, and had wasted his substance in wickedness, and was so reduced that he went into the field to herd swine, the most despicable employment, in the eyes of a Jew, that could be conceived While here "he came to himself." Mark the expression. He came to himself and said, "How many servants there are in my father's house that have bread enough and to spare, while I perish here with hunger. I will arise and go to my father, and say, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. Make me as the least of thy hired servants." He arose and started on his journey. His father saw him while he was afar off. Miserable, filthy, ragged, polluted with marks of vice and degradation, foot-sore and tired, travel-stained and weary. He ran, fell on his neck and kissed him. The son began his heart-broken confession:

"Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. Make me as the least of thy hired servants."

The father, in the joy of his heart, in the eagerness of his love, stops his confession with the joyful exclamation:

"Bring forth the best robe and put it on him. Put my ring on his finger, and sandals on his feet. Kill the fatted calf, and let us rejoice: for this my son was lost and is found, was dead and is alive again."

This picture, drawn by him who spake as never man spake, is but a faint picture of the infinite love of the Father of all for the vilest sinner. It but dimly sets forth the readiness of God to receive to the uttermost all who come unto him. What is our practice? We preach Jesus and him crucified, the melting story of the cross, and when men believe with their whole hearts and confess Jesus as the Lord Messiah, we baptize them as he commanded, and send them on their way rejoicing. So did the apostles in every case.

If the practice of my opponent and his church, in converting men by the mourner's bench, and long-seeking and mourning and vociferous prayers, be correct, and the parable of the prodigal son were to be made to agree with it, it would read thus: While the prodigal was away off in that distant country, a miraculous irresistible influence of the Spirit brought him to himself, and he said:

"I will arise and go to my father, and say, Father, I have sinned

against heaven and in thy sight, and I am no longer worthy to be called thy son. Make me as the least of thy hired servants."

He starts home on his weary journey. The father sees him coming, tottering with hunger and weariness, foot-sore, tired, fainting and tick. Does he run and fall on his neck and kiss him? Does he order a robe to be put on him, a ring on his finger, sandals for his bleeding feet? Does he order the fatted calf to be killed? Does he shout in the joy of his paternal heart:

"This my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found. All rejoice with me."

No, he runs back into his house, retires into his inner chamber, locks the doors, fastens the shutters to the windows.

The fainting son totters up to the door, and knocks and prays in his feeble voice to be admitted. The servants of the father thrust their heads out of the chamber windows and exhort the son:

"Pray on son, father will relent after a while. He will hear you and speak peace to your waiting soul. Sit down on that bench and mourn a spell. Let us all pray together. Sit on the bench and we will pray for you."

Then they spend hours, days, or weeks, in exhorting the son to weep, mourn and pray, and in pounding on the door of the inner chamber, and shouting:

"Come out and pardon this poor soul. Come and speak peace to this poor waiting soul. You must relent. You must come down. We will not let you go. till you a blessing bestow!"

At last, after months perhaps of this harrowing, noisy scene, the father relents. Does he come out and fall on the neck of his son, even then? Does he order his naked, shivering limbs to be covered with his robe? Does he put a ring on his finger? Does he put sandals on his bleeding, weary feet? Does he call on all to rejoice because his son who was dead is alive again, who was lost is found? Nay, verily. He sends out his servants to lead the poor, fainting prodigal away, and put him away—off—down—back—in the cellar kitchen, six months on probation.

Look on this picture and on the one drawn in God's word. Compare this man's practice with God's word. Compare mine, and see which is in accordance with the living oracles of divine truth. The gospel tells us man has wandered and become estranged from God. He needs reconciliation to God. Christ died to reconcile men by the melting spectacle of his cross to God. God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself. Man must come back, and the outstretched arms of infinite love are ready to receive him. God has not to be appeased, reconciled, talked to, prayed and shouted at, before he will receive and pardon the sinner. This idea of the Discipline that God has to be reconciled is grossly unscriptural, and the source of all these mourner's bench scenes of mourning, seeking, praying, shouting, waiting for and attempting to weary God out with vehement importunities.

My next specification is the various orders of ministry and officers that are unknown and contrary to the word of God. In the word of God we read of saints, deacons, elders or bishops, and evangelists.

If these, saints included all. Deacons and bishops or overseers took care of the congregations of which they were members. They were the servants of the congregations. Evangelists were for a special work, and exercised no authority in congregations once set in order. Each congregation was perfectly independent and ruled by law of Christ alone, administered by officers chosen by themselves. All legislative authority was in Christ and his divinely commissioned apostles. Judicial and executive authority was vested in officers chosen by the church, and in the church itself. Thus constituted, the church of Christ was in all judicial and executive authority the most perfect democracy in the world. Such is the pattern left us by apostolic precept and example.

Let us compare the Methodist Church as organized by this Discipline with it. We have bishops, presiding elders, traveling elders, traveling deacons, local deacons, local preachers, exhorters, class-leaders, and stewards. Nine sets of officers instead of three, or two rather. Not one is like the officers of the New Testament. Their bishops bear no resemblance, nor the elders, nor the deacons. They are not chosen by congregations. The church is a vast hierarchy, a vast ecclesiastical aristocracy, the most detestable despotism on earth.

Congregational independence, democracy, and every principle of God's word is violated in this tremendous anti-republican, unscriptural organization. The members have no more voice in the government of this church than the subjects of the Czar of Russia. The preacher governs absolutely the congregation. The elder governs the district, and the bishops are lords over God's heritage. The inspired apostles exercised no such despotic sway. Paul wrote to the church, telling them their duty, but he never assumed authority. He left them to do their own duty and work. All this is in direct violation of God's word.

My next objection is that it fosters ambition and love of power and preferment, odious vices in the eyes of our Saviour and his apostles. A more complete piece of political machinery for the gratification of men's ambition was never concocted. It is boasted that there are in this church 1,250,000 members, and that it owns church property to the amount of \$250,000,000. A man commences in this organization as a member. He is next class-leader, exhorter, local preacher, local deacon, traveling deacon, traveling elder, presiding elder, and lastly, my lord bishop. The whole organization is a vast scheme for gratifying ambition and political work and wire pulling.

This organization, for church it is not in the New Testament sense, resembles closely its grandmother, the Church of Rome. Rome is the mother, the Church of England the daughter, and Methodism the granddaughter. There is a family resemblance all through. Look at the resemblance. The bench of bishops corresponds to our reverend holy father, the Pope; the presiding elders to the cardinals; the traveling preachers to the bishops, and so clear through.

The general conference corresponds to the general councils. There is the same assumption of power in one case there is in the other. There was a time even when confession was enjoined in the Methodist Church. It was to be done in class-meeting. It is asked if we don't

have meetings similar to class-meetings, and have confession. We have social meetings, for singing, exhortation and prayer, and we confess our sins to God alone. Confession was once in my friend's church, and I am glad to see by its rejection, they are improving. With the numerous doctors of divinity, certainly their divinity ought soon to be convalescent.

We urge another specification. "A Methodist preacher is to mind every point, great and small, in the Discipline." No room for freedom of conscience here. No consulting God's word, but he must mind every point, great and small, in the Discipline. And yet this does not take the place of God's word, which Paul exhorted Timothy to hold fast.

We next read of "holding love feasts and watch nights." Where do we read of such an ordinance of God's house as a "love feast?" It is as much an ordinance of the Methodist Church as the Lord's Supper, which it always precedes.

We next object to a clause on the 128(h) page. After enumerating all things opposed to God's word, then follows an additional offense not mentioned in God's word: "Disobedience to the order or discipline of the church." The Discipline can set up a standard and create offenses for which one can be expelled in addition to those in God's word. When God gave his inspired word, it was to make the children of God perfect, and furnish them thoroughly unto all good works. The Discipline does more than this.

But, says my opponent, the Discipline is based on God's word. Then why not go to that directly, and take that? But we do not understand it alike, neither do we the Discipline. We do not reach uniformity by laying aside the perfect word of God, and taking the imperfect work of fallible man. Look at the reflection on God and his word implied here. We can understand man's work better than we can the perfect word of God. Man has to supplement God's perfect word to save himself from error.

But I deny the gentleman's position. The Bible is not the standard. The Discipline is not tested by the Bible. Your preachers are required to understand and interpret the Bible by your standard, the Discipline. Suppose a trial arises in your church, will you allow an appeal from the Discipline to the Bible? Did you ever? You know you never did. Then which is the standard? Which is the higher authority? This Discipline of which you, sir, are to mind every thing, great and small, whether you read it in the word of God, or prove it thereby or not.

We have now placed before you our reasons for arraigning the Discipline for containing statements of doctrine and enjoining church usages contrary to the word of God. Compare it with the word of God in these particulars and decide. If it contains more or less than what is in the Bible, we do not, and will not accept it. If it contains just what is in the Bible, we do not need it. It is a blasphemous usurpation, view it in what light you will.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. HUGHEY'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I discover that my friend has left the Discipline and has taken up the creed question. He has given us quite a little dissertation on the question that we will discuss to-morrow. I will let that question rest until I review his argument on the question before us, and then, if I have time, I will reply to his remarks on the creed question.

My friend has a great deal of trouble about Abraham's justification. He wants to prove that Abraham was justified by works, but in attempting to do this he makes Paul and James flatly contradict each other, thus making the word of God contradict itself. James, as I have shown before, is speaking of the justification of a righteous man in the sense of approval, whose works of obedience prove him to be a justified man. Paul is speaking of the justification of a sinner in the sense of pardon, or the remission of sins, and he brings up the case of Abraham to illustrate how the sinner is justified. He says:

"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 accounted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

Now when was it that faith was counted to Abraham for righteousness? Was it when he offered up Isaac, thirty years after he was circumcised? No, it was before he was circumcised that his sins were pardoned, for Paul says it was not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. Now, if Mr. Braden's interpretation of James is true, there is a positive contradiction between Paul and James. Paul says Abraham was pardoned or justified before he was circumcised. According to Mr. Braden he began to be justified before he was circumcised, but his justification was not completed till he offered up Isaac upon the altar. Now he has talked a great deal about the length of time that it takes with us for mourners to "get through," but I want to know if, according to his theory, Abraham was not a good spell "getting through?" [Laughter.] He began to get through before Isaac was born, but he never got entirely through till he offered him upon the altar. He was all this time getting through. [Continued laughter.] Surely they had a hard time of it in getting through in Abraham's time according to Mr. Braden. But look at the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, and you will see that Abraham was justified by simple faith—that "faith was accounted to him for righteousness" before Isaac was born. Paul concludes his argument on justification by faith, drawn from the example of Abraham's justification, by showing that under the gospel sinners are justified just as Abraham was—that faith is imputed to us for righteousness just as it was to Abraham. He says:

"Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to

him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

Here the testimony is decisive that sinners are now justified by the imputation of faith, just as was Abraham. Now I suppose my opponent will get up again and tell us he does not see the force of my argument; but if he does not it is because he will not see it, for he knows that the moment he admits my position his whole system is gone without hope. If the sinner is justified by simple faith in Christ, then he is not justified by baptism, and Campbellism is proven to be false, and a gross perversion of the word of God. I intend he shall see the truth, and if he will not renounce his errors perhaps my friend Mr. Beard will take him into the Universalist Church, for I think he is in a fair way of getting there. [Laughter.]

My opponent tells us this doctrine of justification by simple faith was a new idea. Certainly it was a new idea to the Jews. They had lost this wholesome doctrine, through which their fathers were justified, and they now expected to be justified by the works of the law. But Paul soon sets this legal idea aside, and proves that Abraham himself was justified by faith, not by works. Abraham was constituted the father of all believers by circumcision, and all believers are constituted the children of Abraham by faith in Christ Jesus. You see I get Abraham through much quicker than my opponent does. He keeps Abraham at the mourner's bench from the giving of the promise until Isaac was grown up to manhood, a period of nearly fifty years. I never knew a mourner so long as this getting through in the Methodist Church. [Laughter.] We get them through much quicker than that; it does not take us that long to get our mourners through. Ours is the shortest method of getting them through, Mr. Braden, after all! [Continued laughter.]

The gentleman tells us that there were sons of God in the days before the flood. But, I ask him, if these persons were the sons of God in a spiritual sense—in the sense in which Christians are called the sons of God in the New Testament? What the term, sons of God, means in Genesis vi. 2-4 we do not know, nor can this passage be brought forward in support of the gentleman's position; for, as I stated, the servants of God under the Old Testament dispensation were always called servants, but under the gospel they were called sons. This is the new name which imparts the new relation into which the children of God are brought by adoption, and which the mouth of the Lord has named. My opponent tells us the whole family is named in Jesus Christ, and consequently the family must bear the name of Christ—Christian. "Ye have not denied my name," therefore the name Christian is the new name. This is his argument. To be named in Christ, to not deny the name of Christ, implies vastly more than the mere name Christian, for many have that name and yet do not belong to Christ, yea, in works deny him. To be named in Christ is not simply to be named after him. as Mr. Braden seems to think, but it is to be constituted a son of God through Jesus Christ. To deny the name of Christ is to deny the faith of Christ, and fall into sin, which thousands have done, and still boasted of wearing the name of Christ—Christian. Not a particle of evidence can he find in the



scriptures that the new name promised is Christian, while it is palpable as a thing can be that it is son, in opposition to servant.

But he tells us Christ is the husband of the church, and the wife must wear the name of her husband; and said he, "You would not like for your wife to wear another man's name." This is a heavy argument, and it is one that is very difficult to reply to; for there is a certain proverb that informs us if you answer a certain character in a certain way you become like him, and if you do not answer in that way he will be wise in his own conceit. So you see I am placed in rather a difficult position according to the advice of this proverb. Christ is called the husband of the church, therefore the church must be called by no other name but Christian! Perhaps I may see the point of this argument sometime, but I certainly do not now. The gentleman assumes that the new name promised to the church is Christian, without a particle of proof, and then he erects his argument upon this assumption. As I said before, the name Christian was given by the enemies of the disciples as a term of reproach. But, says Mr. Braden, inspired men accepted this name. But this does not prove that it is the name promised, for inspired men accepted the names by which sects and parties were known, it did not matter how these names originated. The name Christian was applied to the disciples at Antioch, just as the name Methodist was applied to us, and Campbellite to the followers of Mr. Campbell, though they refuse that appellation while we accept ours.

On our article concerning original sin, the gentleman has admitted that infants are morally impure. If this is true there is a sin of nature. This moral impurity must be purged away, or they can not enter heaven, for nothing impure can enter heaven. This being the case, they must be born again, they must be regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and that, too, without the word. This admission is not only fatal to his objection against this article, but it also cuts up his theory of spiritual influence by the roots.

The gentleman comes to rites and ceremonies again, and he wants to know if these rites and ceremonies are not contrary to the word of God why change them? Simply because what is adapted to one country or age is not adapted to another, and hence the church is left free in this respect to adapt herself to circumstances, as Mr. Campbell well remarks on the law of expediency, at length, in his *Christian System*, pp. 90-94. He says:

"Many things, indeed, that are of vital importance to the well-being and prosperity of the kingdom of Christ, are left to the law of expediency." p. 91.

Such things as are not contrary to the word of God, and as may be judged to be beneficial, the church can ordain, or change for good reasons: such as are, the church can not touch. There is no likeness here to the mother of harlots.

But Mr. Braden still contends that infants can not enter into covenant with God. But I ask him again, if infants are not included in the covenant, when they are expressly mentioned, "Your little ones?" Were not infants put into the covenant of circumcision? He tells us "common-sense teaches us infants can not enter into covenant

relation with God." But divine wisdom says they can. Mr. Braden's common-sense, here is evidently at fault, for it stands diametrically opposed to infinite wisdom. Here I have presented the cases before him where infants did enter into covenant with God, and if he has not common-sense to see it I can not help it.

But the gentleman still objects to our ordination vow. But as I said before, there must be order and subordination in every organization. You can not have an organization without it. This the scriptures themselves recognize, and command us to "obey those who have the rule over us;" and our ordination vow requires nothing more than is here enjoined in the word of God. And what is there unscriptural in solemnly promising to do what Christ enjoins of every one? This, and this alone, do we promise in our ordination vow, and surely any man that is loyal to Christ can do this.

The gentleman tells us it is more difficult, and takes a longer time, to get into the Methodist Episcopal Church, than it does to get into the kingdom of heaven. He tells us that when a man knocks at the door of our church, we keep him waiting in the kitchen six months before we let him in. But that is nothing to the length of time he had Abraham waiting in the kitchen, or some where else. He kept him at the mourner's bench, trying to "get through," some forty or fifty years, and then before he could get through he had to offer up Isaac on the altar on Mount Moriah. Our six months' probation is nothing to the time Mr. Braden made Abraham "wait in the kitchen." [Laughter.] But I ask if every church has not the right to adopt such rules for the reception of members into its bosom as it may see fit, so long as it does not violate the Holy Scriptures? There is not a church on earth which does not have some form of receiving persons into membership. Some churches try those who present themselves for membership by an examination in regard to their religious experience. Others admit them by a vote of the society, which is certainly a trial of their fitness for membership, while we try them by letting their lives for a reasonable time prove that they are proper persons to be admitted into the church. The spiritual privileges and rights, as I said before, of a probationer, are the same as those of a full member; the only difference is they have not a voice in the government of the church. There is nothing unscriptural in this arrangement, but it is in accordance with the general teachings of the scriptures and the practice of the primitive church. Mr. Campbell himself says the government of the church rests with the seniors. But it does look quite ridiculous to hear a man objecting so seriously to a six months' probation, who keeps Abraham knocking at the door, standing in the kitchen, kneeling at the mourner's bench, forty or fifty years, before he will allow him to enter!

But the gentleman objects to our Discipline because it recognizes different orders in the ministry. But does not the New Testament recognize different orders in the ministry? We do not hold to three orders in the ministry, but to two. Our bishops are not an order, but simply an office in the order of elders. The New Testament recognizes bishops, or elders, and deacons. Stephen and Philip were deacons, and they were preachers, or ministers of the word; and Paul

says, "For they that have used the office of deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." This plainly shows that deacons are a subordinate order of ministers according to the New Testament. Here we have elders and deacons in the work of the ministry. Here the word of God is directly against my friend again, but it agrees exactly with the Discipline.

But he tells us that of these different orders in the ministry the New Testament knows nothing. On the contrary, he tells us, the church of Christ is the most perfect democracy. But let us look for a moment at the structure of the apostolic church as it was developed during the apostolic age, and by the apostles themselves, and we will find a most striking agreement between it and the Methodist Episcopal Church. There were, first, the apostles, who belonged to the order of bishops or elders, for these terms both point out the same office or order, the one being of Hebrew, the other of Greek origin. Next we see the elders they appointed to preside over certain districts, as Timothy in Asia Minor, and Titus in Crete. Such were also the angels of the seven churches of Asia, the chief pastors, afterward styled pre-eminently bishops, who had the oversight of all the ministers and congregations in their respective cities. Here we have an office of apostolic origin, answering exactly to our presiding eldership, and to this office Timothy and Titus were appointed by Paul; and they were presiding elders, only the powers conferred upon them were much greater than the powers of a Methodist presiding elder.

Here we have the constitution and government of the apostolic church as it is laid down in the New Testament. So far as the original or primary government of the congregation is concerned, it was modeled after that of the Jewish synagogue. There was its college of presbyters, one of whom was appointed president, and they all jointly administered the government of the church, and dispensed the word of life. The nearest approach to the government of the apostolic congregation that we find in modern times, is found in the Presbyterian Church. The principal difference is, in the apostolic church all the elders were preachers, in the Presbyterian Church they are all laymen. But at a later period of the apostolic age we see under the apostles the episcopal form developing itself in Asia Minor and elsewhere. The angels of the seven churches were the bishops, or presiding elders of the seven churches, and they had the supervision of the whole body of believers in their respective cities, sometimes amounting to several thousand persons, served by different pastors, meeting in different places of worship. Such was the church at Antioch under Ignatius, said to consist of some ten thousand members. And Clement, bishop of Rome, and the fellow-laborer of Saint Paul, expressly states in his epistle to the church at Corinth, that this government of the church was ordained by the apostles; and immediately after the apostles, and during the lives of those who were cotemporary with them, such as Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna, we find this form of government to be universal.

But he tells us these different orders of the ministry destroy congregational independence. This is entirely new to us and to our

brethren. We have never yet learned that our congregational independence has been destroyed by our different orders in the ministry. I have been a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church for nineteen years. I was licensed to exhort, and afterward to preach, in the Methodist Episcopal Church; I have been a local preacher, and traveling preacher. I have filled every position in the church, from exhorter to presiding elder, and yet I have never seen where our orders in the ministry destroyed congregational independence. There is not a church in the land that has more congregational independence than the Methodist Episcopal Church has. It is the laymen who make the preachers. The laymen hold our church property, they elect our church trustees, and the property is deeded to them, and they control it. The laymen control everything in the congregation. No preacher, presiding elder, or bishop, can expel a member from the church until he is convicted by the laymen. Persons are admitted into the church in the presence of the congregation, and with the consent of the society. No man can be even licensed to exhort without a recommendation from the society to which he belongs, or a leaders' meeting, made up of laymen. No man can be licensed to preach without such a recommend, and then he is licensed by a quarterly conference made up of laymen. No preacher can be admitted in our annual conference without a recommendation from a quarterly conference made up of laymen. There is no church government on earth any farther from being tyrannical or oppressive than our church government; and the more you examine into the constitution and workings of the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the more you will be convinced that it comes nearer to the apostolic church in its government than any other church in existence.

Our bishops are not bishops by divine right. We make no such claim. They are not a separate order of ministers; but they are simply officers of the church, set apart for the more perfect and uniform administration of discipline. They may be set aside from their office without impeaching their ministerial character, and they may resign their office, as Bishop Hamline did, and still continue in the order of elders to which they belong. All the authority they have is given them by their brethren for the sake of the good order and discipline of the church. The form of church government is unquestionably left to the law of expediency, and any form may be adopted which is thought to best promote the glory of God and advance the work of the church, which does not conflict with the teachings of the word of God. I wish now to read some of Mr. Campbell's remarks on the law of expediency. He says:

"The communion of saints of all Christian churches—the co-operation of churches as one holy nation, a kingdom of priests, as a peculiar people in all common interests and benefits—an efficient gospel ministry, supported justly and honorably by the whole community—are matters clearly and fully taught by both apostolic precept and authority; but the forms, the ways and means by which these ends shall be attained, are left to the law of expediency."—*Christian System*, pp. 92, 93.

Mr. Campbell here utters the truth, and his followers would do

well to profit by his instructions. Now here are ends to be attained, but the means by which they are to be attained are left to the law of expediency; and while we claim to be as near, and I think a little nearer, the apostolic form of church government than any other ecclesiastical organization, we do not say that other organizations are unscriptural. There is no stereotyped form given that we are bound to follow. There was a change of ecclesiastical government, from the primal synagogue form to a kind of episcopacy, as we have seen in the days of the apostles, and by their authority, to meet the demands and wants of the growing church; and the liberty to adjust these things to the wants of the church has been left to the law of expediency and the good sense of the church.

In regard to church government I have no conscientious scruples. If a man claims episcopacy of divine right, and claims that no other form of church government is scriptural, and no other ordination valid, then I shall certainly reject it, because such high claims are unsupported by the word of God; and I have taken a solemn vow to maintain the pure doctrines of the divine word, and to banish all strange and erroneous doctrines from the church. But I am perfectly willing that men may enjoy their preferences as to the form of ecclesiastical polity, so long as they plead for it on the ground of expediency, and not of exclusive divine right. Whether a man be a Congregationalist, an Episcopalian, or a Presbyterian, I care not a particle so far as church government is concerned; and I will give the right hand of fellowship to any man on this question who does not claim his system of ecclesiastical polity to be exclusively of divine right. But if a man attacks my church government, then I will defend it to the very best of my ability, and I think I shall be able to successfully defend it in the present discussion. I think it is an easy matter to show that the ecclesiastical polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church is as nearly modeled after the primitive and apostolic church as any ecclesiastical organization that can be found.

As to our doctrines, they can not be changed. The articles of faith remain the same always, while an ecclesiastical polity adapts itself to the circumstances of the community and wants of the church.

As for lay representation in the councils of the church, I can not determine whether it is promotive of the interests of the kingdom of God or not. Our church, I mean the membership, voted on the question once, and decided against it, and our General Conference has referred it to them for their decision again. If the church thinks it for the best, they can have it by saying so, and the ministry will not object. If the church does not desire it they can say so. The matter is for the church to decide, and as the laymen themselves decide so will the action of the General Conference be.

But my opponent tells us the Methodist Episcopal Church is the granddaughter of the mother of harlots. He says the Church of England is the daughter of the Church of Rome, and the Methodist Episcopal Church is the daughter of the Church of England. Is not the Campbellite Church the granddaughter of the mother of harlots too? The Baptist Church sprung from the Church of Home, just as did the Church of England, and the Campbellite Church sprung from

the Baptist Church just as the Methodist Episcopal Church sprung from the Church of England; and if the Methodist Episcopal Church is the granddaughter of the mother of harlots, so is the Campbellite Church. The only way in which any church can be spiritually related to the mother of harlots, is by agreement in doctrine and moral character; and in this respect the Campbellite Church bears the marks of relationship much stronger than does the Methodist Episcopal Church. The mother of harlots and the Campbellite Church agree exactly on the doctrine of the remission of sins; they both hold that the penitent sinner can obtain remission of sins only in baptism. They agree in the doctrine of remission of sins after baptism—that remission of sins committed after baptism must be obtained by confession and prayer; though they differ as to the manner of the confession. They both reject the doctrine of justification by faith only, and agree that justification is obtained before God by works of obedience. This granddaughter of the mother of harlots bears the marks of her close relationship most distinctly and unmistakably. His objection to our band meetings comes with a bad grace from him, sustaining the close relation which his doctrine and practice prove exists between the mother of harlots and the Campbellite Church. Our band societies were voluntary associations, and the confessions required in them were consequently voluntary, and were for the purpose of getting assistance in prayer and Christian counsel, and it was therefore scriptural, as you may see by James v. 16. The gentleman can find no agreement between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the mother of harlots, on the distinguishing doctrines of that great apostate church, while there is a striking agreement between her distinguishing doctrines and those of the Campbellite Church.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—It seems before my opponent could reply to what I said concerning justification by faith he had to misrepresent me. I did not say Abraham was many years in being justified. I said he was pre-eminently justified and made father of the faithful, when he gave the greatest exhibition of faith ever seen in man, when he offered Isaac on Mount Moriah. So says the Holy Spirit in James ii. I also said and my opponent heard and understood me, though he misrepresents me, that he was justified when he believed God and obeyed him and went forth into the land of Canaan. He was justified by a living faith, a faith made alive by his works.

The gentleman can not let circumcision alone yet. When Paul was using the language my opponent quotes so much, he was addressing the Jew, and the Jew alone. The Jew hesitated at accepting Christ as his only means of justification, without the law of Moses. He asks how can God justify a man without the law without contradicting himself? Paul shows Abraham was justified before the law, and without a single item of it, by faith and obedience to God.

"Therefore," says he, "a man can be justified now, after the law

has been fulfilled in Christ, by faith and obedience to Christ, without deeds of the Mosaic law."

This is as plain as two and two are four, and shows that Paul gives no excuse for men's perverting his ideas and language, as the Discipline and its champion, my opponent, persist in.

We come now to the name "sou," which he attempted to prove to be the new name of the followers of Christ. It is a name given to them, but is not their peculiar name. It is not a patronymic. Christian is a peculiar name, a patronymic. But he says Christian was given just as Methodist was, and has no more authority. I find it was afterward owned, used, and enjoined by the apostles. It has apostolic precept and example. The name Methodist has not, and is therefore usurping the place of that which has apostolic precept and example. These denominational names are all usurpations.

I have never troubled myself about the impurity of infants. I never trouble myself about what I can know nothing about. How can any one tell the state of the infant's heart? Were mine to die in infancy, I would rest perfectly satisfied concerning their condition. There had been no sin, no opposition to God, no guilt, and they would be accepted by a kind and loving Creator, for of such is his kingdom. I can not conceive how my opponent knows so much about the operation in the infant's mind. How does he know that there is an irresistible influence of the Spirit to regenerate all dying in infancy? If there had been impurity in the heart of the infant, would Christ have placed one before his disciples and told them they must become like it, become impure before they could enter his kingdom? To evade this, the gentleman makes one of the most unfounded, preposterous assumptions ever heard of. The Holy Spirit had changed the infant's heart to render him a fit subject to use as an illustration. In the name of reason and a decent respect for our common-sense, how and where did he learn it? He must have seen it through his spiritual discerning-stone.

My opponent wants to know how a man becomes a member of any particular congregation among our people. When he has obeyed Christ, he is a member of his church by virtue of such obedience, and entitled to its general privileges and ordinances. We everywhere recognize him as a brother. But there still remains the question, when shall he have a voice in election of officers and in those local matters which each local congregation decides for itself? He decides this by giving his name or request to that effect to the elders of a congregation. The elder announces his request, and if no objection is made, we give him the hand of fellowship, and the clerk records the transaction, that all may be done decently and in order.

Mr. Campbell speaks of elders in a church. He uses the word in two senses. So does the Bible. It generically means the seniors of the congregation, who were conceded respect and influence. In this sense it does not mean an officer. But as overseers were chosen from among these, it came specifically to mean, or to be used interchangeably with overseer, and in that sense it means an officer, and is identical with overseer. Overseers or elders and deacons are the only two officers known to the apostolic churches. Evangelists proclaimed the

word, and built up churches, but as soon as these were set in order, their authority ceased. If they became members of the church, they passed under the authority of the officers of that church. The bishop's authority extended no further than the congregation in which he lived. He bore no resemblance to the lord bishops of the Methodist Church.

My opponent has found a presiding elder in Timothy. Timothy went out to set the churches in order, and as soon as that was done, he had no more authority over them. The congregations chose elders, ho ordained them, and then his work ceased. He did not, like my opponent, go around once in three months and take the rule and control of thoroughly organized congregations, and decide questions of law and order for them.

The gentleman reads from Bro. Campbell on the Law of Expediency, and a very sensible article it was. It would have been better for his hearers had he filled up his time in that way. Bro. Campbell does not regard the organization and ordinances of God's house as questions of expediency. They are matters of law. They are established by apostolic precept and example, and we have no discretion. But how the work to be done by these churches and how the duties of these officers shall be executed in regard to agencies employed or instrumentalities used—these are questions of expediency. Campbell said nothing that affords the slightest sanction to such a monstrous usurpation as the Methodist hierarchy. My opponent is simply trying to divert attention from the charge I made and sustained against his Discipline.

We will now, briefly, as we must for want of time, place before you a connected review of the specifications we have presented against the Discipline.

1. We read from article 5, "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." We subscribed to every word of this and asked: 1. If the scriptures contain all that is necessary to salvation, what need of this Discipline? 2. If any thing can be read in them, what need of reading it in the Discipline? 3. If any thing can be proved by them, what benefit in proving it by the Discipline? 4. If nothing except what is in the Bible is to be required of men, why not let the Bible require it? Why do it by the Discipline? Evidently the Discipline, according to its own declaration, is an unscriptural usurpation.

2. We quoted 2 Timothy iii. 15: "The Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation; all scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished to all good work." We asked, what more can be needed? The scriptures do all this, and do it perfectly; hence the Discipline is a presumptuous usurpation.

3. We read the title page. We read first the word doctrines. We showed that the doctrine of Christ was always in the singular number,



was a unit, a glorious whole, of which he was the theme, and his Messiahship the central truth. If the Methodist Discipline contains doctrines, it contains more than God's word, and is unscriptural.

4. We read the name Methodist Church, and showed that the scriptures knew no such. The church, Christ's bride, should wear his name. In wearing some other name, the Methodist Church is guilty of spiritual adultery. The apostles call the church, the church of Christ, church of God, and no other name. Hence the Discipline, on its title-page, violates apostolic example.

5. The Discipline call its adherents Methodists. If they are Christians, it violates apostolic precept and example. We showed from Paul's and Peter's acknowledgment of the name; from their use of it; from James speaking of it as the name by which all were called; from Christ's commendation of the church at Pergamos for wearing his name; from Paul's declaration that the whole family was named after Christ; from his declaration that as all were baptized into Christ's name, and as Christ died for all, we should wear his name; and his condemnation of wearing other names, that the Discipline violates apostolic precept and example in calling its followers Methodists, if they are Christians.

6. We showed that the declaration that God was without body or parts, was a plain violation of the apostolic injunction, "avoid untaught questions," for, as the Bible declares, no man hath seen God at any time, and as the Holy Spirit, which searches the deep things of God, had never uttered a syllable on this point, it was plainly an untaught question.

7. We showed next that the declaration that "there is in the Godhead three persons of one substance," was absurd, contradictory and a violation of the declaration, "avoid untaught questions."

8. We arrayed against the declaration, "Christ died to reconcile the Father to us," no less than six plain declarations of the scriptures, that Christ died to reconcile the world to God. We showed that the idea was incompatible with the character of God given in the Bible, the expiation made by Christ, and the whole spirit of the gospel.

9. We next showed that the mourner's bench practices, seeking, mourning, and the whole theory of conversion and prayer, based on this idea of reconciling God, was unscriptural and absurd in every particular. Though the gentleman was ready to cry with the idolatrous Micah, "Ye have taken away my gods and what have I left," he utterly failed to sustain a single one of the peculiarities of Methodism from the Bible.

10. We next showed that where the Discipline attempts to spiritualize the Jewish law and its promises, it contradicts the word of God, for in it every promise of the Jewish law was temporal and transitory.

11. We next showed that in declaring that Christians are not free from the commandments of the Decalogue, the Discipline is contradictory, for it does not require obedience to the fourth; and that it violates God's word which declares that the tables of the ten commandments were abolished and done away.

12. We next showed that in its teachings on original sin the Discipline taught what was not in the word of God, and what contra-

dicted its teachings, and especially Christ's language concerning infants. All my opponent's twisting and perversion and assumptions about infant regeneration could not save the Discipline from a palpable contradiction of God's word.

13. Next we showed that its doctrine of human inability was absurd, contradictory and Calvinistic, and in direct violation of the whole spirit of the gospel, which predicates man's salvation on his ability to avail himself of the means God offers, and that this ability is inherent, natural, and exists in him, independent of all other influences.

14. We next showed a palpable violation and contradiction of God's word in the central dogma of Methodism, "justification by faith alone," by reading from the scriptures that a man is not justified by faith alone. From this the gentleman was utterly unable to extricate himself. He tried every dodge conceivable. It was the justification of the saint James was speaking of. We showed that it was the justification of all men. Next Paul taught the dogma of the Discipline, thus trying to make a liar of the Holy Spirit. We showed he did not. This most palpable contradiction stands there, and will stand forever. The Discipline explicitly and emphatically contradicts God's word.

15. We next showed that in saying that baptism was a sign of regeneration, the Discipline contradicted God's word, which says it is the answer or condition of a good conscience. It contradicts the gentleman also, who says it is the seeking of a good conscience. It can not be a sign of what already exists, and a means of seeking what does not exist.

16. We next showed that in teaching infant baptism, it violated the law of God which limits baptism to penitent believers.

17. We next showed that in making provisions for the Lord's Supper once in three months, it violated apostolic example, according to Mr. Wesley himself.

18. We next showed, in presuming to change the rites or ordinances of God's house, and teaching that it can be done, it blasphemously assumed the prerogatives of God himself, and violated numerous apostolic precepts, and all apostolic example.

19. We next showed that in teaching and allowing three baptisms, it contradicts the word of God, which declares there is but one.

20. We next showed that in its policy of keeping out converted persons for six months, it violated every apostolic example left us, and involved all in gross and indefensible absurdity. The convert was good enough for heaven, but not for the Methodist Church.

21. We next showed that in teaching that any benefit of the atonement is unconditional, the Discipline contradicts the scriptures, which make them depend on faith and obedience.

22. Next that in teaching that the atonement alone entitled any one to any ordinance, it contradicted the word of God, which limits them to those who have complied with the conditions of faith and obedience.

23. That in teaching that children can enter into covenant relations with God, it contradicts common-sense and all justice, which de-

clave there must be two parties who understand the covenant and assent to it. It contradicts the Word which declares that he will make his covenant only with such as know him, and are willing and understand his law, and have had their sins forgiven. It involves the church in the absurdity of requiring all such persons, when afterward converted, to make the covenant they are supposed to have made years before. It involves the gross absurdity of an unconscious person making a covenant first and then afterward being taught what it was.

24. It involves the gross absurdity of infant membership. If infants are really church members, why deny them the supper, the other ordinance, and why afterward convert and admit them? When did they go out of the church?

25. Our next specification was to the multiplicity and unscriptural character of the officers and ministers provided for by this book. There are nine or ten, and all but two of them unknown to the Bible. This is a palpable violation of apostolic example.

26. Our next specification was the unscriptural manner of their being chosen, violating the simple democratic principle of God's word. They are a self-perpetuating, absolute aristocracy over God's heritage.

27. My next was the extent of the sphere of the power of their office. In the Bible the power of each officer was confined to the congregation. In the Methodist Church congregational independence was unknown.

28. My next was that the officers of the New Testament were servants of the congregations. In Methodism they are rulers and lords, the people having no voice whatever, not even in controlling their own church property.

29. My next was that Methodist preachers were to mind every thing, great and small, in the Discipline, and thus the boasted freedom to consult the Bible, my opponent talked so much of, was a farce. If he were to mind every thing great and small, how dare he question a single one of them? The Discipline usurped the place of the scriptures.

30. My next was that the Discipline added "love feasts" to the ordinances of Christ's church. This is as much an ordinance as the supper it precedes, and a Methodist preacher would be disciplined as quickly for setting it to one side.

31. My next is that the Discipline creates an order of offenses unknown in the scriptures which my opponent pretends to take as the standard, "disobedience to the order and discipline of our church." The Bible knows nothing of such an offense. It is an evident addition to scriptural offenses, for they are first enumerated, and then it is added as an additional one.

32. Our next was that the rigmarole required at the baptism of adults was unknown to the Bible, and a violation of apostolic example.

33. My next was that the questions and confession required when admitting members was unknown to the Bible and a violation of apostolic example.

34. My next was that the oath required of preachers and others was unscriptural. It is almost identical with the oath required of

Catholic priests, so much condemned as tyrannical and unscriptural, by the whole world. They are to reverently and gladly obey those over them, regarding their commands as godly or divine.

For these reasons have we arraigned this Discipline as teaching doctrines and enjoining usages contrary to the word of God. The gentleman attempts to excuse his little book by saying it is based on the word of God. If so, why not use the word? If it contains more than the word, it contains human additions and should be rejected as presumptuous and impious. If it contains less, it is imperfect. If it contains just the word, it is needless. If it agrees with the word, why not use the higher and divine authority, and throw it away? If it disagrees, it is contradictory, as we have urged. If it is claimed that it is used to explain the word, we blasphemously presume to say we can make doctrine and practice clearer than God himself.

The gentleman says the Bible is the standard. If so, why not use it in all cases? But it is not. The Bible is never used in receiving or trying members. If the Bible is the standard, will the gentleman allow an appeal from the Discipline to the standard? No, sir; you use the Discipline as the standard to determine the meaning of the Bible, and you lay the Bible on the shelf. You allow no appeal from the Disciplined It usurps the place of the Bible in the church.

In conclusion, let me exhort you to throw away such human devices. Go back to the perfect word of God, which shall abide forever, which is perfect, converting the soul, which is clear, enlightening the eyes, which will make wise unto salvation, and is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and by which the man of God is made perfect, and thoroughly furnished to all good works.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S CLOSING REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I rise to close the discussion on the present proposition. The gentleman complains that I misrepresent him in regard to Abraham's justification. I do not intend willfully to misrepresent an opponent, but I perceive he has changed his ground materially as to the time of Abraham's justification. I will leave it to you, ladies and gentlemen, if he has not, up to this morning, throughout this discussion, contended that Abraham was justified by works when he offered up Isaac, and that faith was not imputed to him for righteousness until then? He said Abraham's justification was not complete until that event, and he had Abraham seeking justification, or remission of sins, or, in other words, he had him at the mourner's bench from the time he left Haran, when he was seventy-five years old, until Isaac was a grown man, some forty or fifty years after that event. This position he took in the discussion on the second proposition, and he held it till I drove him from it this morning; then he changed his ground, as he did on the question of the chronology of the 430 years between the covenant and the giving of the law; and now he tells us Abraham was justified, his sins were pardoned, before he ever came into Canaan at all; that he was justified by works—by the work of obedience, when he obeyed God

and went forth from Ur of the Chaldees! My opponent is determined not to receive the truth. I drove him from one error, and he plunges into a grosser one. He contended at first that Abraham was justified on Mount Moriah when he offered up Isaac; but as I drove him from that position, he now tells us he was justified long years before that event, by obeying God in going out of Ur of the Chaldees. A man that is thus compelled to admit his error and change his ground in debate on a question of such vital importance, is certainly a very unsafe guide to follow in theology, and [ would not advise you, ladies and gentlemen, to follow his teaching. A man whose mind is so shallow, and whose reasoning powers are so deficient, as to suffer himself to be compelled publicly in debate to abandon a position upon which his whole argument rests, as my opponent has done in this case, I tell you is a dangerous guide to follow. Whenever my opponent compels me to do anything of this kind, you may say, "Hughey is badly beaten, and he knows it."

But this course of the gentleman's demonstrates another thing, and that is, that he is not capable of defending his doctrine. He does not consider well his positions before taking them, and by not considering the consequences of his position, he suffers himself to be compelled, just in the conclusion of the discussion, to abandon his position and his whole argument, thus confessing to you that his whole argument is false and sophistical. He tells us now that he was mistaken all the time; faith was not imputed to Abraham for righteousness at Mount Moriah when he offered up Isaac, but that it was imputed to him for righteousness when he obeyed God and went out of Ur of the Chaldees—that Abraham was justified by works in thus obeying God. *Mr. Braden*—I call the gentleman to order; he is misrepresenting me.

*Mr. Hughey*—State your position then.

*Mr. Braden*—I did not say that James said that Abraham was justified and pardoned as a sinner at all. I never made any such assumption. It was the imputation of that faith which constituted Abraham the father of the faithful at Mount Moriah, and I say so yet.

*Mr. Hughey*—When was faith imputed to Abraham for righteousness?

*Mr. Braden*—That faith was imputed at Mount Moriah. So says James.

*Mr. Hughey*—When was he justified in the sense of pardon?

*Mr. Braden*—Before he was circumcised.

*Mr. Hughey*—I do not wish to misrepresent the gentleman, nor have I done it, as the audience very well knows. I proved by Paul, Romans iv. 11, that Abraham was constituted the father of the faithful—of all believers, by circumcision, not by faith:

"And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also."

Here it is expressly declared that it was circumcision that constituted Abraham the father of all believers, and not his faith; for he had faith before he was circumcised, but he was not the father of be-

lievers before he was circumcised. James says nothing at all about Abraham's being constituted the father of them that believe. He simply says:

"And the scripture was fulfilled (or demonstrated to be true) which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God." James ii. 23.

James here declares that this act of obedience on the part of Abraham proved that he was a righteous man—that faith had been imputed to him for righteousness, but he does not say that faith was then imputed for righteousness, nor does he say that he was then constituted the father of believers. The gentleman's attempt to get out of the difficulty here has only got him a little deeper into it. He is sinking deeper and still deeper into the mire of error. Abraham was justified in the sense of pardon long before Isaac was born. Faith was imputed to him for righteousness long before he was circumcised, and 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.

Now I would like to know how the sinner is justified "who worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly," if he is not justified by faith only? Here the question of the sinner's justification is settled, and it is proved that works have no part in it, for he "worketh not," but simply "believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly;" So our doctrine of justification by faith only is the doctrine of the word of God; and here I will let the matter rest.

But he tells us that persons before the flood were called the "sons of God." They were not called the sons of God, however, in the spiritual sense in which believers under the gospel are called the sons of God. This obscure passage, as the gentleman knows, can not be brought forward to illustrate the use of the term or appellation as applied to believers, while I showed by the New Testament that under the former dispensation the worshipers of God were called "servants," but under the gospel they are called "sons," to represent their new relation under the covenant of grace. See especially Galatians iv. 1-7. The distinguishing appellation of believers under the gospel is sons, in opposition to servants.

But he tells us it was inspired Christian men who accepted the name Christian, which was given to the disciples at Antioch, and that it was uninspired men who accepted the name Methodist. But this does not prove that Christian is the "new name which the mouth of the Lord should name," for the mouth of the Lord did not give this name. But how, I ask, are we to distinguish between those who hold the doctrines taught by Wesley and those taught by Campbell, except we call the one Methodist and the other Campbellite? The name Christian is a common appellation, by which all who profess to follow Christ are known; but it does not point out any particular body of Christians, or any particular form of belief, and the common-sense of mankind demands that different bodies of Christians, or professed Christians, should be known by different appellations. We do not deny or repudiate the name Christian; we simply accept the name Methodist as a term of distinction, by which we may be known among

the household of faith, and there is nothing unchristian in this at all. In the present divided state of the church this is an absolute necessity. I do not say that the present state of the church is right, but it actually exists, and can only be remedied by a higher spiritual life, and it will take a great deal more than the influence of a name to restore the church to the unity of the faith. A more powerful baptism of the Holy Spirit will do it, and that alone.

But the gentleman tells you I am troubled about the salvation of infants. Not at all, sir. I am certain that the four little children of mine who died in infancy are safely housed in heaven; not because they were never denied by moral depravity—not because they were baptized, though they all were—but because they were redeemed by the blood of Jesus and regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. But this does not set aside the fact that by nature their hearts were corrupt and impure. It only shows that the merits of Christ hath procured redemption from original sin as well as actual transgression—that, "as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Romans v. 18.

But he tells us that Christ could not have held up children as the model to which the believer must conform, if they are morally depraved. But the point of resemblance here is not moral purity, but relationship to Christ. The adult stands in the same relation to Christ that the infant does. The infant stands in a justified relation to Christ through the blood of the cross. So must adults. This is as far as the resemblance goes, and in this respect the resemblance is perfect.

But the gentleman wants to know how persons become members of the Methodist Episcopal Church? When we receive a member on probation, he is entitled, as I said before, to baptism, and to all the rights of a full member, except a voice in the government of the church and the administration of discipline. Before he is admitted to this important trust we examine his fitness by a proper time of trial; and it is to this probation, or trial period, that he objects. But, I ask, how does his church admit persons into full membership in the church? They baptize no man into any particular church or congregation, but they baptize persons into the general church just as we do. But how do they get them into a particular church or congregation? But something more than baptism is necessary. There must be some act of the congregation by which the baptized person is received as a member of the congregation, either by a direct vote, or by indirect and tacit consent. But where is the scripture authority for this method of reception? There is none at all; and yet common-sense shows that something must be done to bring the person into the congregation. This is a question of expediency, and all are bound to act upon it. The only question is, which is the best method of reaching this end? Both are alike scriptural, but which is the preferable mode. On this question we differ. He prefers his mode and we prefer ours. All baptized believers are members of the household of faith, but whether they are members of a certain congregation or not depends upon the action of that congregation. It is

only a question of common-sense and propriety as to which is the preferable mode of accomplishing the same result. On this question the scriptures are silent. So after all he can not make out a case against the Discipline on the ground of our probationary system. This reception of members on probation into the church is no new thing. As far back as ecclesiastical history goes, as near the days of the apostles as we can get, we find that a system of probation existed in the church. One hundred years after the death of the apostles we know that this rule universally obtained in the church, as Tertullian, Origen, and their fellow-laborers testify, and sometimes it continued one and two years, while the probationers, or catechumens, were not permitted to enjoy the privileges and sacraments of the church during their probation, as our probationers are. This plan, instead of being opposed to the scriptures, is in perfect harmony with the instructions of Christ and his apostles. Jesus says, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and Paul says, "Lay hands suddenly on no man." I think, upon the whole, this is much the preferable plan of receiving members into the church of Christ. Campbell says the government of the church is to be exercised by the seniors, or older members of the church, and that these seniors or elders are to be elected by the congregation, which represent the majority of the seniors in whom, as he contends, the government inherently rests, as you will see by consulting *Christian System*, p. 93. And this is what we practically carry out in our ecclesiastical economy.

But the gentleman will have it that our different orders of the ministry are contrary to the scriptures. As I told you before, we have but two orders in the ministry, elders and deacons. Bishops with us are not a different order, but an office in the order of elders, set apart for a particular work. Every one knows that there are two orders of the ministry recognized in the New Testament. Deacons were at first appointed as the servants of the apostles, to attend to the temporalities of the church. But they were also a subordinate order in the ministry, as the New Testament fully shows. Stephen, the first martyr, was a deacon, and he was a preacher of the word. Philip was one of the first seven deacons appointed, and he was a preacher also. All ecclesiastical history shows that in and after the apostles' times there were these two orders in the ministry, elders and deacons, and that the bishops, or angels of the early church, were officers belonging to the order of elders, appointed for a special purpose.

But the gentleman tells us that Timothy, after he ceased to be a presiding elder, fell back into the ranks of the ministry. This is just precisely what we do. I expect in a few weeks to give up the presiding eldership and fall back again into the pastoral work, just as I was before I was appointed to the district. So here again we see the striking agreement between the apostolic church and the Methodist Episcopal Church. Here my opponent has helped me in my argument, and has himself pointed out a striking resemblance between the government of the apostolic church and that of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The more you examine the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church the more will you become convinced of its essential agreement with that of the apostolic church.



In regard to the law of expediency which Mr. Campbell pleads for, all must admit that there are many things necessary to the successful efficiency of the church concerning which there are no particular directions left in the New Testament. Many ends are to be reached, but the means by which they are to be reached are left to the law of expediency. So says Mr. Campbell, and so says every intelligent and reasonable man.

I come now to the review of the gentleman's argument, and I will review it in full if I have time.

His first objection to our Discipline was to the name, Methodist Episcopal Church. This, he said, is unscriptural. But I showed in reply to this, that, as the church is divided into different denominations, some distinguishing title by which each division may be known, and evangelical churches may be distinguished from heretical bodies, makes it necessary that some name or title should be applied to each organization of Christians, not to set aside the common name Christian' but to distinguish the true church from heretical bodies. It is true that in the days of the apostles there were none of the names applied to modern denominations in existence, nor was it necessary in their day, for they constituted a living, authoritative tribunal, which had power to determine every question that should arise, and stop all divisions in the church. But since the apostles have passed away we have no living authority to settle disputes about doctrines, and consequently it is impossible to get along without distinctive appellations to point out the different bodies that claim to constitute the church of Christ, so that the world may be able to distinguish between the claims of true and false Christians. So this indictment falls to the ground, and the name Methodist Episcopal Church is not an anti-Christian name, for we do not set aside the name of Christ by this name at all; we still claim and recognize the general name Christian, which is common to all the followers of Christ.

His second objection was, that the Discipline attempts to do what we can not do—to define and teach something concerning which we know nothing. But I showed beyond the possibility of controversy that God is a Spirit, and therefore without body or parts,' that he is omnipresent; but a body can be present in but one place at a time, and therefore the Omnipresent God is not possessed of body or parts, but he is a Spirit. This article sets forth what the scriptures teach in opposition to materialistic heretics. Here again his indictment falls to the ground.

His third objection was to our doctrine of the unity of substance in the Godhead. But I showed that the scriptures teach that God is one in substance, wisdom, and power; and that he has revealed himself to us as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. On these points we have the clear testimony of the word of God. Here again the gentleman's indictment falls to the ground.

His fourth objection was to the doctrine of reconciliation, as taught in our second article of religion, which teaches that Christ died to reconcile his Father to us. He tells us Christ died to reconcile man to God, and not God to man. But I showed that Christ's death was a propitiation—a satisfaction for sin—a propitiation to God. I showed

also that Christ entered into heaven to reconcile things in heaven with his blood, and that the only things in heaven to be reconciled were the principles of the divine government, which stood in the way of the sinner's pardon, and that Christ, by the propitiation of his blood, met and satisfied the claims of justice, and thus reconciled the principles of the divine government to the pardon of the sinner, so that God is now "in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;" and he can "be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." In this sense I showed that the death of Christ reconciled his Father to us, and it is in this sense that our Discipline makes use of this language. Here the gentleman went completely over to Universalism, as I showed you. Here again his fourth objection falls to the ground.

His fifth objection to the Discipline was, that the scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and therefore the Discipline is unnecessary. We do not have a Discipline for the purpose of setting aside the authority of the scriptures as the rule of faith and practice. On the other hand our Discipline expressly declares that the scriptures are "the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice." Our Discipline, instead of setting aside the authority of God's word, recognizes it as the sole authority in matters of faith and practice. It simply gives us a summary of the leading doctrines of the gospel, in opposition to the teachings of heretics, so that the world may not classify us with those who corrupt the doctrines of the gospel. But this question will come up more fully to-morrow. So his fifth indictment fails him.

His sixth objection to the Discipline is, he says it requires Christians to obey the moral law to observe the Jewish Sabbath, etc., which he says was repealed by the death of Christ. But I showed that the moral law, or ten commandments, never has been repealed, and was never intended to be repealed. On the other hand, I showed that this law was reaffirmed by Christ under the gospel. Secondly, I showed that a change of the day did not abrogate the law of the Sabbath, and although we have no direct precept changing the day from the seventh to the first day of the week, we have apostolic example, which is equally as good as a positive precept. Here again the gentleman's indictment falls to the ground, and the Discipline and the scriptures agree, while Mr. Braden stands squarely against both.

But the gentleman tells us that we are constantly changing our doctrines. A more palpable misrepresentation could not be made than is this statement. He knows, or he ought to know, that under the constitution of our church, there can be no change in our doctrines, and he knows there never has been any such change. Our articles of faith are the same now that they ever have been, and they must ever remain unchanged, for the General Conference is expressly prohibited from making any change in our articles of religion, by the constitution of the church. (See New Discipline, p. 49.) There may be changes made in our temporal economy, of our ritual, conference boundaries, etc., but our doctrines can never be changed or altered; the General Conference has no such power.

His seventh objection to the Discipline was against the doctrine of native depravity, as taught in our seventh article. But I showed that

we are by nature the children of wrath—that the carnal mind is enmity against God—and that in the flesh (or unregenerate mind) there dwelleth no good thing. Thus I showed that the doctrine of total hereditary depravity is the doctrine of the Bible; for David declares he "was shapen in sin, and conceived in iniquity." Here again his indictment failed.

His eighth objection was brought against our eighth article—our doctrine on human ability. He contends, in opposition to that article, that we have ability and power to perform works acceptable to God without the assistance of divine grace. But I not only proved that man is by nature a child of wrath, etc., but I proved also by the word of God that he could not even chance his life without divine aid. I showed also that while all men have ability to obey God, and to do that which is acceptable in his sight, this is not natural ability, but gracious ability. Christ has become, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, "the true light which enlighteneth every man that Cometh into the world." Thus God has given us a gracious ability to turn unto him, a new capital, so to speak, to begin life with. Thus I proved that all the moral ability which man possesses is gracious, not natural; and therefore our eighth article is true. Here the gentleman's indictment failed again, and the Discipline and the word of God harmonize perfectly.

His ninth objection to the Discipline was brought against our ninth article, concerning the doctrine of "justification by faith only." But here I showed demonstrably that the Discipline is right, and that he is wrong. I proved beyond the possibility of doubt that Abraham was justified by simple faith, by believing in God, and that this faith was accounted to him for righteousness; and that sinners are now justified just as Abraham was—that the same faith is imputed unto us for righteousness. But it is not necessary here to review this argument further, as it has been fully demonstrated. Here again his indictment failed, and the Discipline is sustained by the word of God.

His tenth objection to the Discipline was to our seventeenth article, which teaches that baptism is "a sign of regeneration, or the new birth." But on a former proposition I proved demonstrably that baptism is the sign of regeneration, or the new birth; and Peter, as I showed you, states this expressly when he tells us that baptism is the answer of a good conscience. Here Peter declares, as I showed you, that baptism is not the condition upon which a good conscience is obtained—that it does not confer a good conscience, but that it is the sign of a good conscience. Here again his indictment fails, and the Discipline and the word of God are shown to agree perfectly.

His eleventh objection was brought against our twenty-second article, concerning the power of the church to change rites and ceremonies. Here I showed that his objection was a gross and notorious misrepresentation of the teachings of that article. I proved to you by the language of that article itself, that the church has no power to change or alter any thing contrary to the word of God. The rites and ceremonies here spoken of have nothing to do with the ordinances or sacraments ordained by Christ; but they refer to those matters of expediency which Mr. Campbell tells us have been left to the judgment

of the church. But, the gentleman asks, if they are right why change them? They maybe right, and yet not expedient. What maybe expedient in one age or country may not be in another age or country, while both may be equally right; and hence the church has liberty in all matters of expediency, so long as she does not infringe the word of God. So says Mr. Campbell, and so says every intelligent and reflecting mind. Here again the indictment fails, and the Discipline and the word of God are agreed.

fits twelfth objection to the Discipline is against infant church membership. On a former proposition I proved demonstrably that infant church membership is taught in the scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments. But my opponent tells us that infants can not enter into covenant relation with God. But I proved to you that infants have entered into covenant relation with God; and I showed you that at the time the covenant which God made with Abraham, and confirmed with Isaac and Jacob, was afterward ratified with Israel on the plains of Jericho—the covenant confirmed by the oath of God, which Mr. Braden tells us was the spiritual covenant—the covenant of grace, the infants, the little ones of the house of Israel, were present, and entered into the covenant and oath of God. See Deuteronomy xxix. 10-14. Here infants not only entered into covenant with God, but the covenant into which they were brought was the covenant of grace, Mr. Braden himself being judge. He says common-sense teaches us that infants can not enter into covenant with God. But divine wisdom says they can, and this ought to settle the question in every mind. Here again his indictment fails, and the Discipline and the word of God are again shown to be in perfect harmony.

His thirteenth objection to the Discipline was against our manner of receiving persons into the church on probation. But I have fully answered this objection in the first part of my speech, and without repeating what I there said, I will simply refer you to my remarks already made on this subject in the present speech. Here again, as I showed you, his indictment failed; he could not array the Discipline against the word of God on this question.

His fourteenth objection was to our different orders in the ministry. But I showed that the New Testament recognizes two orders in the ministry, bishops, or elders, and deacons; and our Discipline recognizes the same orders. Our bishops, as I told you, are not a different order from elders, but an office in the order of elders, for the better administration of the government of the church. So with our ordination vow, as I showed, it is simply a solemn promise on our part to do our duty as ministers, and nothing more. So this indictment also falls to the ground, and the Discipline and the Bible are seen to agree perfectly again.

His fifteenth objection to the Discipline was against the authority it confers upon the ministry. But I showed that our ministers have no authority over the church but such as Christ has conferred upon them. I showed also that the congregational independence of our church is as perfect as can be desired. The congregations own their own church property, manage their own finances, administer discipline, etc., as independently as any church in the land. No minister,

not even a bishop, or all of them together, can expel a member from the church until he is first convicted by his brother laymen.

His sixteenth objection to the Discipline was, that our ecclesiastical government was a great political machinery, that presented strong temptations to ambitious men to seek the pre-eminence. I have fully answered this charge. No human government can be administered so as to be faultless; and in the administration of our church government we do not claim absolute perfection. Bad men can get into any church or organization, and turn the best institutions into means of accomplishing their bad ends. The gentleman's own church furnishes many painful illustrations of the truth of this remark; and I do not pretend to say that we have never had any bad men in our church, or in our ministry. But it is one of the beauties of our system of church government, that if bad men get into our ministry, they do not remain there long. There is too much labor and privation to suit men who have not the work at heart, and too little compensation to induce such men to remain with us; and also the opportunities of detecting bad men are such that they are usually soon detected and laid aside. Now, sir, the history of our church for a hundred years will furnish you with as few examples of bad men in the ministry as that of any church in the land. Our bishops and ministers, as a class, are as pure and devoted men as live on the earth. Not a charge of immorality has ever been brought against one of our bishops, and this of itself speaks volumes in favor of our church government. And when we take into consideration the wonderful progress our church has made in the past hundred years, we must confess that under God she has been most wonderfully successful in converting men to our Lord, Jesus Christ. The array of figures the gentleman brought forward to show the power, wealth, and influence of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is one of the strongest arguments he could have produced in favor of our ecclesiastical economy. A church that can rise in the short space of one hundred years from nothing to such gigantic proportions, must have uncommon vital force and a very nicely adjusted and efficient government.

But so far as the form of church government is concerned, it is a matter that is clearly left to the law of expediency, and I am willing to allow all men to follow their own preferences so long as they do not infringe the law of God or interfere with the rights of others; and if their church government is better adapted to advance the cause of Christ, and to extend the Redeemer's kingdom in the world than ours, I will rejoice in their prosperity. But so far, with our ecclesiastical economy, we have been able to accomplish more in the conversion of souls and building up the Redeemer's kingdom, than any of our sister denominations, and I therefore like it best, and think it comes nearest the scripture standard. And when you come to examine the character of our ministers and people for piety, you will find that the Methodist Episcopal Church in this respect stands, as in every other, in the van of the hosts of the Lord.

Thus every indictment the gentleman has brought against our Discipline has fallen to the ground, and our little book has maintained itself, and vindicated its scriptural character, in spite of all the gentleman's efforts.—[*Time expired.*]



# HUMAN CREEDS.





# HUMAN CREEDS.

---

## PROPOSITION FOR DISCUSSION:

*The use of Human Creeds as bonds of union and communion among Christians, and as guides in the administration of church discipline, is unscriptural and anti-christian.* BRADEN affirms.

### MR. BRADEN'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—In affirming the proposition just read in your hearing, I affirm one of the radical differences between my brethren and other bodies of professed Christians. We contend that the Sacred Scriptures are the Christian's only perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. Others, in practice, supplement them with creeds, confessions of faith, or statements of doctrine. Nearly all the differences between us and the rest of the religious world arise from this difference of practice in regard to creeds.

The word creed primarily means belief. A man's creed means his belief. Every man has a creed or belief. We do not object to this. We are not discussing the nature and character of creeds. We have nothing to do with these questions. We are discussing the rightfulness and propriety of the present use of creeds. I object to any man or set of men setting up a human creed as a test of orthodoxy in belief or conduct. We object to the use of creeds as bonds of union or communion, or as guides in church discipline.

We both of us, in theory or profession, accept the Sacred Scriptures as our only, perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. The difference between us is here. I contend that a legitimate deduction, and the only legitimate deduction from such a position, is that all use of human creeds is unscriptural. I contend that the scriptures are our only, perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, in such a sense as to preclude and forbid all use of human creeds.

My opponent claims that since men differ in their opinions of what the scriptures teach, necessity and propriety sanction the present custom of embodying these views in creeds, and having those who entertain a number of these views in common unite on a creed containing them, as a basis of union in faith, and a guide of practice and in discipline. We have the issue now clearly before you. We wish you

to remember it faithfully and to constantly use it in listening to our arguments.

In determining this question, we will first determine what kind of a being man is, what are his powers and abilities, what he needs religiously, and his ability to meet these needs himself, and of course his right to form rules of faith and practice. We affirm then:

1. Man is a worshiping being. He is as essentially a worshiping being as he is a social or a rational being. Man will worship something. Go where you will, among polar snows or tropical sands, among savage or enlightened, man worships something, whether it be the tree that gives him food and shelter, or the God of heaven; he looks up to some higher power, he feels his need of a God.

2. He will become like the being he worships. His religious nature exerts a controlling influence on his moral nature; in fact, determines it, for the decisions of his God are received as the declarations of one, who in power and wisdom and authority should rule his conduct. Hence show me the character of the deity a people worship and I will tell their character.

3. Man can not devise, discover or originate the idea of a pure object of worship. He can not find purity in himself or in his fellow-men. He can not find it in any thing he can reach by his own power. It is a singular truth that the moral attribute expressed by the scriptural term "holiness," is not known to any language, except the languages in which the Bible is given or into which they have been translated. They have no word to express it, no word with such meaning. The translators have to take some such word as clean or entire, and elevate it to the scriptural standard, and then educate men up to it. This has been done with our word holy, which originally was the same as "whole," or entire or perfect. Hence as Cicero, the wisest of Pagans, says, "The utmost man can do is to ascribe to his deity the same vices and imperfections that he finds in himself and his fellow-men, and become more degraded by worshiping such a being."

4. Man's moral character depends on his system of religion rather than his knowledge of the truth. Mere knowledge of the truth never made any one better. It is not the truth believed, but the truth obeyed from the heart, that purifies a man's conduct. Then all truth must have some sanction to induce man to obey it. The authority and commands of a revered and feared object of worship alone can give to moral truth its needed sanction. It was that that gave to our Saviour's teachings their awful weight. It was in this respect that he spoke as never man spoke, as one having authority. He said, "This do, and ye shall live forever." "This do, and shall be forever banished from the presence of all peace and happiness."

5. As man is a sinful being and needs redemption, God must reveal himself as a pure object of worship, give man a pure code of laws, prescribing his duty to his God, his fellow-man and himself, and give to it adequate sanctions. This revelation must be a system of religion, with perfect laws, rites and ceremonies.

6. As man is sinful and incapable, he has no power, and he has no

authority to legislate on religious matters, and he can act in them only as God in his revelation gives him right and authority.

7. To prevent human corruption, or change our corruption by man's sinful and corrupt nature, this revelation must be perfect and complete in its doctrine, law, rites and ceremonies. Nothing must be left to be supplemented by sinful man, for that would be the entering wedge of a flood of human corruptions. Human additions would be as dangerous as human work at the beginning.

8. If man could not devise or make additions to this law, he can not make compends or synopses of it.

9. As all man's attempts to devise, originate or discover such a rule were corrupted by his errors, imperfections and depravity, so all his attempts to make compends or synopses of this perfect revelation would be corrupted by similar errors, imperfections and depravity. Let me here pause and ask you, Are not these positions scriptural? Are they not in accordance with all human history and experience? Is not the conclusion inevitable, that man can not make compends or synopses of God's perfect revelation, the Sacred Scriptures? That he can not make confessions or creeds without blasphemously interfering with the prerogatives of the Almighty, without undertaking what he is utterly incompetent to do, without exposing himself to the fatal influences of his own depravity by taking away God's perfect word and substituting his own corrupt work instead? But it may be asked, Do not men err in using the scriptures? This leads us to remark:

10. Perfection in the rule will not secure perfection in the application, unless the one using it be perfect also. Hence perfection in revelation will not secure perfection in man's interpretations and use of it, unless man be perfect also. As God has made man a free moral agent, he is liable to choose error and to fail in using God's word.

11. But this does not necessitate nor excuse the use of a human creed as an attempt to do what God has not done—save man from error in using revelation in any other way than giving him a perfect revelation. On the contrary, creeds are forbidden by this reason; they interpose between man and his attaining the truth, two sources of error: 1. Man's liability to err in using revelation. 2. An imperfect human creed. We can not save ourselves from error by introducing, a second source of error. We wish this thought deeply impressed on your minds. We can not save ourselves from error in using God's perfect word by substituting for it an imperfect human creed. We have now two sources of error and the first one greatly increased. An imperfect human creed, and man's far greater liability to err in using this imperfect creed. Does not this overturn from the foundation the argument in favor of human creeds?

We proceed now to affirm that the Sacred Scriptures are just such a revelation as man needs. They reveal a pure object of worship, a perfect law of our duty toward this God, our fellow-men, and ourselves, and this is done in a system of religion, perfect in doctrine, laws, ordinances, and with adequate sanctions. So teach the scriptures, 2 Peter i. 21:

"21. Holy men spoke of old as they were moved of the Holy Spirit."

2 Timothy iii.: "The Sacred Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Here all the needed ends of revelation are said to be accomplished by the Sacred Scriptures.

1. We are made wise unto salvation.
2. Doctrine. All we need is in them.
3. Reproof for the sinner is all here.
4. Correction for the saint is all here.
5. Instruction in righteousness for our growth in grace.

Finally this is here so given that by them alone the man of God is made perfect and is thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Can there be a stronger declaration that a creed is needless, an usurpation, a blasphemous attempt of man to do what he has no authority, power or right to attempt, and what God has already perfectly done himself? We claim for the scriptures that they are inspired in the following particulars:

1. In the matter revealed.
2. In the manner of revealing it.
3. In the arrangement of what is revealed.
4. That this arrangement is essential to a perfect understanding of the scriptures, and to its perfection as a whole. This no one will deny.
5. Then when we take portions out of such connection and interfere with this divine arrangement, and arrange such portions into creeds, we interfere with the work of inspiration, and destroy a valuable aid to reaching the meaning, and introduce a prolific source of error. Nearly all the errors of sectarianism arise from this scrapping the scriptures, and making human pieces of scriptural patchwork.
6. All attempts of men to make creeds and confessions of faith must be imperfect, corrupt and injurious. Job asks, Can an impure thing bring forth a pure. Common-sense says no.
7. We repeat again. Imperfection in using God's perfect word can not be remedied by an imperfect human creed, for that is introducing two sources of error, and aggravating each—error in the rule and error in its application.
8. As much inspiration is needed to make a creed as to give the revelation on which it is based, or pretended to be based. Let us challenge one of these creeds. What right have you, sir, to demand this creed of me as a test of Christian fellowship?

"Because the Bible teaches it.

Why not leave it there then?

"But we have taken what is essential and have it here."

How do you know what is essential? God alone can determine that. Unless he has inspired you, we will reject your uninspired creed, and take his inspired word, believing that his arrangement was inspired and perfect

9. We affirm last that men agree in questions of faith or essentials, and differ only on opinions or non-essentials. God giving his word

to be our perfect rule of faith and practice, proves the possibility and duty of such agreement on his word. The sectarian terms orthodox and evangelical prove that they recognize this great truth. Their talk about one catholic or invisible church proves it also. Now in the name of reason, if we can agree on what is orthodox, need we care about what is unessential to orthodoxy? If we can agree on what makes us evangelical, need we trouble ourselves about what does not enter into evangelical faith? Why not unite on what is orthodox and evangelical in one Catholic, one Christian Church, and make this invisible church a visible one, as it should be, to be what God designed? We can unite on the scriptures the moment we throw away creeds and take the Bible alone.

We will now proceed to apply these general principles to the use of creeds. We object to the use of creeds.

1. They are of human origin and do not meet the end and demands for which they were made. As we have shown, a creed must be inspired to have that authority and sanction necessary to secure man's obedience, and to be perfect as a religious guide, rule or standard. To be divine the creed must have these sanctions. 1. A divine command to make it must be given. There never has been such a command or permission given. 2. Persons must be divinely inspired to do the work. Such persons have never had any thing to do with any creed extant. 3. These persons must be divinely selected and set apart to do this work. Such a thing has never been done. 4. A time must be fixed during which the work is to be done. Man must know when, what prescribes his duty, have all clearly before him. It must be placed all clearly before him. Creeds are manufactured as busily now as ever. Man can not depend on such a variable, incomplete rule. 5. A divine command must be given to receive and obey them. All creeds lack this sanction, hence the carelessness and infidelity of men. Creeds have set the Bible to one side. Men feel as if in rejecting religion, they were rejecting a human affair, for they know these creeds to be human. The scriptures alone have all these characteristics. They are the only creed we can or dare use.

2. Creeds are fallible. We need only refer to man's fallibility to prove this. They introduce a double source of error—error in the creed and error in using it. The scriptures are infallible. Shall we throw to one side the Bible, an infallible book, or attempt to avoid fallible man's errors in using it by introducing a fallible book?

3. They pronounce the scriptures a failure. The scriptures claim to make us perfect in doctrine and in practice. The creed says they do not, for if they do, why use the creed? If the scriptures accomplish, as they declare, perfectly all religious work for man, and make him perfect and thoroughly furnish him for every good work, what is left for the creed to do? The very making a creed to do this, pronounces the scriptures a failure for the end that God declares he gave them.

4. Creeds impugn either God's wisdom or his benevolence. Man is in need of salvation from the practice, guilt and punishment of sin. God has given the scriptures to save him. Every creed declares either that he did not know enough to do so, and human wisdom has

to complete what divine wisdom could not do, or that God is not merciful enough to man to give him a revelation perfect for this work, and human benevolence has to complete this work. There is no avoiding this dilemma. My opponent claims creeds are necessary to church union and discipline, or to perfection of the church, the only means God has given to save the world; then God did not know enough, or was not merciful enough, to complete this work of salvation.

But it is urged that creeds are necessary to shut out heresy. The Bible declares it is profitable for doctrine, and that by it we are made perfect in doctrine, and thoroughly furnished to every work. Will they not then detect heresy? What makes any thing heresy? Its opposition to the scriptures. Are not the scriptures all-sufficient then to point out that error? Did not God foresee all heresy, and when he was giving revelation make all provision against it? Certainly he did, if they are perfect in doctrine, and furnish us for every work and make us perfect. Every use of a creed pronounces the scriptures a failure for the very purposes for which they were given.

The Bible does not fail to detect heresy. But as one extreme always begets another, so men, in correcting an heresy, run into the opposite heresy, and as they see that the Bible fails to teach their pet heresy, they get up the creed for that very purpose. My opponent's church, not content with showing that the Bible does not teach the Manichean heresy, that God has a body or material organization, rush to the opposite extreme of affirming that he has neither body nor parts. As the Bible merely declares that the Manichean heresy should be avoided, as an untaught question, he must have his creed to teach his heresy. We need no creed for the detection of error. It is need to teach the opposite error.

5: Creeds impeach God's veracity. He declares he has given a revelation that makes us wise unto salvation; that is perfect and makes us perfect in doctrine; that is perfect for the reproof of sin; that is perfect in correcting our conduct; that is able to make us perfect and perfectly furnish us to every good work. Creeds, by attempting to supplement this work, declare that God has not done it, and that in declaring he has done it perfectly, God is either mistaken or uttered a falsehood.

6. They are a violation of apostolic and scriptural precept and example. The scriptures declare they are perfect in converting the soul. Psalm xix. 7. That they quicken or make alive. Psalm cxix. That their entrance gives light, or they are all we need for our illumination. Psalm cxix. That they cleanse and purify. Psalm cxix. Also, Acts xv. 9, where we are told our hearts are purified by the faith or God's word. They beget us. John iii. 5-8. 1 John v. 1. 2 Peter i. 22. James i. 18. 1 Corinthians iv. 15. John i. 12. That they are spirit and life. John vi. 63. That they sanctify us. John xvii. 17. Then if the scriptures do all this, what need of a creed?

But creeds violate apostolic precept. Hebrews viii. 5. Moses, as a servant of God, was commanded to copy exactly the models shown him by God. No room was left for him on improvements. 1 Peter iv. 11. All were commanded *to* speak as the oracles of God. They were to speak of scriptural things in scriptural language. 2 Timothy

i. 13. We are to hold fast the form of sound words, or the words of scriptures. No toleration of human creeds here. 2 Timothy ii. 2. The very things, the words the apostle taught them, were to be transmitted in the same words to others. No use of human creeds here. 2 Thessalonians ii. 15. We are to hold fast the traditions or the things received from the apostles, whether by word or epistle. 1 Timothy vi. 3. We are to withdraw ourselves from all who do not adhere to the sound words of the apostles. 1 Corinthians i. 10. We are commanded to speak the same things, to always speak words of the scriptures. 2 Peter iii. 2. In this we are exhorted to be mindful of the words spoken by the prophets and of the commandments of the apostles. Galatians i. 9. Paul says, "If any preach any other gospel than what he has, let him be accursed." Evidently then in substituting our human creeds, our own words for the inspired words of the apostles, we violate many plain apostolic precepts.

The three hundred and sixty or seventy creeds that have been devised, have all been violations of these apostolic commands, and have produced the divisions and vain disputes the apostles foresaw in their day. They commanded the use of the words of inspiration to prevent these evils. A return to these words and abandoning creeds will cure these evils.

The scriptures then are able to make wise unto salvation; they are perfect to convert, enlighten, cleanse, quicken, beget, sanctify, and save us; they are spirit and life—the power of God unto salvation; they furnish us perfectly unto all good works—all the works the creeds are devised to do. If so, are not creeds an unwarranted innovation? We are to speak the same things the apostles did—to hold fast the form of their words, commit them to others, to avoid all human teachings and formulas. Can we do this, when we substitute for them our own words?

For these reasons we regard creeds as unscriptural and anti-christian. We have many reasons we must leave to another speech. We feel the want of time to do justice to our proposition. We will have to give you merely the warp of the argument, leaving your own judgment to supply the woof.—*Time expired.*

MR. HUGHEY'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—In reviewing the gentleman's opening speech on this proposition, I will remark at the outset, that so far as the all-sufficiency of the scriptures as the rule, and the only rule of Christian faith and practice, is concerned, there is no difference whatever between Mr. Braden and myself. You will notice that every specification against creeds, in his entire speech, was based upon the assumption that we reject the all-sufficiency of the scriptures as a rule of faith and practice. Every argument he advanced against creeds was advanced against the Catholic position, and not against the Protestant doctrine of creeds at all. My opponent knows perfectly well that we are Protestants, and that there is a world-wide difference between the use the Catholics make of creeds and the use which Protestants make of them.

What is that difference? The Catholic tells you the scriptures are not the only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. He tells you that they are defective in this, that they do not contain all the doctrines of the gospel, and therefore it is necessary that the church should possess authority to decree articles of faith—that the church should be inspired, as were the prophets and apostles, in order that she may furnish the faithful with a perfect and authoritative creed. Now every argument my opponent has advanced against creeds, he has aimed directly against the Catholic position, and I heartily indorse everything he has said against the Catholic theory of creeds, and in favor of the all-sufficiency of the word of God as a rule of faith and practice. We do most assuredly admit that the scriptures—the word of God—are the rule, the only rule, and the all-sufficient rule, of our faith and practice. On this point my opponent and myself are perfectly agreed.

I will give you the precise language of our Discipline upon this point. New Discipline, p. 33:

"These are the general rules of our societies; all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, which is the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice."

We are also agreed as to man's inability to devise or originate a perfect rule of faith, and also as to his inability to discover or originate the idea of holiness. We are also agreed that a man will be assimilated in his moral character to the object which he worships; and that his moral character will depend upon the system of religion which he embraces, and not merely upon the doctrines which he believes. On this point, however, I think my opponent differs from the ground he has taken on other propositions in this discussion; but I shall not return to discuss these questions now. We are also agreed that man's redemption must be accomplished through a system of revealed truth, and that the scriptures contain that system of revealed truth, and that they fully meet the end for which they were given.

We find no point of difference yet. We agree that the scriptures are inspired, both as to their matter and their language. In regard to all this argument on the all-sufficiency of the scriptures as a rule of faith and practice, there is not one single particle of difference between us.

What is the difference then, you ask? The gentlemen told us that all men have a creed. I am glad to find that we agree upon this point. I am glad that he has admitted this. There is no possibility of proceeding a single step without a creed. He tells us that he has no objection to any one's having a creed, and writing it out if he chooses to do so. I am glad he has made this statement, or admission, for it is more than I expected of him. So we have no difference yet. What, then, is the difference between us on the question of creeds?

His proposition reads: "Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion among Christians, or as guides in the administration of church discipline, are unscriptural, and anti-christian." My opponent affirms that these human creeds are not to be used "as bonds of union and communion among Christians, or as guides in the administration of discipline." This is the point in dispute.



Before proceeding to reply to the speech to which you have listened, I wish to lay before you the position of all evangelical Protestants on the authority and objects of human creeds. All Protestants receive the Bible, and the Bible only, as the rule of faith and practice. "Why, then, the question is asked, do we have creeds at all? I answer, because men differ as to what the Bible teaches, and this difference often affects the fundamental principles of revealed truth. Now, where there is such diversity of opinion, it becomes necessary for us to set forth what we believe the scriptures teach, upon the fundamental articles of faith, so that the world may be able to see the difference between true and false Christianity, and so that evangelical Christians may be distinguished from heretics. We do not have human creeds to teach dogmas. We do not have them because we believe the scriptures are deficient as a rule of faith and practice, or to get a more perfect rule than the scriptures furnish. These are not the objects for which we have creeds. We have them that we may set forth to the world what we understand the scriptures teach. Such a creed every man has, either written or unwritten, as my opponent has admitted.

According to the Protestant view of creeds, the Bible is the only source of the creed. Protestant creeds do not set aside the authority of the Bible, or usurp its place; they simply set forth what are the views of these who received them, as to the teachings of the Bible. This is the object and use of creeds among Protestants, nothing more, and nothing less. Our creed is simply a confession of faith, or declaration of what we understand the scriptures to teach. Now, does the gentleman object to creeds in this sense? If he does, we have something to discuss; if he does not, then there is no question before us. I want to know if it is possible to proceed one step in the work of Christian union, or in the administration of discipline, without a creed in this sense? It is impossible to have a creed without making it a bond of union and communion among us, and a guide in the administration of discipline. Let us look at this question for a moment. The gentleman tells us that all men have a creed, either written or unwritten. He tells us that he has no written creed but the Bible, but he has an unwritten one. What are the articles in that unwritten creed, without which there can be no union or communion with him? They are three, viz:

1. Baptism is immersion in water and nothing else.
2. Penitent believers are the only proper and scriptural subjects of baptism.
3. Baptism is for the remission of sins.

Can you get into the gentleman's church, or have any union or communion with him, without accepting this creed? This is a human creed, and the most human of all creeds, as I have demonstrably shown during this discussion, for there is nothing divine in it, it is purely human! Still it is the bond of union and communion in the Campbellite Church, and without it there is neither!

But, I ask, if it is possible to proceed one step in the administration of discipline without a creed? Let us see. Suppose an individual joins the Campbellite Church, and assents to their creed, and after-

ward falls from the faith, as Elder J. K. Spear, once a minister in that church did, and became a gross materialist; teaching that the souls of the righteous sleep in the grave with their bodies from death to the resurrection; and that the wicked are annihilated. How, I ask, would the gentleman administer discipline in such a case? Each party claims the Bible as his creed—each contends that the Bible maintains his peculiar views. Suppose, now, Mr. Spears is brought before the church, and the church proceeds to try him for heresy, how are they going to convict him? The resurrection of the dead and the final condition of the wicked are not questions of opinion, but they belong to the very essence of the faith. Here the gentleman's story about the way they have of weighing pork in Iowa came in play exactly. The church places the Bible on one end of the rail, and Mr. Spear on the other, and then they guess at the weight of the Bible. [Laughter.] The question is thoroughly discussed, and then the vote is taken to see who is the heretic, and the man who is in the minority is convicted of heresy. The vote of the majority makes the creed, and by that creed, or the judgment of the majority of the church as to what the scriptures teach on the point at issue, is the case determined. Now, is not this judgment of the majority their creed, to all intents and purposes? You may not have a creed when you begin the administration of discipline, but before you can get through with the case you have a creed, and you administer discipline by that creed, and there is no evading it. The only difference between us in this respect is, we have weighed the rocks, and know just what their weight is, while the gentleman's church has to guess at the rocks every time they administer discipline. [Laughter.]

Here is a necessity that it is impossible to evade, or get around by any means. The gentleman may tax his ingenuity to its very utmost, but still he will find himself shut up to the necessity of using his creed as a "bond of union and communion, and as a guide in the administration of discipline," whether it is written or unwritten, whether it is prepared beforehand, or is made for a special case before him. Nor is this a setting aside the authority of the Holy Scriptures; but it is a using of them for a legitimate purpose. Still this does not change the fact that we must all have a creed, and that creed must be a guide to us in the administration of discipline. This my opponent can not evade, without giving up the idea of administering discipline altogether, and admit into the communion of his church all those who profess to believe the Bible, irrespective of what they believe and teach as the doctrine of God's word.

The gentleman tells us that his church has no written creed. It is true that there is no written creed which has been agreed to and accepted by his church; yet it is also true that leading men in that church have seen and felt the necessity of setting forth the leading principles of the denomination, and they have done so. Mr. Campbell was perhaps as well acquainted with the views of the denomination as any man living or dead. He was the founder of the sect, and the principal editor of the church for many years, and the whole theological teaching of the leading men of the denomination passed before him, and he perfectly understood what was believed and taught

among them; and he compiled his Christian System for the very especial purpose of setting forth to the world what he and his followers held. This book is, to all intents and purposes, a creed, and a very human creed at that. It is true the denomination have never accepted it as their creed, and this is the only difference between it and our Discipline. I will read to you from the preface of this book, p. 8:

"The object of this volume is to place before the community, in a plain, definite, and perspicuous style, the capital principles which have been elicited, argued out, developed, and sustained, in a controversy of twenty-five years, by the tongues and pens of those who rallied under the banners of the Bible alone. The principle which was inscribed upon our banners when we withdrew from the ranks of the sects, was, 'Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to him as our Lawgiver and King, the only test of Christian character, and the only bond of Christian union, communion, and co-operation, irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments and traditions of men.'"

In making war on human creeds, Mr. Campbell, in the very next page, in the preface to this creed which he published to the world, as containing the doctrines held and taught by himself and his followers, says:

"Unitarians, for example, have warred against human creeds, because those creeds taught Trinitarianism. Arminians, too, have been hostile to creeds, because those creeds supported Calvinism. It has, indeed, been alleged that all schismatics, good and bad, since the days of John Wickliffe, and long before, have opposed creeds of human invention because those creeds opposed them. But so far as this controversy resembles them in its opposition to creeds, it is to be distinguished from them in this all-essential attribute, viz: that our opposition to creeds arose from a conviction that, whether the opinions in them were true or false, they were hostile to the union, peace, harmony, purity, and joy of Christians, and adverse to the conversion of the world to Jesus Christ."

How the truth embodied in a creed can be "hostile to the union, peace, harmony, purity, and joy of Christians, and adverse to the conversion of the world to Jesus Christ," is something that is beyond my ability to perceive. Truth is truth wherever you find it; and the effects of truth are always the same, and can not be "hostile to the union, peace, harmony," etc., of Christians.

But if such are the effects of human creeds, true or false, why did Mr. Campbell publish his Christian System, which is, to all intents and purposes, his creed? Take and examine this book, and you will find that it is divided into chapters and sections just like a "Confession of Faith," setting forth the various points of doctrine held by these self-styled reformers! There is one chapter called the "Christian Discipline," divided into fifteen sections, or paragraphs. The<sup>1</sup> only difference, as I said before, between this book and the Methodist Discipline is, we acknowledge and receive our Discipline as our creed, or confession of faith, and order of discipline, but the Campbellite Church does not receive Mr. Campbell's Christian System as their creed, or confession of faith, and order of discipline. They tell us

that Mr. Campbell alone is responsible for this book; that they, as a denomination, have never indorsed it. This is true; but it does not relieve the difficulty. Mr. Campbell was a very able man, the ablest man that has ever been connected with the Campbellite institution, and after an experience of twenty-five years he saw it was impossible to get along without a written creed, and he therefore published one! He tells us, "The object of this volume is to place before the community, in a plain, definite, and perspicuous style, the capital principles which have been elicited, argued out, developed, and sustained, in a controversy of twenty-five years, by the tongues and pens of those who rallied under the banners of the Bible alone." But why was it necessary to set forth in this plain, definite, and perspicuous manner, these capital principles, if they were already set forth perspicuously in the Bible? Mr. Campbell saw that without some definite agreement among his brethren as to what the scriptures teach, Universalism and every error was creeping in among these new-fledged reformers. All these heretics, with their discordant doctrines, were coming into his church, and it was verily worse than Noah's ark, that had in it all manner of beasts, birds, and creeping things, clean and unclean, and it was necessary that something should be done to remedy this evil. It was necessary that the denomination should agree upon a set of principles, or system of theology, by which they could be guided in endeavoring to preserve union among themselves. Mr. Campbell has supplied this lack by publishing his Christian System, and if you will study it closely you will find that it contains their whole system of theology, and that every one of them follow Mr. Campbell exactly. They may deny their paternity, they may repudiate this book, but they all go to Mr. Campbell's magazine for their thunder: and this book contains in a nutshell nearly every argument that has ever been advanced in support of Campbellism by any of its advocates.

The truth is, there can be no such thing as Christian union, nor can we proceed one step in the administration of discipline, without an understanding and agreement as to what the scriptures teach on all essential points of theology; and this agreement is a creed, a human creed, whether it is written or unwritten. That which is necessary to Christian union, and the proper administration of discipline among Christians, can not be unscriptural. Human creeds are necessary to Christian union and the proper administration of discipline among Christians; therefore human creeds are not unscriptural.

The first creed propounded by the apostles was very simple. The Jewish people generally agreed with the orthodox Pharisees, and consequently it was only necessary that they should believe in Jesus Christ as the Messiah, in order to be admitted to baptism and the communion of the church. Hence the first Christian creed embraced, in addition to the received Jewish faith, this one article—the Messiahship, and consequent atoning work of Christ Jesus. But we soon Witness an enlargement to the apostolic creed. After the Gentiles began to be gathered into the church, a dispute arose at Antioch concerning the necessity of observing the law of Moses, and the question was sent up to Jerusalem for decision; and there, by the authority of the apostles, the creed was enlarged and sent out to all the churches

from Jerusalem. Turn to Acts xv. 24-29, and you will see an enlargement of the creed:

"24. Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying: Ye must be circumcised and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment.

"25. It, seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul:

"26. Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"27. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.

"28. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things:

"29. That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well."

In this creed, designed for all the Gentile churches, there are both positive and negative articles—some things are forbidden, others are enjoined. At a little later period of the apostolic age, we find that heresies crept into the church, and the creed was again enlarged to exclude these heretics from the communion of the faithful. The first heresies that crept into the church were a denial of the divinity, and also the humanity of Christ. Near the close of the apostolic age John wrote his gospel and epistles, with direct reference to these heresies. In the first chapter of John's gospel we have the supreme divinity and proper humanity of Christ fully set forth; and in (he closing up of the gospel we have the object expressly stated for which he wrote:

"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."

In his gospel John not only sets forth the Messiahship of Jesus, but his object is to prove that the "man Christ Jesus" is "God over all, and blessed forever more." He shows that while Jesus is equal with the Father, he was also "made flesh and dwelt among us." These points are fully brought out in John's gospel and in his epistles. After having fully established the proper humanity of Christ, against the heresy of Simon Magus, John says in his second epistle, verses 7-11:

"7. For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.

"8 Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward.

"9. Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.

"10. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.

"11. For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

Here the proper humanity of Christ is brought out and made an article of the apostolic creed and a test of Christian fellowship; and the apostolic Christians were prohibited, on the pain of becoming part-takers in the deeds, or rather punishment of the heretics, from recognizing them in any manner, or even receiving them into their houses. So we see that during the apostolic age, as heresies crept into the church, there was an enlargement of the creed on the points corrupted by the heretics, so as to exclude them from the communion of true and evangelical Christians. There is no denying this fact; every reader of the New Testament is well aware that it is true.

Here we have the principle fully laid down and adopted, upon which creeds are founded; and we find the successors of the apostles acting on this principle, and enlarging the creed as new forms of error present themselves; and in this they are walking in the footsteps of the apostles. Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch, and who held his office as bishop of that metropolis of the East for thirty years contemporaneously with the Apostle John, was thoroughly acquainted with the doctrine of the apostles, and the rules which they adopted for the preservation of the true faith from the corruptions of the heretics. He was martyred A. D. 107. He gives us the creed of the church in his day, walking in the footsteps of the Apostle John. His creed is found in his epistle to the Trullians, chapter second, Apostolic Fathers, p. 135, and reads as follows:

"Stop your ears, therefore, as often as any one shall speak contrary to Jesus Christ; who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary. Who was truly born, and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, being spectators of it. Who was truly raised from the dead by his Father, after the same manner as he will also raise us up who believe in him, by Jesus Christ; without whom we have no true life."

Here we have a simple creed, setting forth the elements of the Christian faith, in opposition to the heretics who flourished in the times of Ignatius, by an apostolic man, following the precedent that had been set by the Apostle John. This is the first creed written after the apostolic age, and it contains an epitome of the faith of the apostolic church on the points to which it refers.

My opponent tells us that it requires as much inspiration to make a creed as it did to inspire the Holy Scriptures. This is true, according to the Catholic doctrine of the creed; for Catholics hold that the church has the right and authority to prepare articles of faith without consulting the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and independent of them; and hence they claim the same inspiration for the church now that the apostles possessed. But it is not true, taking the Protestant view of creeds; for we claim no more than to give in our creeds what we understand the scriptures to teach: and if we can understand what the scriptures teach without inspiration, we can certainly express what they teach, in our creeds, without inspiration. This he attempts to do without a written creed, and we with one. But without some agreement or understanding as to what the scriptures teach there is no possibility of convicting a man of heresy; nor can there be any bond of

union among Christians whatever; and this agreement or understanding is a creed, whether it is written or unwritten, and it is the bond of union and communion, and the guide in the administration of discipline. The gentleman may object as much as he pleases, yet still he is as guilty as I am of the very thing he condemns, and there is no way for him to avoid it.

Both my opponent and myself receive the word of God as our only rule of faith; but we have drawn directly opposite conclusions from it. He will not receive me into communion with him, nor will I receive him into communion with me. What is the reason? He says the Bible keeps me out of communion and fellowship with him, and I say the Bible keeps him out of communion and fellowship with me. He has adopted a set of principles which he says the Bible teaches, and that is his creed. I have adopted a set of principles I say the Bible teaches, and this is my creed; and it is perfectly manifest to every reflecting mind it is our creeds after all, and not the Bible, which forms our bonds of union and communion. This is just as true in regard to my opponent as to myself. In this respect there is no difference between us, except as I have before stated. My creed is written, his is unwritten. So we see that it is impossible to have any union or communion, or proceed one step in the administration of discipline, without a creed.

One remark more before I sit down. I do not stand here to defend human creeds as bonds of union and communion in an improper or unchristian sense. So far as mere matters of opinion are concerned, no man, or body of men, have the right to interpose any opinion, or set of opinions, as a barrier to Christian union or communion. I thank God that the Methodist Episcopal Church has no such a creed as this, and proposes no such a bond of union and communion. The only creed that we have as a bond of union and communion, embraces those great and fundamental truths of the gospel which have always been admitted by the great mass of Christians as essential to the Christian faith. These fundamental truths are embraced in the Apostles' Creed, which is the only creed our church holds as a bond of communion or fellowship. This creed is called the Apostles' Creed, not because the apostles formed it, but because it contains the doctrines of the apostles. No system of opinions or doctrines, which do not affect the essentials of the Christian faith, and upon which all evangelical Christians are agreed, is made a test of membership or communion in our church. There are certain doctrines which all evangelical Christians admit are essential to the faith, and these are not matters of opinion. Among these are the doctrines of the Trinity, the Messiahship of Jesus, the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, Depravity, the Necessity of Regeneration, Justification by Faith, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Dead, a Future Judgment, and Rewards and Punishment in the Future World, etc. These are embraced in our creed, for they are not matters of opinion, but of faith. Other things, which do not enter into the essentials of Christian faith, such as the mode of baptism, etc., we do not make a test of membership or bond of communion.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—My opponent is evidently disappointed about something, or he would not have dared to assert that I said that he denied that the scriptures are our only rule of faith and practice. You remember that I distinctly stated that we agreed in this, and that the difference between us was here. I claimed that they were our only perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice in such a sense, and to such an extent as to render unnecessary all creeds, and to preclude and forbid their use. Indeed the assertion that they are our only perfect and all-sufficient rule, it seems to me, renders all creeds unnecessary, and forbids their use. Such seems to me to be a necessary conclusion from the assertion.

My opponent claims also that they are one only and perfect and all-sufficient rule, but claims that as men differ in interpreting this rule, those who agree on several to them cardinal points, should unite on a creed containing these common points, and use this creed as a bond of union and communion, and as a guide in church discipline.

I claim that such an act is a contradiction of his position, that the scriptures are our only perfect rule, that it is forbidden by such a position, and that a creed is no remedy for the thing it proposes to remedy. Now I hope that is understood.

We urged in our former speech that man was a sinful being, needing salvation from the practice, punishment and guilt of sin. That a system of religion alone could save him. That man was utterly unable to devise such a system. He lacked the ability to discover the existence and attributes of a pure object of worship, or to devise such an object of worship. He lacked the ability to discover that truth, purity and holiness necessary for his redemption. He lacked the authority to give adequate sanctions to this truth, could he attain it. Hence for man's redemption, it was necessary that God reveal himself in his purity and holiness as a perfect object of worship, and give man a perfect code of laws, with a perfect system of religion, perfect in doctrine, laws and ordinances. To this my opponent assents.

I next claimed that, as man was utterly unable to devise this revelation or discover what it revealed, he was unable to make a synopsis or compend of it. As his attempts to discover it would be corrupted by human error and depravity, so would his attempts to make a synopsis of it. As his attempts to legislate would lack authority, so his compends of divine legislation would lack adequate authority and sanction. Hence all his creeds were corrupt, imperfect, presumptuous attempts to improve what God declared he had done perfectly.

My opponent is evidently in a quandary. He dare not deny what I say in regard to man's inability to devise a system of revelation, or he denies the necessity for such revelation. If he admits his inability, he can not evade the deduction that he is also unable to make additions to or improvements on God's revelation, or to make synopses or compends of it. Out of this dilemma the gentleman can not extricate himself. He must either deny human inability and imperfection and lack of



authority, or admit it to extend to making creeds as standards or as bonds of union and as guides in church discipline. He must either deny the perfection of the scriptures as a rule of faith and practice, or admit that man has no right to make such rules of faith and practice in making creeds as a bond of union, or rule of faith and a guide in discipline or rule of practice.

There is another dilemma he can never avoid. He urges men err in using God's perfect rule. We admit it, for perfection in the rule will never secure perfection in its application, unless the one applying it be perfect. He says one must remedy this error by a human creed. We reply that an imperfect human creed would only introduce a double source of error—error in the rule and error in its application. But were the creed perfect, would not man err in using it, just as he did in using God's perfect rule? No; the rule is perfect and the only way the gentleman can obviate error is to make man who uses it perfect. Man is imperfect. His creeds must be; then we have a double source of error, instead of removing the one that exists. This the gentleman can not evade.

We next proceeded to claim that the scriptures were given for the very purposes for which the gentleman wishes to use a creed.

1. They are perfect in doctrine, or contain, perfectly expressed, the faith. Do we then need a creed or confession of faith of human compilation?

2. They are perfect for reproof of error, or for detecting and exposing all error and heresy. Do we need human creeds as heretic detectors?

3. They are perfect for correction of our conduct, or for discipline. Do we need creeds as guides in discipline?

4. They are perfect in instruction in righteousness, or to prescribe our conduct as church members in all things. Do we need creeds as guides in performance of our duties as church members?

5. By them we are made perfect and thoroughly furnished to all good works. This reviews and sums up the whole matter. The Holy Spirit declares the scriptures were given by God for all, and the very purposes the gentleman would use a creed, and declares they are perfect for this, and will make us perfect in all those purposes, and thoroughly furnish us for them. Yet the gentleman says we need a creed for these purposes of imperfect sinful man's compilation. Which will you believe, this man or the Holy Spirit?

We showed that the scriptures were inspired, not only in matter, but in the arrangement of the matter revealed, and that when we take any portion of scripture of its connection, we render it imperfect, for this divine arrangement is necessary to a perfect understanding of the scriptures. All attempts to make compends of revelation in creeds must be corrupted by human imperfection. My friend can not deny it. Then as much inspiration is needed in making the creed, as in giving the revelation on which it is pretended to be based. The Catholic Church claims to be inspired, and hence logically claims the right and power to make creeds. My opponent does not claim inspiration for his church. He then virtually claims that uninspired men can improve the work of inspired men. He admits his church is falli-

ble in making a creed, and still claims that he- can improve on what God has declared he has perfectly done. If there is not a fallacy here, one can not be perpetrated.

We will now proceed to review the gentleman's remarks. He says he believes that the scriptures are a perfect rule and a sufficient rule. Then what do you need of a creed? But men are imperfect and differ in their understanding of the scriptures. Granted; but how do you propose to remedy this imperfection? The scriptures are perfect and you will take away this perfect rule and substitute man's imperfect interpretations, the very thing you want to guard against as a rule of faith and practice.

But we don't substitute the Discipline as a rule of faith and practice for the scriptures. Which do you use as the rule of faith in admitting members? Do you read to them the scriptures or your Discipline? Your Discipline is the rule or standard of faith. How do you try members? Do you use the Bible or do you use the Discipline? The Discipline is the rule of practice.

Let a man who has been arraigned for error in doctrine or conduct in the Methodist Church say, "I am right according to the Bible." Would they listen to him for a moment? They would say, "Your conduct or doctrine is contrary to the Discipline and you must go out." They will not try him by the Bible. God's perfect standard is laid on the shelf and you have an imperfect human standard—the Methodist Discipline—as your rule of faith and practice. All that you want is in God's perfect word, but you must take out and rearrange it, or state it in language more to your liking.

There was a time when men supposed that if they could separate certain elements of decay from their food, they would have only what would produce or sustain life left, and they would live forever. They did not see that the elements of dissolution were in themselves and not in the food. In the search for this elixir of life, alcohol was discovered, or the elixir of death. Thus was man's presumptuous attempt to improve on God's work punished. In like manner our creed-makers, not recognizing that the sources of error are in themselves, attempt to eliminate them out of God's perfect word, in creeds, and their failure is as fatal and as signal. Creed-making has been the Pandora's-box that has filled the world with error.

I do not object to a man's having a creed, but I object to his making that creed a standard by which he tries others instead of God's standard, the scriptures. I do not object to a man's guessing at the weight of an article I may have to sell, but I object to his measuring the article by his imperfect guess, instead of the perfect standard established and sealed by the government. We have a constitution of the United States. I do not object to men's interpreting it, though I know they often err. But I do object to my friend's elevating his interpretation into the standard, and laying the constitution to one side. Neither will I take my friend's Discipline as the standard, instead of the Bible.

It is asserted that men differ on fundamental articles of faith. Suppose they do. What is to decide who is right? God's word, which is perfect in doctrine and perfect in correcting error, or man's

imperfect work, the creed? Will not the Bible enable us to detect the heresy? If not, it is not perfect in doctrine, and for correction, and the Holy Spirit has lied, or the doctrine it will not expose is no heresy. There is no avoiding this dilemma. The Bible is not perfect in doctrine and for correction of error, or the doctrine is no error.

My friend and myself have a dispute as to the length of a board. We have a three-foot rule which both accept as a standard. How shall we decide our dispute? Shall we apply the rule, or shall we guess at the length of a stick, guessing that it is as long as the rule, each of us thus guessing a standard, and then apply our guesses? Which would be common-sense. So wo differ as to the correctness of a doctrine or act. Now shall we each guess out a discipline or creed, and try it by that, each guessing what the Bible says, or shall we apply God's standard, the Bible, directly? All can see that argument.

We are asked how we take persons into our church. Why, sir, we use the Bible just where you use the Discipline. How do we try people? We use the Bible, God's perfect standard, just where you use the Discipline, man's imperfect guess at what the Bible teaches.

I am asked if we can proceed one step in church union or discipline without a creed. What a question for a man to ask who professes to believe that the Bible is a perfect rule of faith and practice—perfect in doctrine and correction of errors, and perfect in instruction in all Christian conduct? We can not proceed a step unless we have man come in and supplement God's perfect rule for this very purpose, with man's imperfect rule. What a palpable absurdity! We are told they take nothing except what is in the Bible. Then why not use the Bible? The arrangement of the Bible is as much inspired as the matter, and man's interfering with that arrangement is blasphemous and always leads to error.

But suppose the creed-maker was inspired. What better than the Bible, what else than the Bible could he give us? Can not my opponent see that the error is not in the Bible, as his creed-making supposes, but in man's use of it, and what he needs to avoid error, is not an imperfect creed-maker, or a creed-maker at all, for they can at best give us only the Bible; but he must have man inspired in using the Bible, to guard against error in using it? Can he see that truth so plain and evident?

He asks how we get rid of men who wander from the faith. By using the Bible where he uses the creed. But he says the man claims his views are in accordance with the Bible. Suppose a man you were, trying claims his views were in accordance with the Discipline, how would you get rid of him? Just as you would get rid of him using the "Discipline", so we would using the Bible. The difference would be we would use a perfect standard given by God, who has the right, power and authority to give it, while you would use an imperfect, fallible standard made by man who has neither right, power nor authority to make it.

How did we get rid of J. K. Spear and his followers? Just as John, the inspired apostle, got rid of heretics in his day. 1 John ii. 18-20:

"18. Even now there are many antichrists . . . they went out from

us, but they were not of us, for had they been of us they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest that were not all of us."

This is just what J. K. Spear did. He went out of the church of Christ, because he was not of it. He went to creed-making and you have the result.

Our Discipline is in the Bible we are repeatedly told. Why not leave it where divine wisdom placed it? Well, what harm in using it? I will illustrate by stating what every carpenter knows. If you take a rule and apply it to a board and cut it off a certain length, and men take this board and use it, and so proceed, always using the last board sawed off, each will deviate from the standard more and more, so that you can not use the last one. You must use the standard or rule each time. In like manner, when men take the word of God and measure off a creed, and then use that creed, soon a difference of opinion arises about the creed, then it is used to measure off a new party, and this creed to measure off another, till men at last reach the extreme departure from God's word. We have the so-called Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, then that of Trent, and at last all the abominations of the Romish delusion. We avoid this by using the standard, the Bible, every time. If we err once we stand a much better chance of correcting this error by continually using the perfect standard than by stereotyping this error in a creed, and then making wider and wider departures in its use.

My opponent seems to be worried by the pork weighing illustration. I should think he would be; it is so apt an illustration of the folly of laying to one side what he claims to take as a perfect standard, and using a human guess in the shape of a human creed. But he attempts to turn the application on to me by saying the difference between us is that he has weighed the stones, and in the Discipline has determined and fixed their exact weight, while I am the one that guesses at their weight. It won't do, my dear sir. We use neither stones nor rail. We use the scales God has established, and we use the standard he has decreed, the perfect word. My opponent places on his human contrived beam or rail, his guess at what the word contains known as his Discipline, and weighs men by that. He balances men against his guess at what and how much truth should be used in his Discipline. The application, sir, will stick in spite of all your writhing and squirming. But suppose the stones you use are weighed and are accurate according to the standard, why use such needless machinery? Why not use the Bible to weigh the man, instead of first weighing the Discipline by the Bible, and the man by the Discipline?

But I do most emphatically deny that the Discipline contains nothing but what is in the Bible. If it contained only that, men would reject it as useless as the fifth wheel to a wagon. It contains more, and is used for the very reason that it contains more. When Manes affirmed God has a corporeal organization, his opponents were not satisfied with showing that it was an untaught question. No, they must run into another heresy and affirm that he was without body and parts. As the Bible simply affirms that he is a spirit, and teaches

neither heresy, both parties must have a creed to teach and contain more than there is in the Bible. Creeds are made for the purpose of putting in them more than can be found in the Bible, and are used because they contain more than there is in the Bible. They are an affirmation that the scriptures are not sufficient as a rule of faith and practice.

There is one thing that has come up here that I had hoped I should not be compelled to meet. The gentleman asserts we have a creed—the Christian System—written by Bro. Campbell. He asserts this is just as much a creed as any book used by others is a creed, only we don't own it. Thus charging us with having a creed, and with falsehood in denying it. The gentleman has made this assertion in every debate he has had with our brethren, and has had every time to back out of it, but still he asserts it in the next one, and in nearly all his sermons where he can beg it in. He has always backed out in such a way as to partially accomplish his ends by leaving the impression that it is nearly so, and he draws attention from the main question and consumes time in refuting his assertion. Now I intend to dispose of it forever with one blow. I now say deliberately and most emphatically that any man who here or elsewhere asserts that the Christian System or any other book, except the New Testament, is held, taken, or used by our brethren at large, or a single congregation of them, as a confession of faith or a Discipline, as we understand those words, or as other bodies of people use their creeds, is either willfully ignorant and wickedly slanders us by uttering something of which he is ignorant, and which he might and should know to be false, or he is a base, willful liar. Mr. Reporter, I want that to go on to the record just in that shape. I intend to end this falsehood every Methodist, from the probationer down in the cellar kitchen up to the presiding elder in the chamber parlor of the edifice, is continually retailing.

My opponent says that there was a creed in the days of the apostles. Of course there was, and we are contending that we should be content with the inspired apostles and inspired creed. When difference of opinion arose, James and the inspired apostles sent out statements of what was acquired at that time. Certainly, and we accept them, and we claim that now, when the same differences of opinion arise, we should take their settlement of them rather than the uninspired guesses of my opponent. John condemned the heretics who opposed the divinity of Christ. Yes, and we are willing to be satisfied with his inspired condemnation, and will reject my opponent's uninspired creed. We believe God made him by inspiration perfect for this work, and we reject the imperfect work of my opponent. We accept the creed of the apostles, because inspired and therefore perfect for doctrine and conduct, and reject the creed of my opponent, because uninspired and therefore imperfect. Does my opponent see the difference?

Ignatius had a creed, or rather he wrote a creed for a certain church. To prove it, he reads a letter he wrote to a church, pointing out certain errors and warning the church against them. Now the gentleman knows that he is raising a wrong impression here. That

never was a creed, and never was used as one. He knows that the letters of the apostles alone were used in the days of Ignatius as guides in doctrine and discipline. By his course of reasoning every sermon and letter ever written or spoken to a church on faith or discipline is a creed. What a subterfuge! Ignatius' letter a creed? Neither his letter nor that of any one but an apostle was ever used by the early Christian Church as a creed. They were used as creeds, and properly, for they were given by inspiration for that purpose.

A man may write out his opinions, and he may preach them, and send them out to the world in any way he pleases, but he must not set them up as a standard of my orthodoxy. When he attempts to weigh me by his human guesses, I object.

We will proceed now to our affirmative argument.

7. We object to creeds that they take the scriptures out of men's hands and substitute for them human, imperfect thoughts and authority. They come in and take the place of the divine plan and standard for measuring and trying men, and lay the Bible on the shelf. Instead of reading the Bible to men, the confession of faith is used in measuring them when admitted into the church. Instead of trying men by the Bible, they are tried by the Discipline or some human imperfection.

8. They check freedom of thought and investigation, and dwarf the mind. When a man enters one of these creed-bound churches he has to have his mind stretched out, or chafed off, till it fits the image of Procrustes' bed there used. When a student enters one of these theological schools, he is taught, not the Bible—he is not allowed to read and interpret it for himself. No, he learns the stereotyped ideas of a certain creed, and when he goes out to preach he must preach them, and not what he has read for himself in the Bible. He must dwarf his mind down to a certain channel; he must learn not the Bible, but the confession of faith. We say their creeds, with their systems of schools and creed-bound churches, check free investigation and dwarf every mind down to their own stereotyped ideas and channels of thought.

9. Creeds prevent the discovery of truth. Each one declares that his creed is final—that he has embodied in it all truth. They say they have taken the word of God and placed it in their theological crucibles, and have tested all of it. They have decided what is essential to salvation, and in what sense and just how broad and how narrow each one must believe it; and they have rejected what is non-essential. No one dare investigate the scriptures, except to find what the creed teaches. If he ventures beyond it, he must be laid on the Procrustean bed of the creed and chafed off till he is reduced to the orthodox standard. We object then that creeds stand as an impassable obstacle in the way of unfolding scriptural truth, and prevent a growth in spiritual knowledge and truth.

10. They create party spirit, and set Christians to fighting each other. One says, "I am of Paul and have his creed;" another, "I am of Apollos and have his creed," and another, "I am of Cephas and have his creed," and they all forget that they ought to be of Christ, have his creed, the scriptures, and them alone. Here were

Christians contending what names they should wear, and about their creeds, and the apostle condemned and forbade all party names and creeds. But unfortunately the apostolic injunction has not been heeded. Creeds have produced parties and parties have multiplied creeds, as one evil always begets another. Christians have fought and denounced each other, and their enemies have destroyed the divided followers of Christ.

We read in Gulliver's Travels that when he visited Liliput, the Cranes were waging a war on the Pigmies, even to extermination; but instead of being united and waging a war on their relentless foes, the Pigmies were engaged slaughtering each other in a deadly war. The all-important subject of dispute was, "at which end of a yam should they begin to eat, the little end or the big end?" And on this all-important subject the Little Erdians and the Big Erdians were slaughtering each other, while the Cranes were rapidly destroying all parties. So the Little Erdians and Big Erdians in the churches are warring against each other, while the world lies in darkness, wickedness and infidelity. Had there been half the zeal displayed in spreading pure Christianity that there has been in defending creeds, the whole human race would trow be everywhere worshipping one Father in heaven and loving each other as brethren.

When did the church make its most rapid progress? When the word of God was the only rule of faith and practice, and creeds were unknown. Though persecuted and opposed by idolatry, infidel philosophy and infidelity, it triumphed over all opposition. But philosophizing began, and men began to elevate their dogmas above the faith of the gospel, and to embody them in creeds, and make these bonds of union, and then began division and quarreling and bloodshed, and the pure light of the gospel became almost extinct when creeds exercised their greatest power over the human mind. The truth remained alone with the Waldenses and Albigenses. When the Reformation began, it was not a restoration of the pure simple Bible Christianity of the apostolic churches. Creeds still exercised their baleful influences. We have Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, instead of Christians. These war on each other, instead of converting a world and turning men from Satan to God.

11. We say next that creeds draw the hearts of men from the scriptures and Christ to certain names, dogmas and organizations. Men love what they think most of, and contend most for. Their names are their own peculiar names, these dogmas are my faith and make me orthodox, and this is my church, hence they care more for these things than for the Bible and Christ, which are common to all. Said Mr. Halstead, of the Cincinnati *Commercial*:

"I can, in the presence of members of half, a dozen churches, blaspheme the name of God and Christ without rebuke; but let me say a word about Methodism, or Presbyterianism, and how soon would I meet with indignant rebuke, showing that men care more for their party and name than for him they claim to reverence as Saviour of all, or even Jehovah himself."

We said that God must reveal a religion perfect in laws and ordinances and in object of worship. We will now further add that he

must center all this religion in a person, who shall be its exemplar and leader. We all know that all revolutions, parties and movements must have a leader and exponent around whom its adherents rally. We know also how powerful the influence of personal attachment to such a leader, and confidence in him, is to unite and make efficient all the followers, and increase their devotion to the cause.

God has given such a leader and captain of our salvation in Christ. Christ is the central character of the Old and New Testaments. All prophecy and ordinances point forward to him. The Old Testament tells how God prepared for his coming. The gospels were written that all might believe that he was the Christ. The Acts of the Apostles tell us how he was preached. The epistles tell us how we must obey him. He is the Alpha and Omega of the scriptures, its central character.

Not only is this the case, but his Messiahship, or the declaration that "Jesus is the Christ, the only begotten Son of God," is the central truth of revelation. It stands related to all other truths, as the sun to the solar system, as the heart to the human body. Around this great central truth, all others crystallize. It gives utility and consistency to all of them. Take out this and revelation would be left as the body without the heart, a corpse that would soon crumble into its elements.

When a man is loyal to Jesus as King of kings, and believes with his whole heart this stupendous truth, he receives, in receiving that Jesus as his prophet, priest and king, all of revelation, even to its minutest truth, as the perfect law of his king. Any system then that removes this, the heart of the Gospel System, and substitutes some dogma, the mere hand or foot of the system, as effectually destroys this system, as the rash innovator who would undertake the like exploit with the human body. We object to creeds that they destroy attachment to Jesus by substituting party names and dogmas, instead of him; and they murder Christianity by removing the heart, the Messiahship of Jesus, and substitute some subordinate dogma, instead of this great soul-inspiring truth.—[*Time expired.*]

MR. HUGHEY'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—It is not often that my word is called in question when I make a statement as a fact; and when a man publicly accuses me of a base falsehood, as Mr. Braden did in his speech, it does not set very well. I stated that this Christian System was, to all intents and purposes, a creed, or confession of faith; and I proved that Mr. Campbell published it for the very purpose of setting forth before the world the views of these self-styled reformers, by his own declaration in the preface to *the* book. But I stated expressly that the Campbellite Church had never received it as their creed, or confession of faith; and that the only difference between this book and our Discipline was, that we had accepted ours, and acknowledged it as our confession of faith, and Discipline, while they had not accepted the Christian System as theirs. You remember that I stated this distinctly, and the report will show it. I



did not misrepresent him nor his church, and he knows it. It is not my manner of debating to get up and misrepresent the position of an opponent. And yet, notwithstanding this explicit statement on my part, he got up here and publicly charged me with falsehood without the shadow of ground for it. I do not allow any man to make such, statements about me without that public rebuke which his conduct merits.

I stated that Mr. Campbell had seen the necessity of publishing such a book as this, in order to let the world know what he and his brethren did hold and teach, and that he consequently published this volume, stating that this was its object; but I also expressly stated that the denomination had not accepted it as an authoritative exposition of their faith, and that this was the difference between the Christian System and the Methodist Discipline. Did I tell a falsehood? Have I done him any wrong? I have not slandered his church, I have not misrepresented the Christian System, nor have I slandered or misrepresented Mr. Campbell. I call upon my opponent to say if I have stated the facts in regard to the Christian System, and if I have not acted the gentleman during this entire discussion? Why, then, should he get up here and offer such insult by publicly calling me a liar? I hold him responsible before the Christian public for such ungentlemanly and unchristian conduct. No gentleman would ever act as he has done, or make such statements as he made in his last speech, without the shadow of an excuse for offering so gross an insult. I am sorry to be compelled to speak thus in a religious discussion, but justice to myself and to the truth demands that I should repel the insult he has offered me in as public a manner as it has been offered. I never stoop to things of this kind if I can avoid it; but in dealing with some men you are compelled to put yourself on a level with them or they never can understand you. You must go at them as they come at you, or they can not appreciate you at all; and this is my apology for these remarks.

I will now take up the gentleman's speech and review it in order. He tells us that revelation must be perfect and complete. Upon this point we are perfectly agreed. Upon the perfection and all-sufficiency of scripture as a rule of faith and practice, all Protestants are agreed. But my opponent tells us that if uninspired men could not give us a perfect revelation, they can not present us with a perfect synopsis of the essential teachings of revelation. There is not a person present, who has any acquaintance at all with the principles of mental science, but knows that this position is false. There are a great many truths that the mind can not discover, which it can perfectly understand and comprehend when once discovered and presented to it. If the mind can not perfectly comprehend the essential teachings of revelation, then it is no revelation at all; and if it can perfectly comprehend the essential teachings of revelation, then it can most certainly present a perfect synopsis of that which it perfectly comprehends; unless the gentleman will contend that a man may understand a thing perfectly, and yet be unable to communicate his knowledge to others. His position here shows that he is profoundly ignorant of the plainest facts and principles of mental science.

The human mind can fully grasp and comprehend many things which it can not originate. All our observation and experience teaches us that there are many things which we never could originate, which, when presented to the mind, we can perfectly comprehend at once. My opponent tells us man can not originate a perfect law. This is true. But when a perfect law is revealed he can understand and comprehend it. So we can understand the essential teachings of the word of God, and understanding them we could present them to the world in their essential purity, either orally or in writing. Will my friend tell us what is there wrong in a court, when trying a case, to have the proceedings noted down for the guidance of future courts in all similar cases? This illustrates our position exactly, and there is nothing unscriptural in the proceeding at all.

The creed of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the only creed she holds as a bond of union and communion, is the Apostles' Creed, and it contains only the fundamental doctrines of the gospel which all evangelical Christians have ever held. Every good man is willing to accept this as the symbol of his faith. But does not my opponent and his brethren put forth their creed in every sermon they preach and in every publication they put forth? He admits that every man has a creed, but objects to making this a bond of Christian union or communion, or a guide to the administration of discipline. But I showed you that it is impossible to have a creed at all, without making a bond of union and a guide in the administration of discipline. I showed you also that it was impossible to proceed a single step without a creed, either written or unwritten.

But he tells us we try members of the church by the Discipline, and not by the Bible. This is a great mistake. Our Discipline requires that we should proceed in the administration of discipline according to the scriptures—that we should take the steps laid down by Christ in Matthew xviii. 15-17:

"15. Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.

"16. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

"17. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

These are the gospel steps, and they are the steps which our Discipline requires shall be taken in the administration of discipline. We have our rules of order and decorum in the trial of members, which are laid down in the Discipline; and so has his church also, and so must every church.

Suppose a preacher is brought before our church for preaching heresy; how do we prove him guilty? It is by the scripture, and by that alone, that we prove a man guilty of holding and teaching heretical sentiments; but we have a standard of agreement as to what are the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and we do not have to make

a standard or creed every time we have to try a case for heresy, as my friend does.

But my opponent asks, if the scriptures are a perfect rule, why is it necessary to have any other? We do not have any other. The creed, as I showed you before, is not designed to set aside the Bible; it does not propose another rule; it is simply a synoptical statement of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel; and the reason why it is necessary for us to have a creed, is to state what we understand the scriptures teach, in opposition to the heretical teaching of those who corrupt the truth, and yet claim the Bible as the source of their doctrine. The necessity for a creed originated, as I showed you in my first speech, in the perversion of the gospel by heretics. Both heretical and true Christians claim the Bible as teaching their sentiments. How, I ask, is the world to distinguish between the two, unless each one sets forth that system of doctrine which he claims is taught in the Bible? Who can tell what a Campbellite believes? They do not know themselves what they believe. One man holds to one thing and another man to another thing. They have no standard of doctrine, and consequently you find every shade of belief represented in this new-fangled reformation. But how do they proceed in trying a man for heresy, and how can they convict a man for heresy in their organization? How did they manage to expel J. K. Spear from the church for his materialism? Mr. Braden says they got him out of the church just as they expelled heretics in the times of the apostles. But will he tell us how they expelled heretics in the times of the apostles? Mr. Spear, I presume, withdrew from the Campbellite institution and set up a new church of his own, claiming, like those whom he left, to prove his doctrines by the Bible! How did they get out one Mr. Raines, a Universalist preacher who joined them many years ago, but still retained his Universalist sentiments? He appeared before the Mahoning Association, and asked to be recognized and admitted as a brother in the ministry. Many of the brethren were not ready to fellowship Universalism, and confusion and trouble were likely to ensue, when Mr. Campbell procured a settlement of the difficulty in the following manner: "Whether he held these views as matters of faith, or as pure matters of opinion, was then propounded to him. He avowed them to be, in his judgment, matters of opinion, and not matters of faith; and in reply to another question, averred that he would not teach them, believing them to be matters of opinion and not the gospel of Jesus Christ. Although a majority of the brethren were satisfied, still £ number were not reconciled to this decision. It was repeatedly urged that it mattered not what his private opinions were on this subject, provided he regarded them only as matters of opinion, and held them as private property." *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. 1, p. 147, quoted in *Campbell and Rice's Debate*, p. 818. Here they got Mr. Raines out by keeping him in!

Here was a man holding a fundamental error, and still retaining that error, admitted into the church and recognized as a minister; and the only thing required of him was, whether he held Universalism as a matter of faith, or merely as a matter of opinion; and when he declared that he regarded it as a matter of opinion only, and not a

matter of faith, he was recognized as a brother beloved and sent forth as a true gospel minister ! What he held and taught as a matter of faith before, became only a matter of opinion after he was immersed into Mr. Campbell's reformation. Verily here was a wonderful transformation ! This reminds me of the story of the duke-bishop, who was in the habit of using profane language. On one occasion when swearing profanely his servant reproved him, saying: "What, you a bishop swear!" "Oh," said the bishop, "I do not swear as a bishop, but as a duke." "Well," said the servant, "when the devil comes after the duke what will become of the bishop?" So, I ask in this case, when the devil comes after the Universalist what will become of the Campbellite? [Laughter.] There must be a capital deficiency in a system that has no means of protecting itself from heresy, or of freeing itself from heretical teachers.

The gentleman tells us that our creeds are like the alchemist, who in pursuit of the elixir of life found the elixir of death. This is indeed a fine illustration of the position of his church. They have gone in search of the elixir of life, but their perversions of the word of God have indeed proved to be the elixir of death. As alcohol is produced by the decomposition of the grain given by our Heavenly Father for the life of our physical natures, so, by the perverse principles which Mr. Campbell and his followers have adopted, from the word of God, given to sustain our spiritual natures, they have extracted the elixir of spiritual death. Instead of unity of faith among these self-styled reformers, we find confusion and every heresy. Their organization reminds us of Babel of old. When one call for brick they bring him mortar, and when one calls for mortar they bring him brick; and amid this confusion of tongues there is no possibility of finding the pure doctrine of God's word. Just such an organization, claiming to be the church of Christ, the world has never before seen. Instead of presenting to the world a summary of the doctrines which they believe and teach, they tell us they take the Bible as their creed—they believe just what the Bible teaches! But they forget that there is often a vast difference between the teachings of the Bible and their opinions as to what the Bible teaches. But in this organization each man claims that he has discovered the truth; and if his brethren will not agree with him, like Mr. Spear, he will quit their communion and set up a church of his own.

But my opponent tells us our creed is a stick about three feet long, and every time we measure anything by it we call it three feet long, it does not matter how long or how short it is. Here again the gentleman's illustration is unfortunate. We have measured our creed and we know its exact length. But my friend's creed is still an unmeasured stick. He says his creed is the Bible, but the Bible is no more his creed than it is ours. His creed is what he thinks the Bible teaches, and our creed is what we think the Bible teaches; the only difference between us being, our creed is written and his is unwritten. Our creed is a stick of the same length in every one's hand, but his is a stick of divers lengths, according to the views and capacities of the man who uses it. In Mr. Braden's hand it is about two feet long. I should judge; in the hands of J. K. Spear it was about three feet.

long; in the hands of Dr. J. R. Lucus it is about four feet long; in the hand of J. R. Sweeney it is about six feet long: and in the hands of some of the gentleman's brethren present it is about six inches long. [Laughter.] His creed forcibly reminds me of a story I read when I was a boy, of a dispute between three men about the color of the chameleon. One declared it was black, another contended that it was green, and another that it was blue. Finally, to end the dispute, one said: "I caught the animal last night, and can produce him." The others urged him to do so, each one confident that he was right. But when he was placed before them he was neither black, green, nor blue, but white. So it is in regard to my opponent's creed. After all their disputing among themselves about it, when the Bible is properly understood, not one of them is right. Their creed is a human creed indeed, for it is purely human, unsustained by the word of God.

But he asks, why can we not proceed a single step in the administration of discipline without a creed? I showed clearly the reason why in my former speech. You may say, we have no creed but the Bible; but suppose a minister is accused of holding and teaching heretical doctrines. He is cited before the church to answer the charge of heresy. But he appears and denies the charge, and contends that his doctrines are not heretical, but are sustained by the Bible. What are you going to do? The question must be decided as to which side is right—on which side the truth is to be found. You may not have a creed on that point when you begin the trial, but before you get through with it you will have a creed; for when the question is decided by the majority, that very decision is the creed, and if the accused does not accept it as his creed, however much he may profess to believe the Bible, you will expel him for heresy! Thus you see it is impossible to proceed one step in the administration of discipline without a creed, for before you get through with it you will have a creed in spite of yourself. The same is true in regard, to union and communion among Christians. There can be no union without an agreement in doctrine, and that agreement is a creed.

But the gentleman tells us that Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, who was cotemporary with the Apostle John, had no creed except the New Testament. He asks how they got along before there was any creel? I answer, there never was a time since the apostles when the church had not a creed. While the apostles lived there was an infallible authority in the church to settle all questions that might arise concerning the faith, but after their death there was no such authority, and consequently it was necessary that there should be some understanding and agreement among the Christians as to what the apostles taught; and this agreement we see first embodied in the creed of Ignatius, published seven years after the death of the Apostle John. The gentleman has made some very strange assertions in regard to the time when the man of sin began to be developed. I am surprised at some of his statements. There is a chronological period of 1260 years, allotted in prophecy, as the period of the reign and triumph of the man of sin; and we know that he was not developed until the fifth century, for his triumph and reign did not terminate until 1230 years after this period. For any man to fix the beginning of the reign of

the man of sin before the reign of Constantine the Great, is to contradict all the facts of both history and prophecy. He told us that the man of sin began to reign when creeds were introduced. If this be so, then the man of sin began to reign immediately after the death of the apostles, for we find creeds in the church in the next age after them. I quoted Ignatius' creed in my former speech, and I will read it to you again:

"Stop your ears, therefore, as often as any one shall speak contrary to Jesus Christ; who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary. Who was truly born, and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, being spectators of it. Who was also truly raised from the dead by his Father, after the same manner as he will also raise us up who believe in him, by Jesus Christ, without whom we have no true life."

Here is the creed of the church in the time of Ignatius, framed with direct reference to the heresies of Simon Magus and Cerinthus, who denied the real humanity and the true sufferings and death of Christ, and contended that he was only in appearance a man, and that he only appeared to suffer and die. Is this creed of Ignatius a creed of the man of sin?

In the next generation we find Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, who was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple and cotemporary of the Apostle John, and Ignatius, setting forth the creed of the church throughout the whole world. He says:

"The church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith: [She believes] in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations of God, and the advents, and the birth from a virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension into heaven in the flesh of the beloved Christ Jesus, and our Lord, and his [future] manifestation from heaven in the glory of the Father, 'to gather all things in one,' and to raise up anew all flesh of the whole human race, in order that Christ Jesus, our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the will of the invisible Father, 'every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; ' and that every tongue should confess to him, and that he should execute just judgment toward all; that he may send spiritual wickedness, and the angels who transgressed and became apostates, together with the ungodly, and unrighteous, and wicked, and profane among men, into everlasting fire; but may, in the exercise of his grace, confer immortality on the righteous, and holy, and those who have kept his commandment?, and have persevered in his love, some from the beginning [of then-Christian course], and others from [the date of] their repentance, and may surround them with everlasting glory." Irenaeus' First Book Against Heresies, Antonicine Library, vol. 1 of the writings of Irenaeus, pp. 42, 43.

Such was the creed of the church in the days of Irenaeus. Is this one of the creeds of Popery? I am astonished that a man professing to be an educated man should make statements so utterly at war with the well-known facts of history. The man of sin was not manifested until the year A. D. 430, while we have creeds running back to the purest times of the primitive church—to the very generation cotemporary with the apostles. So we see that we can not proceed a single step in drawing the line of distinction between truth and error, without a creed.

The gentleman tells us that we take the Bible out of the hands of our people, and substitute the creed—the Discipline—in its place. This he knows is untrue. I might in reply say he takes the Bible out of the hands of his people and puts the works of Mr. Campbell in its place; and there would be as much truth in this statement as in his, but I do not choose to argue in this way. When Mr. Braden says, or intimates, that we put our Discipline in the place of the Bible, and give it to our people instead of the Bible, he states what he knows is not true; for he knows that the Discipline, against which he so seriously objects, expressly states that "the word of God is the only rule, and sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice." Do Campbellites read the Bible more than Methodists? Do Campbellites give more to circulate the Holy Scriptures everywhere than the Methodists do? I will put our people against his in both these respects without the least fear of suffering shame by the comparison. Why then does the gentleman talk such nonsense?

But again he tells us creeds check the freedom of thought. He tells that when our candidates for the ministry enter our theological schools, the creed is put into their hands, and they must judge everything by the creed. This is a gross misrepresentation. The Bible is the standard of theology in every Protestant theological seminary in the land, and the leading standard works of the leading evangelical denominations are all upon the shelves of our libraries, and there is as much freedom of thought in our theological schools as there is in the institutions of the gentleman's church. His remarks are false, and a slander on our theological schools. Why, he would have you believe that we are the veriest tyrants in the world—that we allow neither liberty of thought nor liberty of conscience. The liberty for which the gentleman pleads is the liberty to overthrow all law and order; it is the liberty of anarchy, as we have seen in looking at the practical workings of his system. If we are such terrible spiritual tyrants, it is certainly a great wonder that our people have never yet felt the galling yoke of that terrible tyranny which has crushed out their freedom of thought, which my opponent has dwelt upon so eloquently!

But he tells us he was raised a Methodist, and he does not wish to say anything against the Methodist Episcopal Church, for he has many dear friends still in the granddaughter of the Mother of Harlots! This is indeed a wonderful declaration after what we have been listening to for some days past. I am really afraid his parents did not do their duty in raising him properly, for if they had I think he would have been a much better man, and would never have left the Methodist Episcopal Church to become engulfed in the heresies of

Campbellism. A man properly trained and indoctrinated in the doctrines of Methodism from childhood, can never become a Campbellite, and I am sure, however good the gentleman's parents themselves were, they were sadly deficient in the religious training and education of their boy. [Laughter.]—[*Time expired.*]

MR. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will take up the subject of the Christian System first. I said that any man who said that that book was a creed in our congregations, in the sense in which we use the word creed in this debate, was either willfully ignorant and was to be branded as a base slanderer for asserting what he did not know to be true, and ought to know to be false, or he was a base, willful liar. I repeat the assertion, and dare any man to move me one particle from it. My opponent says he did not say so. Then what I said does not apply to him. If he said so, or says so now, or in the future, I apply this language to him, or any one that says so.

I certainly understood him to say so, and I think the report will show that he said that it was to all intents and purposes a creed—just as much a creed as any creed used by any church. I place the same stigma upon that assertion, because the gentleman knows that it has never, in a single instance, in a single congregation, been adopted or used as a test of church membership or as a guide in church discipline. He knows we use no book but the New Testament. I will go further and say that the gentleman's last statement, that it is just as much my creed as the Discipline is his, with this difference, that he owns his, while I do not mine, is just as willfully false.

I have never read but two or three chapters of the book. There is much in the nature of the book that I do not approve. The gentleman has been very unfortunate in his selection of a book to attempt to fasten on us as a creed, for it is an unpopular book. Not one in five of our brethren have read the book. Not one in twenty have it. Yet we are told this is our creed. When we try members or set forth our views we use the New Testament alone. The Christian System has just the same authority among our brethren that the gentleman's book now in the hands of the Methodist Book Concern in Cincinnati will have among his brethren when published, and no more. The gentleman knows this, and has known it, hence his statements deserve the stigma I put on them. I have placed it on them and there it will remain forever.

My opponent finds fault with my position that man can not make a perfect synopsis of God's perfect rule. If man is imperfect and corrupt, will not his work partake of that imperfection and corruption? Can imperfection produce perfection? Which shall we take, that which comes perfect from the Spirit of Infinite Wisdom, or that which comes from a fallible, imperfect and corrupt source, and must of course be fallible, corrupt and imperfect?

Suppose I admit man can have a correct idea of revelation as far as he goes, and can express it perfectly, can he have a complete idea? Can finite man give a perfect synopsis of the infinite system



of redemption? Which shall we use, that which comes perfect from the hand of an infallible infinite source, or man's fallible interpretation of it? My logical opponent is continually involving himself in difficulties. He admits that God's word is perfect as a rule of faith and practice, or as a creed and guide in church discipline, but urges that we need a creed, because men differ and err in the use of this perfect rule, or can not have a perfect idea of it. When we press him then with the objection that all creeds then are imperfect, and we have two sources of error—the imperfect rule and imperfect man's imperfect use of it—that this only aggravates the evil; he turns around and claims man can make a perfect synopsis of God's word—can have a perfect idea of it, can use it perfectly.

His starting point has always been that we err in our understanding of the Bible and in our application of it. Now we ask him again to tell us how we are to remedy this? Can we do it by throwing away that which he says is perfect, and using this very imperfection in the form of a creed? Was there ever such an absurdity?

I am told that I place my creed in my sermons. True, and it is my duty, as an honest man, to do so. But do I make it a bond of union and communion—a guide in church discipline? Do I make it a standard? Remember we are not debating the propriety of every man's having a creed, but the propriety of his making that belief a standard instead of God's word to try men's faith and practice.

We are told heretics appeal to the Bible, and how shall we detect them? Is not God's word perfect to detect error? God says it is perfect in doctrine, and in correction of doctrine, and in reproof of conduct. Is not that a sufficient answer to the gentleman's question? But he declares God's word is not perfect for this purpose, but we must construct human detectors to make as perfect and furnish us thoroughly for the work of detecting heresy. The gentleman here contradicts the Holy Spirit as flatly as it can be done.

We once received a heretic into our church. Aylett Raines, a Universalist, was received by us. Bro. Raines believed that salvation was through Christ, and that men should obey the gospel, and preached such obedience. On a promise that he would not make a hobby of his Universalist opinions, and would not make divisions by preaching them, he was received and went out to preach, just as my opponent's church have received and retained soul-sleepers to my own knowledge. He preached the truth, and preached himself out of error, till he is now one of our ablest writers against Universalism. We tolerate differences of opinion concerning mere opinions of what the Bible teaches on mere questions of opinion, just as the gentleman's church tolerates many and wide differences of opinion on depravity, and other opinions as to what the Discipline teaches. We unite on questions of faith concerning scriptural faith, just as the gentleman's church unites on what they regard as the essential doctrines of the Discipline. In short, we use God's creed and discipline which he has given us, for the purposes he has given it. My opponent uses a human guess, a human, imperfect, corrupt, fallible standard, and rejects what God has given him. That is just the difference between us.

Christianity must bear the blame and scandal of abominable

heresy, unless we have creeds to set forth the truth, and distinguish between those who hold the truth and those who are heretics. Is not the Word sufficiently clear to defend itself from abominable heresy? Can not we compare abominable heresy with God's perfect standard and detect it as well as with a fallible, imperfect standard—a human creed? God says his word is perfect in doctrine, in correction of heresy, and in reproof of conduct. The gentleman says it is not; we must, have another and better standard, a human creed.

But Braden is a heretic. Let us try the gentleman and myself for a moment. Heretic comes from *aireoo*, to cut out, to cull, to select. I take the whole word of God just as he has given it. The gentleman cuts out, culls, selects certain portions, and embodies them in a creed, and uses that instead of God's entire word. Which is the heretic?

The gentleman refers to what is called the Apostles' Creed, and by emphasizing the word apostles, he hopes to lead you to infer that the apostles framed or at least indorsed this creed. Another of his little dodges. He knows that he has not a scrap of proof that the apostles ever saw it. On the contrary, it was doubtless framed over a century after the death of the last of them. Let us have no play on the words Apostles' Creed.

We are told Ignatius had a creed. He had the New Testament. But he gave a creed, or wrote a creed for a certain church. The gentleman knows better. He wrote a letter urging them to try certain heretics, and gave his reasons for supposing or believing that they were heretics. In like manner the gentleman has warned you to beware of my heresies, and has argued against them, and set faith in his own views in this debate. Are his arguments a creed? They are just as much as Ignatius' letters. No one was ever tried by Ignatius' letters, or admitted into the church on subscribing to them. They were never a bond of union or a standard in discipline, a test, any more than my opponent's discussions.

He tells us that all evangelical Protestant churches are agreed on the great fundamental principles of the Christian religion. They agree on what is evangelical, orthodox and essential. A more fatal statement was never made. If they all agree on what is orthodox, evangelical and essential, on what does the creed divide or separate them? On what is not necessary to orthodoxy, to being evangelical? On what is not essential? Can a more fatal concession be made? Common-sense asks, why not unite on that which is fundamental, orthodox, evangelical and essential, and let what is not fundamental, not necessary to orthodoxy, or to being evangelical, not essential, go? Why in the name of reason divide on what is non-essential when you agree on what is essential?

All the gentleman's arguments against my position are simply arraigning God's Word and not myself, or my brethren. We are fallible and we know it. But we do not attempt to remedy our imperfections by throwing away God's word, and taking instead an imperfect, fallible creed. No, we still use the perfect standard, and in this way we correct former errors. We certainly run less risk in using God's perfect standard than man's fallible standard. Were the creed to be

taken, there is the same liability to err in using that. Yea, tenfold more, for it is imperfect. We can correct our errors in using God's word, just as the gentleman can his errors in using the Discipline. Yea, tenfold easier, for God's word is perfect for correction, but his Discipline is imperfect and fallible. He dare not deny it.

We come now to our regular affirmative argument. We object to creeds, because

12. They lead to a distortion of the scriptures and a perversion of the word of God. Men do not read the scriptures to learn what they teach, but to find something to prove the creed. They do not go to the Bible as the pupil goes to the school to learn the truth, or as the man in darkness goes to the light that he may walk in it, but as the soldier goes to the arsenal to get ammunition to fight with. Portions are selected and run into theological bullets to shoot enemies. The Bible is a magazine of proof-texts to slaughter enemies.

Every perversion and distortion of God's word is resorted to in making these creeds. God's word is placed into these crucibles and run into altogether a different shape from the pure coin as it was coined in the mint of heaven. Take the scrapping of the word of God, the garbling partial readings, the suppressions, and the flat contradiction that these creeds lead men into. Take the practice of selecting isolated passages and appending them to the statements of the creeds, when in their connection they have no such idea. Such was the gentleman's attempt to sustain the faith-alone hobby of his Discipline. Take such readings as "he that believeth shall be saved." An infidel was once rebuked by a Methodist preacher for not believing the Bible. He retorted:

"You do not either. Do you believe baptism is for the remission of sins?"

"I do not," replied the preacher.

"The Bible says, 'Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins.' I told you that you are as much an infidel as I am," said the infidel.

Nothing but having creeds to defend would lead to such perversions and denials of God's word.

13. They are the great source of infidelity. Men embody their opinions and speculations in creeds, and set them forth as what the Bible teaches. They preach these dogmas instead of the Bible, and as the Bible. Men are driven by these absurdities into infidelity. They reject these dogmas, and suppose they are rejecting the Bible, because these dogmas have been preached instead of the Bible and as the Bible. What has led to infidelity and rationalism in Germany and New England but the preaching the dogmas of the Calvinistic creeds instead of the Bible and as the Bible? Men's good sense revolted and rejected these and threw away the Bible because these creeds had always been presented to them as the Bible. In like manner the dogmas of my friend's church concerning total hereditary depravity, God's needing reconciliation, the miraculous operation of the Spirit, and a score of others, which he preaches instead of the Bible and as the Bible, are fast leading this region into Universalism, Unitarianism and Infidelity.

14. They take the cross of Christ and the gospel out of men's mouths, and place instead dogmas and human opinions. Men no longer determine to know nothing save Jesus and him crucified. They no longer preach the great facts, commands and promises of the gospel. They preach metaphysical disquisitions, theological dogmas, fine-spun theories and human opinions. Take the modern sermons of our advocates of creeds, and compare their subjects and language with that of the apostles, and see how obviously creeds have taken away the gospel and substituted human creeds.

15. They weaken the cause of Christ by dividing the followers of Christ, and setting them to fighting each other. Instead of one undivided army fighting the common enemy, we have nearly four hundred little parties that spend ten times as much time in fighting each other as warring with sin and unbelief, and all the while claiming to believe that they are agreed on what is fundamental, evangelical and essential. What a spectacle!

16. They contain heresy and more than what is in the Bible. If creeds contain just what the Bible teaches, of what use are they, since the scriptures are perfect to make us wise unto salvation, for doctrine, for correction, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, and if we are made perfect by them and thoroughly furnished for every good work? No; creeds are made for the very purpose of placing in them more than what is in the Bible, for if they contained only that, men would no more attempt to make them than they would want to wear two heads exactly identical. Men fancy their fellow-men are teaching heresy. Not satisfied to use God's word, not satisfied with his exposition or detector, they rush to the opposite extreme and then make a creed to embody their heresy that is not God's word, and throw away God's word, and fight error with error. Creeds are made to contain more than there is in God's word, and are therefore heretical, presumptuous and blasphemous.

17. They weaken the advocates of the scriptures by compelling them to defend human error instead of divine truth. Creeds contain more than there is in the scriptures. The religious world is pledged to them as scriptural truth. They have to defend, not only the Bible, but these creeds. Not only so, but those dogmas contain errors that are the weapons of the infidel in his contest with the Christian world. He takes these errors and assails the Bible with them. He assails them because the religious world teaches them as the Bible. The man bound to a creed has either to defend them as the Bible, or abandon his creed.

We are told that when Cambyses, king of Persia, was invading Egypt, he arranged before his army an immense herd of sheep and domestic animals, which the Egyptians worshiped as gods and regarded as sacred. They dare not hurl a single dart or spear, for fear of committing sacrilege and wounding one of these sacred animals, and thus incurring the wrath of their gods. The Persians had no such scruples, and plied their weapons and totally routed their superstitious enemies. In like manner the infidel world has always arrayed before them the absurdities of the creeds. The religious world dare not assail them for they would destroy their creeds and sectarian fortress.

Rice in his debate with Pingree was thus beaten for days. He had to defend his confession of faith instead of the Bible, and instead of assailing Universalism. When Owen challenged the preachers of the United States, Bro. Campbell alone dared to meet him, for he stood on the Bible alone. 80 when Bishop Purcell assailed the churches of Cincinnati, they dare not meet him, for he showed that all their creeds came from the Romish Church. Their creeds must be abandoned, or he would use them against them. Bro. Campbell taking the word alone, met him. He alone dared do it. Now our brethren alone take the word of God alone. They alone make Jesus the central character; they alone make his 3Iessiahship the central truth, the rock on which the church is built; they alone are not paralyzed by creeds; they alone can meet successfully infidels of all grades. When will you throw away your creeds which render you utterly helpless and stand forth on God's word alone?

18. Creeds cause schism, heresy and error, and foster the very evil they were designed to correct. Men err in interpreting God's word. Others rush to the opposite extreme. Both parties, dissatisfied with God's word, embody their heresies in a creed. Men differ in interpreting these creeds, and a new creed is made. Thus heresy begets creeds and creeds beget heresy, and so on *ad infinitum*, like Milton's monsters of sin and death. The beginning of organized heresy and divisions was the first departure from the use of God's word alone. Men not satisfied with this, framed the Apostles' Creed. They differed concerning this; then came the Nicene Creed. They differed on this, and then arose new parties, and in the attempt to guard against these by human creeds, men wandered further and further away till they lauded in the delusions of Catholicism.

In like manner Luther and Zwingle split and made creeds. Men split on these, and then on the resulting creeds, until we have our four hundred different sects and creeds. The Episcopalian creed came from the Romish Church, and the Methodist from that. They are but two removes. The whole idea is based on a fallacy. Men err in interpreting the scriptures. Will they not in interpreting a creed? Will not each creed be a new source of heresy, division and error? This leads to our next argument.

19. They fail to secure unanimity of opinion, and fail of the very end for which they are made. Men err in interpreting a perfect Bible. Will they not err and differ more in interpreting an imperfect, fallible creed? Each man gives his interpretation to the creed. They differ. Then each one makes his interpretation a new creed. Men differ concerning each of these. Then follows an interpretation of the interpretation of the interpretation, and so on *ad infinitum*. It is like the old lady's theory of the world. It rested on a rock. On what did this rest? On a rock. On what this? Another rock; until at last she answered, "Why don't you see, it's rock all the way down?" Why not place God's word as the center and let each believer revolve around it in accordance with God's decree, and avoid these baseless creeds and interpretations.

My friend knows that his brethren differ as widely in interpreting the Discipline as men do in interpreting the scriptures. I have before

me a letter of Dr. Spear, of the New School Presbyterian Church, in which he shows that these churches, though subscribing to and defending the same confession, are as wide apart as the poles on some points. He says Dr. Albert Barnes' explanation of the creed is heaven-wide from Dr. Hodge's. They have the same creed. Do we remedy the errors in interpreting the scriptures by using creeds? No; we increase and multiply them. Like the case of the carpenter using the last board, he sawed for a measure instead of his perfect rule; we wander further and further from the truth. The whole argument for creeds is a fallacy. Men differ more in their understanding of imperfect, corrupt creeds than in their understanding of God's word.

20. They destroy spirituality and zeal for Christ. As Paul said to the Corinthians when they began to have creeds and names, they forgot they were of Christ; they forgot him and became carnal. Their zeal was not for Christ and the gospel, but for their sect and creed. They make religious partisans, but not Christians. Christ is removed as the supreme object of love, and dogmas and sect is enthroned instead. We labor for their church and not for Christ and the salvation of souls. The bigoted sectarian would rather see men damned than saved, except by his church or sect. Like the disciples of Jesus, they will forbid a man's casting out devils, unless he goes with them.

21. They are a source of bigotry, intolerance, persecution and self-righteousness. As soon as men abandon God's word, and the right of each individual to appeal to it without a creed, and to believe for himself, and set up a creed as a standard; the next step is to exclude all who will not take their sectarian Shibboleth. Then comes denunciation, then persecution. Look at the terms orthodox and evangelical. How much of bigotry, persecution and Phariseism do they express? Every sect that has stood one hundred years has persecuted, except the Baptists. They have escaped, because they have wandered least from God's word.

22. We object next, because they have rejected and excluded as heretical the great and good of all ages. The Son of God himself was rejected by the orthodox Pharisees, who had abandoned, as he told, the law of God and adopted creeds, or human traditions. Wickliffe, Tyndale, Luther and Wesley were treated as heretics by the orthodox creed sticklers of their day, just as Bro. Campbell has been in this century. Dr. Tyng is a heretic in the mummery-ridden High Church party of the Episcopalian Church, though he is acknowledged to be one of the best men and preachers of his city. He was a heretic because he preached in a Methodist Church, just as I am a heretic in the eyes of my opponent. Creeds have made heretics of those who are guided by God's word ever since the days of our Saviour.

23. We object that they fail to detect error, but on the contrary create it. "How can we detect error?" cries my opponent. I will find how Christ himself commanded the churches to detect error, even when the inspired Apostle John was living. Revelation ii. 2:

"2. I know thy works and thy labor and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil; but hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast proved them liars."

"13. Thou holdest my name, and hast not denied my faith."

"25. That which ye have, hold till I come."

Revelation iii. 3 :

"3. Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast."

"10. Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I will also keep thee."

How were they to detect error to try men? By the word of God. If the apostles dare not make a creed when uninspired, but had to use only the inspired word, how dare we to do it now ? They dared to use only the word as a creed and discipline. We dare do no more.

24. We object to creeds because they were utterly unknown to the first two hundred years of the church—the best period of the church. I might read from Neander, Mosheim and Waddington to prove this, but my opponent dare not deny it. If, when the church was most successful and purest, it had no creed, creeds are not necessary to its success and purity. The ecclesiastical historian tells us that the scriptures were the only symbols of faith, and that on a simple profession of their faith in Christ, men were baptized and then taught to observe all that the apostles enjoined in their writings. If the inspired apostles so managed the churches in their day, can we uninspired men improve heaven's plan?

25. Our next argument is that when men were aroused by great Christian love and zeal, and actuated by pure motives, they not only cast aside creeds as useless, but as obstacles and barriers to success. Such is the case in all revivals and great religious awakenings. Then the followers of Christ unite and preach the gospel alone. Creeds are carefully avoided as dangerous things that will do harm. After thus laboring together as Christians, because they have dropped their creeds, when the good work is done, then creeds come in to undo it and introduce schism, bigotry, sectarians and hatred, and destroy all Christianity and love of Christ. The quarrel commences about what church converts shall join, what name they shall wear, what creed they shall profess. There was none of this quarreling when they had laid aside their creeds and labored as followers of one common master, and spoke the one dialect of Canaan. Suppose there was but one church, with but the scriptures as a common creed, could they not labor together in it, just as they did during the revival? But the devil enters in the shape of a creed, and introduces the Babel of Ashdod, the Shibboleths of creeds and parties, and the work is more than undone.

26. We object to creeds that they introduce and create a sectarian terminology, dogmatic catch words and phrases, sectarian Shibboleths which take the place of the pure speech of the Bible, the "same things" the children of God are all to speak. Men speak like the creeds and not like the oracles of God. Trinity, transubstantiation, getting religion, mourner's bench, seeker's circles, and all these things are innovations and corruptions of creeds.

27. They have added to and corrupted the ordinances of the church. Nearly all the corruptions of the ordinances of the church have been made the basis of creeds, and sanctioned by them. Indeed

the use of a creed is a corruption, or rather a destruction of the simple ceremony of admitting members and of trying delinquents by the scriptures alone.

28. Men unite to accomplish all the purposes of the gospel in Bible Societies, Tract Societies, Sunday-Schools, Christian Associations, Evangelical Leagues, Missionary Societies, Union Prayer Meetings, outside of their church organizations. Creeds keep (he churches apart and the members while acting in them. Hence they step outside of their churches, and from such associations as the Christian Association, and soon make a kind of general church of it. A sort of illegitimate church, just as men who have failed in receiving proper treatment from their wives sometimes, seek for it in adulterous connections. Were these barriers of creeds broken down, and the churches made one, then men would accomplish these purposes by means of God's own instrumentality, the church, and not subordinate the church to such illegitimate organizations.

29. All good men are now striving to throw away these creeds. Witness the associations we have already named, and the universal prayer for union. Witness the attempts at all the conventions of these associations to break down these middle walls of partition. We hope the time will come when such men will not allow the sectarian organizations to erect them again between them when they have broken them down at such gatherings.

HO. When men take the word alone, they soon unite. Witness the Union and unanimity reached by the various denominations in our American Bible Union. When men have laid aside creeds, and taken the word alone, they have always reached an unanimity that will enable them to live fraternally together.

31. Creeds make a farce of our Saviour's prayer. He prayed that his followers might be one. How one? As he and his Father are one. Creeds make nearly four hundred parties. Are Christians one as Christ desired? Did Christ mean what he prayed? Did he desire it? Is it practicable? No one dare insult the Son of God by answering no. Creeds produce the very opposite result. Are they not unscriptural and anti-christian?

'62. Lastly we object to these creeds that they set up a false standard of union. What does the Bible present as the real standard of union among Christians? Not devotion to a sect, or party, or set of dogmas, or a creed; but a living faith in a person, in Christ, as the Sou of the living God. Creeds take away this and substitute a partisan zeal—a set of dogmas. They takeaway the bread of life and give us a stone—they take away the fruit of the tree of life which was for the healing of the nations, and give us apples of Sodom, that turn to ashes on our thirsty lips. Poor cheated humanity stands over the tomb of a slaughtered religion, slaughtered in the house of its pretended friends, and cries like the weeping Mary over the tomb of our Saviour, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where to find him." Let us then restore the scriptures as our only perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. Jesus, to the supreme place in our hearts, as our Prophet, Priest and King; and his Messiahship



as the great central truth of our religion, the rock on which the church is built, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it.—[*Time expired.*]

## MR. HUGHEY'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—As the gentleman has presented the last argument that he intends to present, I shall first review his speech, and then, if I have time in this half hour, I will review the arguments which he has advanced, that I have not yet replied to.

In regard to the Christian System—you remember that I said distinctly, when I presented that book at first, that there was a book sent forth for the purpose of giving to the world the principles of the Bethany Reform, by Mr. Campbell himself; an J that he had as good and opportunity of knowing what they hold and teach as any man living or dead, for the whole theological literature of the denomination passed under his eye, from the beginning of the movement up to the time this book was published. Mr. Campbell is the known and recognized head of the denomination, whether his followers will acknowledge it or not. I stated that it was divided off into chapters and sections. just like a confession of faith, and that the only difference between it and the Methodist Discipline was, that it never had been adopted or received as their confession by the Campbellite Church. This I stated expressly when I first introduced the Christian System. I stated also that it does contain the whole system of doctrine usually taught by the denomination. Now, whether this is true or false, must be determined by studying the book and comparing its teachings with the teachings of the Campbellite Church. I have read the book carefully, I have heard the arguments that have been adduced in this discussion, and I have debated with several other gentlemen of the denomination, and I find nearly every argument and doctrine they have advanced in this book. It was set forth as a systematic representation of the doctrines of the Campbellite Church. But I did not say that the denomination had adopted it as a confession of faith. You will remember I distinctly stated that they had not done so.

My friend took great offense at what I said, and charged me, as you all remember, with willful lying. Now he says that any man who will say what I did not say tells a falsehood. [Laughter.] He says if I had said that the Christian System had been accepted by his church as their creed or confession of faith, I would have told a falsehood. But I stated precisely the opposite, and he knows it.

My statement in regard to the Christian System was this: That Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Campbellite Church, and the most talented minister that has ever been in it, saw the necessity of having a written statement of the doctrines held and taught by the denomination, and that he consequently published the Christian System for this very purpose, as he states in the preface. But I stated expressly that it had never been received as a creed or confession of faith by the denomination. I stated also, and I here reiterate the assertion, that in this book—the Christian System—we find the doc-

trines, discipline, government—the whole system of Campbellism generally—set forth. If they have ever held or taught differently I have never learned it; nor has my opponent taught differently during this discussion. I am sorry that my opponent's remarks made it necessary for me to say what I did, for I hoped that our discussion would close without any such unpleasant feelings or remarks. I have never intended to misrepresent an opponent, and I never will; and never want an opponent to misrepresent me; nor do I want an opponent to attempt to make the impression on the minds of an audience that I have been guilty of falsehood, for that is not my manner of discussing at all. I hope now that this matter of the Christian System is finally settled.

He told us that this is a very unpopular book among the denomination. But why? Because they do not want anything to be considered in any way as binding them down to any particular set of principles, and because it is brought against them every time they get into a discussion on the creed question, just as I have done here, and perhaps sometimes unfairly. It would be unjust and unfair to charge it upon the Campbellite Church as their confession of faith; but this I have not done. This book is unpopular because it puts into the hands of their opponents a club to break their own heads. I know it is an unpopular book in the gentleman's church; but notwithstanding its unpopularity it contains the whole system of Campbellism, prepared by Mr. Campbell himself; and if any man ever was capable of giving us an intelligent digest of the heterogeneous mass called Campbellism, Alexander Campbell was that man. The system is here set forth, but whether my opponent has read the work or not I can not say. I have read it, and I know it contains their entire system, whether they will acknowledge it or not.

The gentleman has taken the position that, if man can not originate a perfect rule, he can not give a perfect synopsis of it.

*Mr. Braden*—I say so yet. Admitting that he can do it, for the sake of argument, there would be great liability to error in it. For argument's sake I admitted such was the case.

*Mr. Hughey*—I do not wish to misrepresent the gentleman. It is a fact which every schoolboy knows—whether he admits it or not—that has ever read a dozen sentences, that a man may be incapable of originating many things that he is capable of perfectly understanding when once presented to the mind; and it is perfectly self-evident that what the mind perfectly understands it can give a perfect synopsis of. If the scriptures of divine truth are so obscure that we can not perfectly understand them in all things necessary to salvation, they are properly no revelation at all. If the mind can perfectly understand the scriptures in all things necessary to salvation, then it can give a perfect synopsis of them. In all things essential to the faith or practice of the Christian, the Bible is a plain book, and can be perfectly understood by those who earnestly seek for the truth, and consequently we can present a perfect synopsis of its essential doctrinal and moral teaching. If we can not give a perfect written creed, or synopsis of what the Bible teaches in regard to things essential to salvation, the gentleman can not give a perfect unwritten synopsis of

those doctrines, and consequently the gospel can not now be fully taught! Here, you see, his objection bears as heavily against his position as it does against mine—we both stand upon precisely the same ground.

But the gentleman asks, why throw away a perfect rule and take an imperfect one? I answer, we do no such thing. The Bible is our rule of faith, and our only rule. But heretics have perverted the teachings of the Bible, so that it is necessary for the defense of truth for us to present what the Bible does truly teach, in opposition to the perversions of heretics. My opponent tells us that we throw away the Bible and take our creed in its place. This he can not but know is untrue. He says this is done by implication. I deny that any Protestant creed even implies any such thing. Every Protestant creed expressly declares that the word of God is the only rule, both of faith and practice. With such a declaration in the creed no such implication is possible. Our creed, instead of usurping the place of the Bible, simply sets forth what we understand the Bible to teach in regard to the essential doctrines of the gospel; and the gentleman knows there is no such thing as throwing away the Bible, and taking the creed in its place, among us. As I showed before, heretics make it necessary that we should have a creed, by their corruptions of the doctrines of the Bible, yet claiming that they believe and teach what the Bible teaches. How is the world to know whether we fraternize with heretics, and accept their erroneous teachings or not, unless we publish to the world what we understand the Bible to teach? We choose to put in a written creed what my friend has in his unwritten creed, and what he publishes to the world, in his sermons, tracts, and theological publications. My friend tells us he believes and teaches just what the Bible teaches. We think we do the same. Now, he is either in possession of the spirit of inspiration, or he simply gives us his views of the Bible. Does he claim inspiration? Does his church claim inspiration? If he does, then he may claim to tell us that he has only an inspired creed; but if he does not claim inspiration, he is on the same ground with us; and the only difference between us is, our creed is written and his is unwritten, if ours is a written human creed, his is an unwritten human creed; and there is no getting from this fact. If we set aside the Bible because we have a written creed, he sets it aside because he has an unwritten one. This is the only difference between us. Our creed is written. The world knows what we understand the Bible to teach; but my opponent has to give an explanation of his creed every time he wishes to use it. We have the rocks weighed, but my mend has to guess at the weight of the rocks every time. [Laughter.]

Did I say that because heretics appeal to the Bible, therefore we must throw the Bible away? Did I advance any such argument in defense of creeds as that? No, sir. I said heretics appeal to the Bible, and tell us that the Bible teaches their views; and how, I asked, is the world to distinguish between true Christians and heretics, unless we publish to the world what we understand the scriptures to teach, in opposition to the teaching of heretics? And how, I asked, are you going to convict a man of heresy unless you have some agree-

ment or understanding as to what the Bible teaches? Our creeds are not for the purpose of setting aside the authority of the Bible, but to publicly declare to the world, as I have told the gentleman again and again, what we understand that holy book to teach as necessary to salvation, and in opposition to the perversions of heretics.

My friend tells us that they took Mr. Raines into their church as a Universalist, and set him to preaching, but made him agree he would not preach Universalist doctrines; that he preached Universalism out of himself, and got to be an earnest reformer, and became a great and good man among them! But suppose he had not preached this heresy out of himself, what would they have done with him? Why, they received him as a Universalist, and they would have kept him as a Universalist! A church that has no way to keep out such foul heresies as Universalism is not the church of Christ! We would have kept him out until he was purged of his heresies before we would even have admitted him on probation.

The gentleman tells us that so far as heresy is concerned, I am the heretic and he, of course, is orthodox. A heretic, he tells us, is one who "selects out." If this is to be taken as the proper meaning of the term, I confess that it can not well be applied to him or his church, for they do not select out much. They take people as they come, Universalists and all. [Laughter.] There is not a church in the land, whose door is so wide as to admit all classes of errorists, as that to which my opponent belongs.

But I use the term heretic in its ordinary acceptance; I mean by heretic, "one who corrupts the truth—one who teaches and believes error in opposition to scripture truth." Hence I claim that my opponent is the heretic, and I am the orthodox in the present case. But as wide as is the door of entrance into the Campbellite Church, there are certain things that must be accepted, or there is no admittance into its fold; and which must forever exclude me from admittance into that institution. The first is, "Immersion only is Christian baptism;" the second is, "Baptism is for the remission of sins;" and the third is, "Believing penitents are the only proper subjects of Christian baptism." If a man accepts this creed he may believe anything else he pleases. Universalism or what not, still they will receive him! But he tells us he does not receive members by his creed, but by the "Thus saith the Lord." But if this is true he must claim inspiration according to his own position. He tells us it requires the same inspiration to give a perfect synopsis of a perfect rule as it does to originate a perfect rule. Is this a perfect synopsis? Then he is inspired! Who is it that makes assumptions here? I do not claim inspiration for our church; nor do I claim that she is wholly exempt from error; but I do not think my opponent can find one particle of error in the creed which our church has adopted, and the only creed which she accepts as a bond of union and communion among Christians.

The gentleman tells us that the apostles never saw the "Apostles' Creed." Did I not state expressly that it is called the Apostles' Creed, not because they framed it, but because it contains the doctrines which all evangelical Christians admit the apostles taught? It

is really not quite so old as the Nicene Creed; but this does not effect the truth of the doctrines it contains.

But again: the gentleman tells us that Ignatius had no creed, and that persons were not admitted into the church in his day on a profession of faith as contained in the creed which I read you from Ignatius. Indeed, he seemed to deny that there were any such heretics in the days of Ignatius, as I told you this creed was aimed against. Every one at all acquainted with ecclesiastical history knows that I stated the facts as to the existence of the heresies of Simon Magus and Cerinthus. Schaff, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1, pp. 88, 89, thus speaks of these heresies:

"The opposite extreme is a false Gentile Christianity, which may be called the Paganizing, or Gnostic heresy. This exaggerates the Pauline view of the distinction of Christianity from Judaism, sunders Christianity from its historical basis, resolves the real humanity of the Saviour into a Docetic illusion, and perverts the freedom of the gospel into Antinomian licentiousness. The author of this baptized heathenism, according to the uniform testimony of Christian antiquity, is Simon Magus, who unquestionably adulterated Christianity with pagan ideas and practices, and gave himself out, in pantheistic style, for an emanation from God. Plain traces of this error appear in the later epistles of Paul (to the Colossians, to Timothy, and to Titus), the second epistle of Peter, the first two epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, and the messages of the Apocalypse to the seven churches."

Now here are the very points set forth in the creed of Ignatius. I read you wherein he says Christ "was truly born, and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead," etc. The true, real humanity, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, is here presented in opposition to the illusion heresy of the Gnostics.

This was the confession of faith, or creed, upon which persons were admitted into the church in the days of Ignatius. These are facts that can not be called in question. I read you the creed of Irenaeus, wherein he sets forth the faith of the church in opposition to the heresies that prevailed in his time, and showed that these heretics formed no part of the church, and that they could not be admitted into the church. Yet my opponent says persons were not received into the church on a profession of the faith contained in the creed—

that no such tests were applied in the times of Ignatius and Irenaeus. I wonder that a man of Mr. Braden's pretensions to learning should make such a statement. Persons who did not receive the faith as contained in the creed were not admitted into the church, nor recognized as Christians; and this all ecclesiastical history shows. From the days of the apostles the church has had her creeds, as we have seen; and no person was received or retained in the church who did not subscribe to the doctrine of the creed, in opposition to the false teaching of the heretics. This is a fact so well established by the testimony of ecclesiastical history, that I wonder that any man making any pretensions to learning or information should ever call it in question. For the full confirmation of this remark, see Lord King's account of the primitive church, pp. 205-211.

The gentleman wants to know why we do not throw away our creeds on the non-fundamental points of Christian doctrine? I answer, this is precisely what we, as a denomination, have done, and what all evangelical Christians are doing. He tells us that the various evangelical Protestant denominations unite in our Sunday-school work, holding Sunday-school conventions, etc. Yes, and this illustrates the very point I have been presenting to him during the entire discussion of this proposition. It proves that our creeds are no harriers to Christian fellowship and communion. But I was surprised to hear him speak as he did about our revivals of religion, where he told us that when the Spirit was poured out upon us, our creeds were thrown aside, and we all united as brethren. This was a remarkable admission! In his caricatures of our revivals he has represented them as anything but spiritual exercises—as nothing but the wildest fanaticism and excitement. Now he admits that they are the real work of the Spirit of God, and that during these seasons of the out-pouring of the Spirit we lay aside our creeds, and unite as brethren in the common work of the Master. But here he has renounced his whole doctrine. He has contended all through this discussion, and his church agrees with him in this, that there is no spiritual life to be enjoyed until we are put into Christ by immersion. Now he tells us that his doctrine is false—that there is spiritual life among Pedobaptists—that our revivals are real works of grace, and many thousands are truly converted to Christ in these revivals! I confess I was surprised to hear him thus admit that his doctrine is false, and his whole argument a sophistical quibble. If Christians can unite in their Sunday-school and revival work, it shows that creeds are not in the way of Christian union and communion, and therefore his whole argument is a fallacy! This admission has completely overthrown his whole system, and shows that he does not believe his own doctrine.

But the gentleman tells us creeds destroy spirituality and zeal in the church. Are Pedobaptist and orthodox Baptist churches less spiritual and zealous in the cause of Christ than the Campbellite Church? Without boasting, I will put the Methodist Episcopal Church, for spirituality and zeal in the cause of Christ, against his church, and not feel the least fearful that she will suffer by the comparison. I admit that the gentleman's church has much zeal, but it is sadly deficient in spirituality; its zeal is not a zeal for the salvation of sinners, but a zeal to proselyte Christians to the errors of Campbellism. I have been most bitterly denounced in their pulpits and their periodicals, because I have opposed their zeal and showed up their unscriptural creed in its proper light. If their zeal for the water and to make proselytes was a zeal for God, they would certainly be the most zealous people ever the sun shone upon; but it is a zeal like that of the Jews: "Not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."

He gives us the case of Dr. Tyng as an example of the effects of creeds. But the gentleman has forgotten that the High Church party in the Episcopal Church, who are the persecutors of Dr. Tyng, do not

receive the Bible as the only and sole rule of faith. They add tradition to scripture—they are semi-papists, led on by Dr. Pusey, of the Church of England, and will sooner or later unite with the Church of Rome. This case can not illustrate the effects of creeds among Protestants, who hold the written word of God as the sole rule of faith and practice, and who have creeds only for the purpose of setting forth what they understand the scriptures to teach.

But the gentleman tells us that creeds create heresy and schism, and lead men away from the Bible—that they east out good men from the church and retain bad men in it. I have just shown that this is untrue. Instead of our creeds leading men from the Bible, they constantly point them to the Bible as the only source of truth. Instead of creeds creating heresy and schism, I have shown that heresy and schism made it necessary to have creeds. But he tells us that Mr. Wesley was cast out of the Church of England by the creed. This is indeed news to the Methodists! Is Mr. Braden really no better posted in ecclesiastical history than to tell you that Mr. Wesley was cast out of the Church of England? Mr. Wesley lived and died a minister in good standing in the Church of England, and all the members of his societies were members of the established church until after his death. I am surprised to find Mr. Braden ignorant of this fact.

We have found that creeds are necessary in order to draw the line of distinction between true Christianity and heresy. This necessity has always existed since the days of the apostles. But he tells us the apostolic church could try persons for heresy without a creed. Yes; but the apostolic church had a living authority to decide every question that might arise in the church, and they needed no further creed than the decision of an apostle, on any question that might arise. But that living authority does not now exist in the church, consequently there must be some agreement in the church concerning the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, or there could never be a man convicted of heresy in the church at all; and that agreement is a creed, whether it be written or unwritten. I have shown that the creed of the apostolic church was enlarged, from the one simple article on the Messiahship of Jesus, to embrace a number of articles—to expressly set forth the proper divinity and real humanity of Christ, in opposition to the heresy of Simon Magus. But this creed, of course, is embodied in the scriptures, and whatever articles might have been added to the creed during the lifetime of the apostles, must necessarily form a part of the scripture; so we can look for no creed of the apostolic church outside of the New Testament.

Again the gentleman tells us that for the first two hundred years of the Christian era creeds were unknown. But I have proved that they were known and in use at the end of the first century, and used by a man who was a bishop for thirty years cotemporary with the Apostle John—Ignatius of Antioch. Then I read you the creed of Irenaeus, who flourished as a writer from A. D. 170 to 205. He was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John. Irenaeus was bishop of Lyons, in France, for over twenty-five years, and he wrote four books against the heretics, and also a history of all the heresies and sects that had sprung up in the church up to his time.

The creed of Irenaeus is the creed of the church universal, in opposition to the heresies that existed in his day; and he gives it to us, not as something new, but as a formula well known, and always held by the true church of Christ. I was surprised again to hear the gentleman make a statement so directly at war with the well-known facts of ecclesiastical history.

My opponent tells us he objects to creeds because they create divisions and strife among Christians, but Jesus prayed that believers should all be one. The oneness for which Jesus prayed was a oneness both of faith and spirit. This unity of faith may, and does exist in diversity, among all evangelical Protestants. A mere unity of organization, where diversity of faith exists, is not the unity for which Jesus prayed. He prayed that believers should be one in him—one in spirit, one in heart—not simply one in name and organization. The unity for which my opponent contends is the unity of Babel, and not the unity of the Spirit. I am in favor of Christian unity on the scriptural basis—the unity of faith, the unity of the Spirit; and such a scriptural unity exists to-day among the evangelical churches of Christendom, though this unity exists in diversity of organization.

My opponent admits that such a unity exists in times of revival among evangelical Protestants. Creeds can not divide those who are united in spirit; and without this unity of spirit, visible, organic unity can not accomplish anything—it amounts to nothing. There is greater unity among the various Protestant churches than there is among the members and ministers of his own church. The different branches of Methodism all hold the same creed; their differences originated not in regard to their creeds, or to matters of faith, but in regard to ecclesiastical polity, or on the question of slavery. There is far less difference between the schools of the Presbyterian Church than there is in the Campbellite Church between its own members.

But then he says creeds destroy our spirituality and zeal for God. Observation and experience prove the very reverse of this true. What churches are those in this country who are most active and zealous in sending the Bible and the Missionary everywhere? What churches are most actively engaged in our Sunday-school work? They are the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Lutheran, Episcopal, etc.; and all those churches who have their creeds, and yet who unite on the Bible as the only and all-sufficient rule of faith; while the Campbellite Church has yet done but little except make war on the churches of Christ, and endeavor to make proselytes from them to their fold.—[*Time expired.*]

#### MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Let me have your undivided attention, for I shall have to speak very rapidly, and but briefly, on the many topics I shall have to notice. My opponent now says he did not assert that the "Christian System" is ever used as a creed or discipline, or that it is considered as such by our people. He only meant that Mr. Campbell published it as an exposition of his views, and what he regarded as the teachings of the re-



formation. To that statement we take no exception. We hope the gentleman will always state it clearly in that form hereafter. His first statement was not so understood by a single person in the house. His public statements on dozens of occasions have never been so understood. His hearers have always understood him to assert that we have a creed in a book, just as much as any one, but it is a secret affair. We have a creed and are hypocrites in denying it. He now publicly says that such is not the case.

The gentleman did intend to have his hearers believe what he now repudiates, or what was the point of his statement? What relevancy was there in it? What do I care for what Alexander Campbell wrote, more than what Wesley wrote, unless it contains more truth? I have accomplished my purpose, and will now let the matter rest.

He produces another evidence that we have a creed. We all speak just alike. There is a most remarkable uniformity of doctrine, even to our peculiar manner of expressing it. Yet he told you we were agreed in nothing. How does this statement comport with his assertion that men need creeds to secure an organization? If we have so wonderful a uniformity in using the New Testament alone, could not the whole world? We all speak the same thing, for we all speak as the oracles of God speak. We are guided by our inspired creed, and not a human guess at what that inspired creed contains.

He now asserts that men can have a correct and perfect idea of the scriptures. Then what imperfection is there in the use of the scriptures that requires a creed. If men have a perfect idea of the scriptures, then why not use that perfect rule of which they have a perfect idea? The gentleman can not dodge the dilemma. His argument for the necessity of a creed destroys the possibility and propriety of one, or his argument for the possibility and propriety of a creed destroys the argument in favor of the necessity of a creed.

But the gentleman's assumption that imperfect man can have a perfect knowledge of revelation is absurd. Can the finite comprehend the infinite? Can an imperfect cause produce a perfect result? All of man's creeds must be imperfect, and the gentleman is guilty of the fallacy of attempting to remedy man's errors in using a perfect rule by substituting for it an imperfect rule. He has two sources of error instead of one.

The gentleman tells us we have the most proscriptive and intolerant creed in the world, and then that the door to our church is so wide that any body can enter. Now which of these flatly contradictory statements are we to believe? We all speak the same things and agree on matters of faith; that is the foundation for his charge that we have a proscriptive creed. We ask just what the Bible demands of applicants for membership. We dare ask neither more nor less. I challenge the gentleman to mention one scriptural requirement that we neglect. His charges against us are really the highest compliments he could give us, and as fatal admissions as he could make.

He says we have these articles in our creed. Immersion is baptism. Penitent believers alone should be baptized, and baptism is to such for the remission of sins. We read in our creed, the New Testament, that baptism is a burial in water, or an immersion. The dis-

ciples were commanded to immerse penitent believers alone, and they commanded such to be baptized for the remission of sins. We have those articles in our creed, the New Testament, as he says.

The gentleman quibbles around the fatal historical fact that the apostolic churches had no creed. I now repeat what all ecclesiastic history affirms, that neither in the days of the apostles, nor for one hundred years after their day, did any church have any creed except the apostolic writings of the New Testament. This was their only standard. By it they received members-; by it they disciplined them; by it they rejected the unworthy. If such was the course of the inspired apostles, and of their immediate followers, when the church Was purest and most successful, do we need creeds? Have not creeds caused the very evils the gentleman deprecates?

He denies that the Church of England regarded Wesley as a heretic. Wesley had to take to the fields and was regarded by the church as a dissenter. He and his followers were known as Methodists and Wesleyans. Are they the same as Episcopalians? Wesley was not an Episcopalian in belief or practice, nor were his followers.

Because I speak of conversions in creed-bound churches. I do not thereby sanction creeds. God visited the Jews and brought them up out of Babylon, under Nehemiah and Ezra, although they were corrupted by idolatry. But he required them to purge themselves. So we would have creed-bound churches cease to speak the language of Ashdod in using creeds, and return to the pure speech of Canaan by using the Bible.

The gentleman has styled me a heretic and himself orthodox several times. Now, concerning the courtesy and good taste of such personal comparisons, I leave you to judge. He wants his creed to draw the line between us. Why not let the Bible do that? If he uses any thing else, then he leaves me and the Bible on one side, and places himself on the other. I am content to have his creed draw the line. The Bible will not condemn me; he has to construct a creed to do it.

We now take up our review. You remember that we objected to the use of creeds as standards in church fellowship and discipline. Every man has a creed; and we neither object to this nor do we examine his creed to decide its correctness. We only object to his making a test of church fellowship and of Christian conduct. We would use the scriptures alone for that purpose. We both agree that the scriptures are our only, perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. I contend that they are in the sense of being our only creed, our only bond of union and guide in discipline. They are our only rule in such a sense as leave no necessity for a creed, and to preclude the use of a creed. They forbid the use of a creed.

My opponent claims that since men differ in interpreting the Bible, those who agree on what he calls cardinal points should unite on a creed embodying these points, and use it as a means of excluding heretical interpretations of the Bible, and correcting heresies in conduct. Here is the issue between us.

1. My first argument against creeds was that man had neither power, ability, nor authority to make one, such as his wants required.

We showed: 1. That man was a worshiper and his religion determines his moral character. 2. He will become like the being he worships. 3. He can not devise a pure object of worship. 4. A knowledge of the truth does not make him necessarily better. The truth must be obeyed as well as believed. To produce this result it must have the weight and authority of religious sanctions. 5. Then God must reveal himself as a pure object of worship, and give man a pure code of laws, prescribing his duty to his God, his fellow-man, and himself, embodied in a system of religion. 6. To prevent changes and corruption of this system, it must come from God perfect, complete in doctrine, laws and ordinances, and man must not tamper with or change it. 7. A personal exponent of this religion must be given as a leader, that man's personal devotion to such a leader may enlist his entire nature in devotion to the religion.

Then man lacked the power, ability and authority to devise such a religion. If he could not devise it, he can not tamper with it when given. He can not make compends or synopses of such a religion. Man has neither power, ability, nor authority to make a creed.

2. All man's attempts to devise a pure system of religion must be corrupt and imperfect, for he is corrupt and imperfect. No one will deny this. Then all his attempts to make compends or statements of a perfect revelation of such a religion must be imperfect and corrupt. Hence creeds are imperfect and corrupt.

3. The gentleman's argument in favor of creeds is a most transparent fallacy. It is admitted that men will err in interpreting the Bible, but creeds are no remedy for such errors. Perfection in the rule, the scriptures, will not insure perfection in its application, unless man who uses the rule be perfect. But a creed is no remedy for these errors, for, as we have shown, such creeds must be imperfect and fallible, and the attempt to obviate errors in the use of an infallible rule, by substituting an imperfect fallible rule, is most absurd, for we have now two aggravated sources of error, an imperfect rule and man's imperfect use of it. From this the gentleman could not extricate himself. His argument that man erred in using the perfect rule, proved that his creed would be imperfect, hence he substituted an imperfect rule for a perfect one to correct errors in using the perfect rule. To evade this he claimed that man could have a perfect knowledge of revelation, and could make a perfect statement of it. Then what error is left for the creed to correct?

Perhaps he means that he can make a perfect statement, but others will err and he must write out his perfect creed to exclude all who err. The modesty of such a claim is obvious. But all creeds must be imperfect and fallible, for an imperfect cause can not produce a perfect effect. If man could not devise a perfect religion he can not make a perfect synopsis of it.

4. The Holy Scriptures were given for all the purposes of a creed and are perfect for such purposes. The Holy Spirit declares: 1. They make us wise unto salvation. 2. They are perfect in doctrine. 3. They are perfect for correction of error. 4. Perfect for reproof of conduct. 5. Perfect for instruction in righteousness. 6. He sums it all up in saying that by them the man of God is made perfect and

thoroughly furnished unto all good works. They were given for all the purposes of a creed and discipline, and are perfect purposes. Then the use of a human creed is unscriptural.

5. The scriptures are inspired in: 1. The matter revealed. 2. In the manner of revealing it. 3. In the arrangement of the matter revealed. All this is necessary to their perfection. If creeds contain the same matter, arranged in the same way, they are identical with the scriptures and needless. If they interfere with either matter, or arrangement, they presumptuously interfere with revelation and are unscriptural.

6. Creeds lack authority and proper sanctions. They are uninspired and can only use temporal sanctions. They can not speak as never man spoke. They lack the authority and sanction necessary to secure obedience.

7. They are uninspired and unauthorized. As much inspiration is needed to make a creed as the Bible on which it is pretended to be based. To make them inspired and authoritative and scriptural there must be: 1. A divine command to make them. 2. An inspired person to do the work. 3. This person must be selected and inspired for this very work. 4. A time must be fixed in which it shall be given and completed. 5. A divine command must be given to obey them. Creeds lack all these, hence they are unauthorized and unsanctioned by scriptures.

8. Creeds pronounce the scriptures a failure. God declares that his word is perfect as a bond of union and communion, and as a guide in discipline. Creeds declare it is a failure, for they have to be used to complete and supplement the work.

9. They impugn God's wisdom or benevolence. Man needs a rule of faith and practice. God says he has given it in the scriptures. Creeds assume that he has not given it, for they have to supplement his work. Then God is not so wise as man, and man has to do what God could not do, or he is not so merciful as man, and man has to do what God would not.

10. They impeach his veracity. God says his word is perfect for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and by it the man of God is made perfect and thoroughly furnished to all good works, or that his word is perfect as a bond of union and communion, and as a guide in discipline. Creeds say it is not. They have to supplement and complete the work—the man of God is not perfect and thoroughly furnished without them. They give the lie direct to Jehovah.

11. Creeds are not needed to shut out heresy or expose error. Nothing is heresy or error in religious matters except what is opposed to the scriptures. If the doctrine or conduct is opposed to the scriptures, will not the scriptures themselves show such opposition? If the scriptures do not show such opposition, then none exists, or they are imperfect, for the very purpose for which they were designed? We need no creed to do the work which God has already done.

12. Creeds are a violation of apostolic precept and example. We read in your hearing a score or more of plain commands to hold fast the word of the apostles in the very form in which they gave them.

Creeds then are forbidden. The apostles never used them; hence they are a violation of apostolic precept and example.

13. We object to creeds that they virtually take the scriptures out of men's hands, and substitute human thought and authority. Instead of studying the Bible, men study the creed. Instead of testing men by the Bible, it is done by the creed. Instead of trying men by the Bible, it is done by the creed. They virtually lay the Bible on the shelf, just as the historian lays away the newspaper from which he gleaned his facts, and men read and use the creed, just as we read and use the history instead of the newspaper.

14. They check freedom of thought and investigation and dwarf the mind. They have the same effect on the Protestant world that Papacy has on the Roman Catholic world. Men dare not think beyond the creed, or they will be heterodox. They must find in the Bible just what the creed says. The channel is worked out in which they must run. They are as tyrannical as ever Papacy has been.

15. Creeds prevent the discovery of scriptural truth. Each church declares its creed to be perfect and complete. Men must not find any more in the Bible than just what they say. If they do, they are heterodox. The creed was made for the very purpose of declaring them to be such.

16. They create and foster party spirit and set Christians to fighting each other. One says, "I am for Paul and his creed," another says, "I am for Apollos and his creed," hence arise parties, quarrels and divisions. They have led to debates, quarrels and persecutions. We need not argue this.

17. Creeds draw the hearts of men from Christ and the Bible and fix them on party names and dogmas. As we have said Christ is the central character of the Bible, and his Messiahship the central truth. Creeds remove this and substitute some subordinate dogma. They as effectually destroy Christianity as to tear out the heart and place the hand in its place would destroy human life.

18. Creeds lead to garbling, distortion and perversion of the word of God. We have had notable instances of this through this discussion. Men do not read the scriptures to hear what they say, but to find proof texts to sustain their creeds. These are taken out of all connection, and often garbled shamefully to suit that use. What but a creed would lead men to so garble God's word and read, "He that believeth shall be saved," "Repent for the remission of sins," etc. The defender of creeds does not take the Bible as the word of life, but as material to be molded into bullets to shoot his enemies.

19. They are the great source of infidelity. Men embody their dogmas into creeds and preach them for and instead of the Bible. Men reject these dogmas and suppose they are rejecting the Bible. Nothing but Calvinistic creeds has driven Germany and New England into infidelity.

20. They take the cross of Christ and the gospel out of men's mouths, and set them to preaching and defending the dogmas of creeds. There is no more resemblance between a modern sermon and one of the sermons in the New Testament, than between the healthy pulp of the grape and the fiery poison men extract from it. Men no

longer preach Christ and him crucified, the facts, commands and promises of the gospel; but theories and dogmas of creeds.

21. Creeds divide the followers of Christ and set them to fighting each other. Instead of one undivided army, with one great Captain, warring on the common enemy, we have four hundred little parties fighting each other, under the banner of as many creeds, while the world lies in darkness, wickedness and infidelity. Language can not measure the inexpressible wickedness of the division caused by these creeds.

22. They contain heresy and more than the Bible. If they contained only what was in the Bible, men would never make them, for they would be as superfluous as the fifth wheel to a coach. They are made to contain more, and because they contain more. One heresy begets another, and these opposing heresies make creeds, because the Bible contains neither. They are always heretical. The motive that leads to making them demands that they should be.

23. They weaken the advocates of Christianity by compelling them to defend human creeds instead of the Bible, and in addition to the Bible. The infidel takes the creed and exposes its errors. The Christian has to defend the error and his creed, or abandon his creed as unscriptural. In all debates, the scriptures have been covered and pierced through the errors of the creeds. Nine-tenths of infidel objections are not to the Bible, but lie only against dogmas creeds have foisted on to the Bible.

24. Creeds are a failure as an exponent of the views of the people who make them. There is not a creed in existence that sets forth the real views of its adherents. The "Confession of Faith" certainly can not declare the views of both Old and New School Presbyterian churches, since they differ so widely in doctrine and church polity. No Presbyterian believes that church officers have the power to remit and retain sins, yet so his confession declares. Certainly the "Articles of Faith" do not set forth the views of parties diametrically opposite, as the High and Low Church parties. The prayer in the Methodist Discipline before baptism of adults teaches that the baptized have their sins washed away in baptism. No Methodist now believes it. The Discipline does not set forth my opponent's views in this matter at all. The Philadelphia Declaration of the Baptists teaches that faith and repentance are the conditions of baptism. It requires no others. In practice they require the narration of an experience. Their declaration knows nothing of such a practice. It is not an exponent of their views. Hence not a creed in existence is a fair exponent of the real views of its adherents.

25. Creeds lead to heresy, schism and error, and foster and create the evil they were designed to correct. Some person thinks another is preaching an error. He runs to the opposite extreme of error in opposing it. The Bible satisfies neither, for it teaches the views of neither. Both make a creed. Then men differ concerning these; then a new creed again. Thus heresy makes creeds and creeds make more heresy. Men began with the Apostles' Creed, so-called, and ended in the abominations of the Romish Church. One little creed led to hundreds of ponderous dimensions.

26. They fail to secure the very object for which they are made. Men differ more concerning the creed than concerning the scriptures, and we have a new creed as an explanation of the explanation of the Bible, and so on *ad infinitum et ad nauseam*. Like a bad habit, each error and departure introduces a thousand more. The history of Christendom proclaims them a failure.

27. They destroy spirituality and zeal for Christ. Men forget they are of Christ, and his word and law, and substitute partisan zeal and bigotry, for spiritual zeal, life and zeal and love for Christ. The sectarian would rather see men damned than saved by any other church than his.

28. They are the source of bigotry, intolerance, persecution and self-righteousness. How much of bigotry, intolerance, persecution and Phariseeism is expressed by the words orthodox and evangelical! The creed makes men assume these titles and creates these odious vices. Paul found them and condemned them at Corinth, and the party names which led to them.

29. They have rejected as heterodox the great and good of all ages. Our Saviour himself was heterodox by the creeds of the Pharisees by which they made void the law of God. Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Milton, Newton, Locke, Campbell, and the great of all time have been rejected and denounced by the narrow-minded partisans of creeds, because they would not have their giant souls hewed down to the narrow dimensions of these Procrustean creeds.

30. We object to them because they fail to detect error, and on the contrary create it. God's word is perfect for correction of error, but my friend must have an imperfect standard, one that will produce more error. Perhaps he believes like will cure like.

31. We object to them because they were utterly unknown in the days of the apostles and the pure days of the church. Nothing but the scriptures were known or used then. Then they are needless and opposed to apostolic example.

32. We object to them that the use of the words orthodox and evangelical shows that they are needless. When pressed with the divisions creeds have made, my opponent exclaims: "Well these divisions don't amount to any thing. All evangelical or orthodox denominations are united on what is fundamental." A more fatal concession could not be made. Why not then, says common-sense, unite on what is orthodox, evangelical and fundamental, and let what is not essential to orthodoxy or being evangelical go, or why not unite on the Bible which contains what is fundamental?

33. Our next argument is that when men are aroused by real Christian zeal, they love to lay aside their creeds, and do and unite revivals and great religious movements. When souls are converted, then the devil in the shape of creeds comes in to produce quarrels and destroy what has been done. There are hundreds of cases of this.

34. We object to them that they create a jargon of names, a sectarian phraseology, unknown to the Bible. Instead of the pure speech of the Bible, the creeds give us a Babel of Ashdodic terms, as sectarian Shibboleths.

35. They have added to, and corrupted the ordinances of the

church. Nearly every innovation has had its origin in a creed, or has been stereotyped on to a party by a creed. They have corrupted the ancient simplicity of the gospel.

36. They drive men to unite outside of the church in leagues and societies to accomplish what the church should do, and thus substitute these illegitimate organizations for the church. Throw away creeds and men would, by and through the church in which they were all united, seek to accomplish these things as God ordained.

37. All good men are now striving to throw away creeds, showing that they know they are wrong and a curse to the church. How fervently all such men rejoice in the Sabbath School Social Meeting, where all can see eye to eye without these partition walls that are built by creeds around their churches. Why should they exist?

38. Men unite on fundamental principles in parties, societies, and lodges, though they differ in opinion on matters aside from these, or subordinate to them. Can not the Christian world act as wisely? Can not they unite on what is faith, what is fundamental, or what is evangelical, and let opinions be private property? When men have taken the word alone they have always reached a unanimity that has brought them fraternally together. The gathering of men of all views into our churches, and the uniformity the gentleman speaks of, proves this.

39. Creeds have made a farce of our Saviour's prayer. He prayed that all his followers might be one, that the world might believe the gospel they preached. Creeds have divided them, and the world has plunged into infidelity in consequence. Do creed-makers believe that our Saviour believed or meant what he said? If so, is not their work in dividing his followers grossly anti-christian?

40. Lastly, we object that these creeds set up a false standard of union for Christians. The scriptures declare they are the only perfect creed. They present Jesus as the great central character, the Alpha and Omega of revelation. They declare his Messiahship to be the central truth, the soul, the heart of Christianity and the gospel. They set up the Messiahship of Jesus as the common rallying point, and Jesus as our leader, exemplar, mediator, redeemer, elder brother, prophet, priest, and king. They present faith in a divine person as the bond of union and communion. Creeds present dogmas and sectarian names as rallying points for sects, and for the division of Christians.

Christ declared that this great truth of his Messiahship should be the rock on which he should build his church. The apostles preached it; men were converted to it; on it they were united into one body, one temple of the Holy Spirit, one house of the living God. The great facts which attested the Messiahship of Jesus were the gospel in fact, the three commands he, as the Messiah, gave, were the gospel law, that went from Zion; the three great promises were to the soul, as an anchor both sure and steadfast, reaching to that within the veil whither Jesus, our forerunner, has gone.

When the gospel was thus preached, thus delivered, thus obeyed, thus lived, it met and vanquished paganism, pagan philosophy, infidel philosophy, and triumphed over persecution, superstition, and every



opposing obstacle. Then there was no creed but the oracles of living truth. There was one God and Father, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope. But evil days came. Men differed on untaught questions. These differences were placed in creeds. Creeds begot parties, parties produced more creeds, and begot persecution and quarreling. Bigotry, party strifes, and innovations, and creeds, at last nearly quenched the pure light of the gospel. Men's minds were called away from the great central truth of the gospel to follow the *ignes fatui* of human creeds.

When Luther began the Reformation, unfortunately, he did not make it a restoration. He did not go back to the old standpoint, the Bible alone, as the creed of the world. He emancipated men from the thralldom of the Papal hierarchy to let them fall under the tyranny of human creeds. But a new awakening is now stirring the pool of the religious world. Men are growing restive under these ecclesiastical fetters and long to throw them off.

Infidelity has assailed in past ages the dogmas of the Christian Church. It has assailed miracles and prophecy, but has been astounded to see the religion of Jesus flourish and prosper. It has at last discovered that it has been assailing only the extremities of Christianity, while the heart remained unharmed, as long as men rallied around Jesus as the Messiah. So long as devotion to him as the Son of God actuated men, they cared little about genealogies and chronologies. They now admit the reality of the life of Jesus. They pay the most glowing and beautiful tributes to the excellence of his humanity. They insidiously creep into the human heart and steal away the confidence of the world in his divinity. They endeavor to remove this great central truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. They endeavor to remove the heart which sends the warm, vivifying blood pulsating through the great Christian world.

What are our creed-makers doing? Helping them in this work by themselves dethroning this regal truth, and tearing out the heart, and substituting, in the dead system left, in its place some human dogma. What church to-day makes the Messiahship of Jesus its central truth, his name their name, his law their only guide? Who is prepared to meet the infidel in his new assault on the citadel of our faith? Who will shield the heart of our religion from this thrust? Only the church that is built on this one rock, the Messiahship of Jesus.

Then let me exhort you to restore to its place in the beautiful system of our faith this great truth. Exalt Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of the living God, to his place as our prophet, priest and king; wear his name; take his law as your only rule of faith and practice; preach his gospel, the power of God unto salvation, in the three great facts, his death, burial and resurrection for humanity; its three great commands, faith, repentance and baptism; its three great promises, remission, the comforter and eternal life. Then take his word as your bond of union and communion and guide of life, and unite, wearing the one name of our Redeemer, for the redemption of sin-cursed humanity, and we shall see the truth triumph over all.—[*Time expired.*]

## ME. HUGHEY'S CLOSING REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—In arising to close the discussion on this proposition, I wish you distinctly to bear in mind that all that my friend has said in regard to the Bible being our only and all-sufficient rule of Christian faith and practice, I heartily indorse; there is in this respect no difference between him and myself whatever. He is beating the air while arguing to prove the all-sufficiency of the scriptures. I stand here myself pledged to maintain the Bible as the only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice; and I have not one single remark to make in reply to anything he has said upon this point. I say this in reply to the exhortation with which the gentleman concluded his speech. I cordially and heartily indorse every word that he has to say in regard to the Bible being the only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice.

There were some points in the gentleman's second speech this morning that I did not have time to reply to, that I will now take up, before proceeding with the review of his last speech.

His ninth objection to creeds is, they prevent the discovery of truth. How this can be the case, when the Bible is received as the only rule of faith, I can not imagine. It can not be the case unless the creed is set up above the Bible; and this we have seen no truly Protestant Church ever did. Our creeds all point to the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice; and while this is the case they can not possibly be in the way of the discovery of truth.

His tenth objection to creeds is, he tells us, they create a party spirit. He says we have thrown away the Bible and Christ, and have become partisans, and have brought into the church of Christ contentions and schisms. While he was speaking on this point I thought he was giving us the most vivid description of his own church I had ever heard. Take up their periodicals, if you wish to have a full, practical exhibition of his anecdote about the pigmies and cranes, and you will find it. They are continually "pitching in" to one another. Mr. Braden, perhaps, against Dr. Lucas, and Dr. Lucas against Mr. Braden. They are continually debating with one another, as well as with all the world beside. Every man among them "hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation." They are all like Elihu of old, crying, "Hearken to me, I also will show mine opinion." If his anecdote did not fit his own "church there was no point to it at all, for if they can not get anybody else to fight, they go to fighting one another. Such an organization has never been seen before since the world began.

Creeds, however, do not create a party spirit, as we find from the fact that the gentleman has admitted that Christians of different creeds are uniting all over the land in great Christian enterprises. But he tells us they are doing this in spite of the creeds. There is nothing in our creeds to prevent Christian union. We can have that union as well with our creeds as without them. There is more of the spirit of Christian union among the various evangelical churches who have

their respective creeds, than there is in his church without a creed to-day.

We are told that when there was no creed everything went on harmoniously. There never has been a time when the church had no creed but the Bible, except in the time of the apostles. The very next generation after the apostles, and the man who was for thirty years cotemporary with the Apostle John, presents us with a creed, and directs that Christians should have no fellowship with—yea, that they should "stop their ears against," all those who taught differently from the doctrine contained in it; they were regarded as heretics, with whom Christians should have no intercourse. It is plainly proved by ecclesiastical history, that when there was no creed but the Bible in the church, there was a living authority, a living tribunal, to settle every question—that might arise. If that living authority was not present, it could be consulted, and its decision obtained, as we see frequently was the case during the apostolic age.

His eleventh objection to creeds is, that they draw men's hearts away from God, and lead them to fix them upon their party names. To illustrate this objection, he told us of a man in Cincinnati who said he could blaspheme God without reproof, but if he said anything against Congregationalists, Presbyterians, or Methodists, he would get a fight on his hands at once. If he should happen to speak against the Campbellites he would get a fight much quicker than he would from Congregationalists, Presbyterians, or Methodists. There is no church wholly free from zealots, who lose sight of the higher and more important principles, and are carried away simply by sounds and names; but the Campbellite Church seems to be made up wholly of that class. They are vastly more zealous for a name than for the reality represented by that name.

His twelfth objection to creeds is, that they give birth to infidelity. Unfortunately for this objection it is not borne out by the facts of history. It is a fact which the gentleman well knows, that infidelity has never been able to make any progress in those countries where evangelical Protestantism has been firmly established. There is no country in the world where infidelity is less prevalent among the native population than the United States, and none where there are more creeds to be found. The form which infidelity assumed in Germany was that of rational Christianity, which denies spiritual operation and influence. There is wonderful similarity in many respects between German rationalism and that corrupted form of Christianity in the United States known as Campbellism! Open infidelity has flourished and triumphed only in Catholic countries; evangelical Protestantism does not foster nor give birth to infidelity.

The gentleman tells us that if I get into a discussion with a Universalist or an infidel, I must throw away my creed and take the Bible. This is a very great mistake. There is no conflict between the Bible and my creed. I am under no necessity to abandon my creed in a discussion with any one, nor will I do it. I wish it distinctly understood that there is nothing in my creed that I have to repudiate in a discussion with anybody. I thank God that I have a creed that I can maintain every article of, when meeting every form of

error, and I will never adopt any other kind of a creed. My creed does not weaken my argument in advocating the cause of truth, and this objection falls to the ground also.

I come now to review briefly the gentleman's last speech. He asks if an imperfect cause can produce a perfect effect? I answer no. But he tells us the human mind is imperfect, and therefore it can not produce a perfect creed. This would be true if the human mind should attempt to originate a perfect creed without the light and aid of revelation. The Bible is a perfect revelation, and I ask if the human mind can not understand it fully in regard to all things necessary to salvation? If the human mind can perfectly understand the Bible in all essential points, can it not give a perfect synopsis of that which it perfectly understands? Whatever the mind can perfectly understand it can perfectly express. To say that the mind can not perfectly comprehend the Bible in all things essential to salvation, is to deny that the Bible is a perfect revelation; and to say that the mind can perfectly comprehend the Bible in all things essential to salvation, and still not be able to give a perfect synopsis of that which it perfectly comprehends, is an absurdity of the grossest character. The human mind, to be sure, is imperfect; and unless it had a perfect rule to guide it it could never reach a perfect faith; but it has that perfect rule in the Holy Scriptures, and therefore it can arrive at a perfect faith, and can consequently produce a perfect creed in all things necessary to the essential articles of the Christian faith.

But the gentleman told us that I said that his creed was the most restricted of all creeds, and yet that it opened the widest door into his church of any creed. This he says is a contradiction. It seems paradoxical, and yet it is true, notwithstanding the seeming paradox. It is so restricted that no Pedobaptist, it matters not how pious he may be, can ever gain admission into his church. This excludes the greater part of the most conscientious and devoted followers of Christ in the world. But while it excludes these, it admits open Universalists, and heretics of almost every description. I am not going to stop here to argue the mode, design, and subjects of baptism again. We fully disposed of these questions some days ago, and I am perfectly willing that the argument should go to the world just as it was delivered, as I am perfectly satisfied with my arguments on these points.

He tells us of a certain person who said her Bible was a Campbellite Bible. Well, I knew a man once who thought he had a Methodist Bible, and he was very much troubled about it; and I suppose these two persons would match very well together. [Laughter.]

My opponent again asserts that there was no test applied in the reception of members into the apostolic church but the scriptures. Certainly there was not, for, as I said before, there was a living tribunal in the church during the lives of the apostles, who could decide every question that might arise, and that decision, when made, as we have seen, formed a part of the scriptures. But the creed of the apostolic church was enlarged from time to time to meet the false teaching of the heretics, and the principle was laid down by the apostles which developed creeds in the hands of their immediate successors, as I have proven. The whole doctrine of the apostles is con-

tained in the scriptures, and it is impossible that we should have a creed from them separate from the scriptures.

The gentleman next came to speak of our revivals again. In his former speech he did recognize these as real seasons of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, in which many were really and soundly converted to God. But here he contradicted all he has before taught; for he told us there was no spiritual life before baptism; and he represented our revival meetings as anything but religious exercises. Here he did flatly contradict himself and repudiate his whole doctrine; for if our revival meetings are real works of grace, and souls are really converted to God, as he admitted they were, then persons may receive the Holy Spirit, and consequently have spiritual life before baptism! Now he contradicts himself again, and tells us all our converts need is a Peter to tell them what to do, that is, to be baptized! No, sir; these converts, like Cornelius, receive the Holy Ghost without baptism—these revivals prove themselves to be real works of grace, and Mr. Braden, by admitting it, has completely overturned his whole system and neutralized his entire argument.

My opponent still contends that Mr. Wesley was cast out of the Church of England. I am sorry that he is not better posted in the current history of the church. Mr. Wesley lived and died in full communion with the Church of England.

*Mr. Braden*—Was not Mr. Wesley virtually excluded from the communion of the Church of England, and did he not reject her creed?

*Mr. Hughey*—No, sir. Mr. Wesley was never virtually excluded from the Church of England, nor did he reject her creed. The bishops closed their churches against him because he would not settle down in some particular parish, and because he would go everywhere and preach in the fields, and do everything he could for the salvation of souls. But Mr. Wesley and Mr. Whitfield both lived and died in full communion with the Church of England. There were several presbyters of the Church of England engaged with him in his work, and assisted in laying the foundations of Methodism, but they all remained in the establishment until after Mr. Wesley's death. He saw, toward the close of his life, that a separation of his societies from the establishment was inevitable after his death, and he made preparations for that event: but it did not take place during his lifetime. Mr. Wesley, like Dr. Tyng, was a Low Churchman, and he would not submit to the restraints the High Church party wished to put upon him; but he never separated from the church.

I will now spend the remaining few minutes I have, in a brief review of the argument on this proposition. The proposition before us is:

"Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion among Christians, or as guides in the administration of discipline, are unscriptural and anti-christian."

The position which my opponent has taken, and persistently argued from the beginning of the discussion, is, that the Bible is the only rule, and all-sufficient rule, of faith and practice; which I as heartily and fully indorse as he does. There is no difference between us here at all, and consequently there has been no force whatever in his argu-

ments directed to this point, for it is not the point in controversy. Every argument that the gentleman has advanced on this proposition has been based upon the assumption that we deny the all-sufficiency of the scriptures as the rule of faith and practice. I submit to every intelligent man and woman present if this is not the case? Mr. Braden is not so ignorant that he does not know that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is our rule of faith and practice. Every argument he has advanced, or can advance, to prove the all-sufficiency of the scriptures as the rule of faith, I most heartily indorse; and to all his arguments to prove the all-sufficiency of the scriptures, I shall attempt no reply; because they are brought forward to prove a position held by all evangelical Protestants, and is only objected to by Catholics and High Churchmen. If my opponent objects to creeds as used by evangelical Protestants, let him meet the question on its merits, and not spend his time in beating the air, or knocking down a man of straw of his own erecting. He does not like to be misrepresented, and I have tried not to misrepresent him, or the position of his church during this discussion. But he has persistently misrepresented us on the creed question, and has utterly refused to meet the issue between us. There is no issue between us on the question of the all-sufficiency of the scriptures, and consequently there is no room here for discussion.

I stated our position on the creed question fully and fairly at the outset, and showed that we do not have creeds for the purpose of setting aside the authority of the word of God, nor for the purpose of teaching dogma. I showed also that we do not have a Discipline for the purpose of furnishing a set of rules for the administration of discipline contrary to the word of God. The Bible furnishes us with all things necessary to faith and practice. The New Testament lays down the steps necessary to be taken in the administration of discipline. Why, then, it is asked, do we have a creed at all? I showed creeds are necessary in order that we may have some agreement among us as to what the Bible does teach, and that the world may be able to draw the line of distinction between the true church of Christ and those who teach heresy. There is and ever has been, since the days of the apostles, false teachers, who corrupt the gospel by their heretical teaching, and yet claim that their doctrine, and theirs only, is to be found in the Bible. This makes it absolutely necessary, in order that the true church may be distinguished from heretics, to set forth to the world that system of doctrine which we understand the Bible to teach, and this is a creed. This is the ground upon which we predicate the defense of creeds. Hence, instead of the creed setting aside the Bible, the Bible becomes the foundation of the creed.

I showed, in the first place, that it is impossible for a man not to have a creed—that every man has a creed, either written or unwritten. This my opponent admitted, and said he did not object to having creeds, but his objection was to the use of them as bonds of union and communion among Christians, and as guides in the administration of discipline. I then showed, in the second place, that there can be no union or communion among Christians without a creed—without some agreement or understanding as to what the Bible teaches; and

whether this agreement be written or unwritten, it is a creed to all intents and purposes. I showed also that it was impossible to proceed one stop iii the administration of discipline without a creed. Suppose a man is charged with heresy, and brought to trial on that charge in the gentleman's church. He denies being a heretic, and claims the Bible alone as his creed, and affirms that the Bible teaches the doctrine which is denounced as heresy, what course must they pursue? Why, the question is stated before the congregation, and the arguments from the scriptures on both sides are fully presented, and then by a vote of the society the question is settled as to what the scriptures teach. The moment this decision is reached you have a creed. The decision itself is the creed of the church on that point, and judgment is rendered, discipline is administered, by the creed! Here we see a creed is an absolute necessity, and without it no discipline can ever be administered. This agreement, or decision, as to what the scriptures teach, may never be written, but it is a creed nevertheless, and it is made just as all creeds are made, and used just as all creeds are used.

The gentleman admits that he has a creed; but he tells us the difference between his creed and mine is, that mine is written and stereotyped, and I can not change it if I find it is wrong, while his is unwritten, and when he finds it is wrong he can change it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is a good thing, both for him and his creed, that it is unwritten; for it certainly needs to be changed a great deal in order to make it conform to the teachings of the Bible. I hope he will keep it unwritten, and continue to change it until he gets it to conform to the teachings of the Bible, and then I hope he will write it out and get it stereotyped, so it can not be changed any more. [Laughter.] My creed is already right, and does not need to be changed, and therefore it is best that it should be stereotyped to prevent its being changed after the example of my opponent's. [Continued laughter.]

In the next place, I showed you the successive steps by which the creed of the apostolic and post-apostolic church was developed. I showed that in the first place the apostolic creed embraced but one article—a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. This was all that was necessary for the first Jewish converts, for the great mass of the Jewish people were soundly orthodox on all the great fundamental principles of revealed religion, and to such, a belief of the Messiahship of Jesus, and faith in him, was all that was necessary. But when the gospel was preached among the Gentiles, and false teachers began to rise up in the church, it was necessary to enlarge the creed. The first enlargement of the creed of the apostolic church was made, as I showed you, at the Council of Jerusalem, recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, where the questions which had been agitated in the church, concerning the necessity of the Gentile Christians observing circumcision and the law of Moses, was settled.

The next enlargement of the creed was made necessary by the heresy of Simon Magus, who denied the proper divinity and real humanity of Jesus. Simon Magus taught that Christ was not divine, and that he was man only in appearance, as I proved to you by Schaff's

Ecclesiastical History. John's Gospel and first and second Epistles were written to refute this heresy, and in the latter part of the apostolic age we see that the creed of the church expressly and distinctly set forth the absolute divinity, and real humanity of Christ, in opposition to this heresy. After John had distinctly set forth the absolute divinity, and real humanity of Christ—his atoning work and intercession, he said:

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that bideth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 10, 11.

Here fellowship with those corrupters of the truth, who denied the divinity of Christ, was prohibited under pain of becoming partners in their sins and punishment. At the end of the apostolic age we find the church united, never again to be divided, on the question of the divinity and humanity of Christ, in opposition to the heresies of Simon Magus and Cerinthus. Those who denied these great and fundamental principles of Christianity, were not recognized as forming any part of the church of Christ, and Christians were prohibited by an inspired apostle from holding any communion with them.

We next find this creed of the apostolic church more fully developed and set forth in the form of a creed by Ignatius, an apostolic bishop, seven years after the death of the Apostle John. Ignatius was for thirty years bishop of Antioch during the life of the Apostle John. He was instructed by the apostles, and knew what the faith of the apostles was, and was also familiar with the rules which they adopted for the government of the church and the administration of discipline in the reception of members into the church and the expulsion of improper persons therefrom. While on his way from Antioch to Rome to receive the crown of martyrdom, he wrote seven epistles, and among them one to the church at Tralles, and in it you will find the creed which I have read. In this creed he sets forth the doctrines of the church in opposition to the heresies of Simon Magus and Cerinthus fully. He commands the church to have no fellowship with, nor even listen to those who entertained these heresies. Such was the creed of the church during the latter part of the apostolic age, and immediately after the death of John.

In the next generation after Ignatius we find the creed of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, who was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John, and appointed by him bishop of Smyrna. In this creed, which is found in Irenaeus' First Book Against Heresies, which I hold in my hand, he sets forth the faith of the universal church. His First Book Against Heresies, in which this creed is found, was written in the year A. D. 182. In this creed the faith of the whole church is set forth, in opposition to the perversions of the heretics.

After the times of Irenaeus we find the creed of the church given by nearly all the writers of note until the Council of Nice, and though they differ often in phraseology, they all agree in the substance of their teaching, until we see the church universal adopt the Nicene Creed, and the creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed, because it contains the doctrine of the apostles. This creed has been accepted



as a true symbol of the faith of the apostles by all evangelical Christians, from the time it was presented to the church until the present time.

When the man of sin was fully developed, and his reign was fully established in the church, then the authority of God's word was set aside. But the creed of the ancient church, as given by Ignatius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, etc., never set aside the authority of God's word, nor usurped its place. They were like the creeds of evangelical Protestant churches; they set forth what the church understood the scriptures to teach, in opposition to the teachings of the heretics. Instead of these creeds setting aside the authority of the Bible, they derive all their authority and support from the Bible, and every article they contain is based professedly on the teachings of the divine word. Such a creed as this every man and every church has, and they can not proceed a single step without it.

The question is narrowed down to this: Shall we have our creed written out, so that we and all the world may know what it is, or shall we have it in an unwritten form, that must be determined every time we wish to administer discipline? My opponent has a creed, but it is unwritten. I have a creed, and it is written. But we both have creeds, and we both use them in the same way, and for the same purposes. His creed is his understanding of what the scriptures teach, and my creed is what I understand the scriptures to teach. Our creed is the mature judgment of the whole church as to what the scriptures teach. His creed of his church is the judgment of every little society of a half dozen or more Campbellites, who are often totally ignorant of the principles of interpretation, and only slightly acquainted with the teachings of the Bible. Now, I ask, if it is not as likely that the whole body of learned and devout Christian ministers should arrive at a correct understanding of the doctrines of the Bible, as that a half dozen or more illiterate men should arrive at a perfect understanding of the doctrines of the Bible? This, and this only, is the difference between our creeds. Now, I ask, which is most likely to arrive at the truth? Again: in our church we have uniformity—we have but one creed for the whole church, while in his church there are as many creeds as there are congregations, almost as many as there are members, with the prospect of an infinite increase in the number of their creeds! We are perfectly satisfied with our creed, and see no necessity for a change. My opponent is not satisfied with his; he wishes to leave it an open question, so he can change, it when he sees he is wrong. This is wise in him, for most certainly it needs to be changed very much in order to make it conform to the Bible. Upon our creed—that called the Apostles'—all evangelical Christians can unite; and my opponent tells us they do unite in our Sunday-school work, and in our revivals. Yes, and upon this creed the primitive church was united for centuries, and upon it the church of Christ is now uniting in her evangelical work in many ways, and upon it she will unite and become one household of faith, when the sanctifying Spirit is poured out fully upon her from on high. Creeds, like every other good thing, may be, and often have been, prostituted to bad purposes;

but this does not prove that they are unscriptural and anti-christian. It is not our written creeds that prevent a proper and scriptural union among Christians, but it is the corruptions of the heart, the want of that perfect charity which is the full measure of Christian privilege.

I close this discussion with the kindest feelings toward my opponent and those who agree with him. If I have used strong or seemingly harsh language, it was not from any ill feeling toward him or them; but because I thought that fidelity to the truth required it. But once during the entire discussion have my feelings been roused against my opponent, and that was to-day when he accused me of open falsehood concerning the Christian System, but as the gentleman made the proper apology for this, I close the discussion with perfect good feeling toward him, hoping and praying that God may lead us all into the way of all truth, and finally bring us to everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

To the Moderators who have presided during the discussion with so much dignity and impartiality, and who have borne with us with so much patience, I return my hearty thanks, and shall ever carry with me a grateful recollection of them for their kindness and impartiality. And permit me, ladies and gentlemen, to return my thanks to you for your kind, respectful, and continued attention throughout this protracted discussion.—[*Time expired.*]

CLOSE OF THE DISCUSSION.

---

#### MR. BRADEN'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.

After Mr. Hughey had concluded his general remarks, at the close Mr. Braden arose, and said:

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—It is also due to all present that I too should express my appreciation of the kindness and consideration with which I have been treated by all. I would return to the audience my heartfelt thanks for the courteous and patient hearing they have accorded to me, and for the constant and faithful attendance of so large a number. It is not only flattering to myself and opponent, but a convincing proof of your intelligence, candor and love of the truth. May all attain to a knowledge of the truth, and the liberty of the sons of God.

To you, gentlemen moderators, I tender my thanks for the able, impartial and patient manner in which you have discharged your onerous and delicate duties. I owe to you a debt of gratitude for your kindness and patient forbearance. You have more than met my expectation in all things.

Permit me now to say that I entered into this discussion from a sense of duty. I felt it was due to the cause of truth that I should respond to the call of my brethren to defend it. I have been in earnest, because I believed what I said. The contest between myself and opponent has been an earnest, unsparing one. We have both of us

been raised in a stern school—self-education—and it has made us earnest, determined men—men who contend not for child's play.

I will now say of my opponent that he has my thanks for the square and manly way he has taken his positions, and defended them. He has taken the exact position I desired each time. He has also commanded my respect for his ability and thorough knowledge of his work. In all my debating and reading of debates, I have never found his equal. I believe he has done the best that could be done for his positions. His courteous treatment has happily disappointed me in regard to his course in debate. What we have said is before you. You are the jury. You have your Bibles. Compare all with that perfect standard: "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." I entertain toward my opponent none but friendly feelings, in evidence of which I now cordially tender him my hand.

Here Mr. Hughey cordially shook hands with Mr. Braden amid the enthusiastic applause of the audience.

Mr. J. T. Hough, Methodist preacher, stationed at Metropolis, then offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

*"Resolved,* That we tender to Messrs. Braden and Hughey our sincere thanks for the rare intellectual feast we have enjoyed in listening to their very able presentations of what they esteemed to be the truth of the scriptures, and that we earnestly wish them success in their future lines, in laboring for and sustaining the truth."

After the benediction by Elder Silas W. Leonard, of Centralia, the congregation was dismissed *sine die*.



# APPENDIX.



# APPENDIX.

---

## Appendix A.

NOTE, Page 299.—The printer misapprehended the reference to Wesley's works. The quotation is from an old edition, and is reproduced in the "Doctrinal Tracts," from which we quote, beginning at paragraph marked (1) near the foot of page 299.

---

## Appendix 33.

ME. BRADEN'S ARGUMENT.

*The passage from Clement of Alexandria.*

Our readers doubtless remember how persistently my opponent reiterated a passage quoted from Clement of Alexandria, and how triumphantly he flourished it as an instance where *baptizo* could not be translated dip. He did not attempt to claim that it sustained his position, or that it could mean pour or sprinkle; but seemed to be overjoyed that he could vociferate, "It can't mean immerse." Following Seiss and Beecher, he rendered the passage, "In like manner it was a custom of the Jews often to baptize themselves on their couches *by washing their hands at meals.*" We join the italicized words to the translation, because they, by their translation and explanation, made it a part of the sentence and context.

"Now," said Mr. Hughey, most triumphantly, "they could not immerse themselves on their couches at the table by washing their hands; hence *baptizo* can not mean immerse."

As we had not the original, and my opponent could give but two words of the original, and those spelled in Roman type, we could not expose the perversion or mistranslation, for we felt certain there was one or both in the rendering he gave. Since then we have, by Robert Clarke, of Cincinnati, obtained from Leipsic, Europe, a complete copy of the original of Clement of Alexandria, and we now fulfill our pledge made in the debate, to show that *baptizo* in this passage, as in every other, means immerse, and can mean that only. The Greek, with the context, is as follows:

§ 149. "Ὅσα δ' αὖ περι ὕπνον λέγουσι τὰ αὐτὰ χροῖ και περι θανάτου ἐξακοῦσιν. ἐλάτερος γάρ δηλοῖ τὴν ἀπόστασιν τῆς ψυχῆς ὁ μὲν μᾶλλον, ὁ θεὸς ἦττον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ και παρὰ Ἡρακλείτου λαβεῖν. (5.) ἀνθρώπος ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ φάος ἀπτεται ἑαυτῷ ἀποθανῶν ἀποσβεσθεῖς, ζῶν δὲ, ἀπτεται τεθνεώτος ἐνδῶν ἀποσβεσθεῖς ὄψεις, ἐγγρηγορῶς ἀπτεται εὐδοντος. μακάριοι γάρ οἱ εἶδοτες τὸν κύριον" κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον ὅτι ὥρα ὑμᾶς ἦδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι. (10.) νῦν γάρ "ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἢ νῦν προέκοψεν, ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν. ἀποδώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός." \*) ἡμέραν δὲ τὸν νῦν ἀλληγορεῖ και φῶς, τὰς τε αὖ παραγγελίας ὄπλα φωτός μεταφοραῶς. (15.) ταύτη τοῖ λελουμένους φασὶ δεῖν ἐπὶ τὰς ἱεροποιίας και τὰς εὐχὰς ἵεναι καθαρούς και λαμπρούς.

§ 144. Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν συμβόλου χάριν γίνεσθαι τὸ ἐξωθεν κεκοσμηθῆναι τε και ἡγνισθαι, ἀγνεία δὲ ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὅσια και δὴ και ἢ εἰκῶν τοῦ βυπτισματος εἶη ἂν και ἢ ἐκ Μωϋσέως παραδεδομένη τοῖς ποιηταῖς ὡδὲ πως.

ἢ δ' ὑδρηναμένη καθαρά χροῖ εἶματ' ἔχουσα† ἢ Πηνελόπη ἐπὶ τὴν εὐγύν ἐρχεται. Τηλέμαχος δὲ, χεῖρας νιφάμενος πολίτης ἄλλος ευχετ' Ἀθήνη † ἔθος τοῦτου Ἰουδαίων ὡς και τὸ πολλάκις ἐπὶ κοίτῃ βαπτίζεσθαι. εὐ γοῦν κάκεινο εἶρηται, ἴσθι μὴ λουτρῶ, ἀλλὰ νύμφ καθαρός. ἀγνεία γάρ οἶμαι τελεία ἢ τοῦ νοῦ και τῶν ἐργῶν και τῶν διανοημάτων, πρὸς δὲ και τῶν λόγων εὐλίχρινεια και τελευταῖα ἢ κατὰ τὰ ἐνυκνια ἀναμαρτησία. (30.) [P. 628, Pott.]

Of this we give the following translation, omitting the quotation from Heraclitus:

"But again, respecting sleep and respecting death, they?ay the same things are to be understood, for each sets forth the falling away of the soul, both the former and the latter, which indeed one can gather also from Heraclitus." . . .

"Blessed are those knowing the Lord," according to the apostle, "because the hour has already come that you be awaked out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent and the day is at hand. Let us therefore put off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light."

Now day allegorizes the Son, and so also does light; and, on the other hand, the armor of light is a metaphor for the commandments. Accordingly they say those having washed themselves and being shining (illustrious), ought to go forth to sacrifices and prayers. And this having been outwardly prepared and purified is to be for the purpose of a symbol; but purity consists in purposing religious things, and indeed also the image (symbol) of baptism might be even the one handed down in some way by Moses to the parts. "But having bathed herself and having clean garments on her body, Penelope goes to prayer," and "Telemachus, having washed his hands at the foaming sea, prays to Athenae" (Homer). In like manner this was a custom of the Jews, that they also often after sexual intercourse immersed themselves. That at least has been well said, spotlessness (purity)



comes not from the bath, but from the mind. For I think perfect purity is that of the mind, and of the actions, and of the thoughts, and there comes also from the words the pureness and the perfect innocence of dreams."

The reader will observe that I translate "*epi koitee*" the words Beecher, Seiss and Mr Hughey render "on their couches," by "after sexual intercourse." And as the Jews were commanded by Moses to bathe or immerse themselves after sexual intercourse, Lev. xv. 18, Clement here, in referring to that command, uses *baptizo* in the sense of immerse. My reasons for this rendering are as follows:

1. I will remove the additions and glosses my opponent has given to the passage 1. *Koitee* is singular instead of plural, as he makes it in his translation. If it mean couch, "*epi koitee*" must be rendered "on a couch." 2. The possessive pronoun their is neither expressed nor implied in the passage. 3. Their hands-washing and at the table are not in the original, nor is there the slightest reference to washing, or hands, or to meals, or tables. All this is foisted in to patch up their perversion of the original. With the meaning given to *koitee* by my opponent, the passage would read: "In like manner this was also a custom of the Jews, that they often baptized themselves on a couch."

2. The rendering of my opponent is ungrammatical and absurd. It is absurd to say a nation baptized themselves on a couch. It should be on their couches. My opponent knows this, hence he perverts the passage and so renders it.

3. The idea of my opponent, that this refers to washing the hands at meals, and that *koitee* means the couch used at meals, is a palpable contradiction of classic usage. *Koitee* means a bed or a sleeping couch in its primary use in classic usage. So also does *klinee*; but *klinee* is always used for the couch used at meals, while *koitee* is never in classic usage so used. When it means bed, it means the sleeping-bed or couch. The reader will see the distinction and its force. Both *koitee* and *klinee* mean bed or couch; but when the table-couch is designated, *klinee* is always used, and *koitee* is never to used. Hence the Greek Clement could not have meant by "*epi koitee*," "on the table-couch," as my opponent contends.

4. The Jews were not required to wash, or in any way purify their hands or themselves, at meals, or on the table-couch, or on any couch, (as is here said), by the law of Moses. Our Saviour and his biographers, the apostles, expressly declare that this was a tradition of the elders, and made void the law of Moses, and they disregarded it. The action here spoken of was required by the law of Moses and was the symbol or origin of certain heathen rites, according to Clement. So well-read a Christian as Clement would never have violated the teachings of our Saviour so grossly as to call a tradition of the elders a requirement of the law of Moses.

5. The Jews were required to bathe themselves after sexual intercourse by the law of Moses. Leviticus xv. 18:

"18. The woman also with whom a man shall lie with seed of copulation, they shall bathe themselves in water and be unclean until evening,"

Here we have the law of Moses, to which Clement refers. This washing or bathing was, as we have shown by Maimonides, Vatabalus, Grotius and several other learned men, invariably a complete immersion of the whole person. Hence Clement used *baptizo* as the word that pre-eminently expressed that action.

6. In the Septuagint Greek, which Clement, as a Greek, used, *koitee*" is the Greek word which is rendered into English by copulation or sexual intercourse in Leviticus xv. 17, 18. This conclusively shows that this was the purification required by the law of Moses, to which Clement refers.

7. *Koitee* is the word which specifically and pre-eminently means sexual intercourse in the Greek of the New Testament and the Septuagint version of the Old, the book that Clement always quoted from. It primarily means a bed or a sleeping couch, Luke xi. 7. It means marriage-bed.

Hebrews xiii. 4, "The marriage-bed (*koitee*) undefiled."

It means marital intercourse. Horn. ix. 10, "Rebecca conceived" (had *koitee*).

It means sexual intercourse in general. Rom. xiii. 13, "Chamberings" (*koitais*).

In Leviticus xv. 17, 18. the word rendered copulation or sexual intercourse is *koitee*.

Leviticus xviii. 20, "Thou shalt not lie carnally (give *koitee*, sexual intercourse) with thy neighbor's wife."

22. "Thou shalt not lie (lie with the sexual intercourse—*koitee*—of a woman) with a man."

23. "Thou shalt not lie (give sexual intercourse—*koitee*—to a . . .) with a beast."

Leviticus xix. 29, "Whosoever shall lie carnally with a maid" (lie with sexual intercourse—*koitee*).

Leviticus xx. 13, "If a man lie with a man as with a woman" (lie with sexual intercourse—*koitee*—of a woman).

15. "If a man lie with a beast" (give sexual intercourse—*koitastian*).

Numbers xxxi. 17, 18, "Every woman that has known a man—every maid that has known a man" (known the sexual intercourse—*koitee*—of a man).

35. "Women that had not known a man" (the sexual intercourse—*koitee*—of a man).

Judges xxi. 11, 12, "Known a man by lying with him" (known the sexual intercourse—*koitee*—of a man).

The passages show most conclusively that *koitee* is pre-eminently and specifically the word used in the Septuagint Greek (the text of the Old Testament which Clement used) to denote sexual intercourse. Hence when Clement used it, as he did, in a quotation or reference to the law of Moses, he used it in the only sense it is there used.

8. This word is the root of *koimao*, the verb which is always used in the Septuagint, where "to lie with" occurs in our English version. The Latin *coitus* and our English coition—sexual intercourse—come from it as the root. This we think sufficiently sustains our position concerning the meaning of *koitee*. It completely sets aside our oppo-

nent's objections to rendering *baptizo* immerse. It proves conclusively that it means immerse, for with that meaning of *koitee* the action was invariably a total immersion.

9. The references to sleep and dreams and the references to the purification required by the law of Moses, agree exactly with the meaning we give to *koitee*, but are utterly incongruous with the rendering given by our opponent.

10. Potter, from whom our opponent quotes the passage, comments on it as follows :

"**Epi koit**<sup>^</sup>—*Hoc est concubitum. Hervetus perperam vertit in lecto—Heysichius—Koítai—yunikwn epiquiniai—Rom. xiii. 13—nh koitaij pathdwmen*" (Translation.) **Epi koith**, That is after sexual intercourse." Hervetus improperly renders it on a couch Heysichius renders *koitai* "lusts for women." Romans xiii. 13, "Let us not walk in chamberings" (lewdness).

It is this erroneous rendering of Hervetus that Beecher copies and follows, though Hervetus had enough knowledge of Greek to express the action of *baptizo* by "*tingere*" to immerse. Hence my opponent's own editor of Clement pointedly condemns his rendering.

11. Finally, as conclusive of the whole matter, we will quote from Clement a passage that occurs a few pages before the one on which my opponent so much relies, and in which he uses *koitee* in such a way as to leave no doubt as to its meaning, and in precisely the same reference to the law of Moses that he does here. The former passage will settle the latter, especially since the reference is the same.

§. 82. Ἡ δὲ ἐπιφορὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου. καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθαι διὰ τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκεῖνο προυνακόπτει μὴ εἰς ἐπιθυμίας ἐτέρας ἐτραπῆναι ποτε, οὐ γὰρ ἀποκρούεται τέλος τὰς τῆς φύσεως ὀρέξεις δυσωπούσα ἢ πρόσκαιρος συμφωνία, δι' ἣν εἰσάγει πάλιν τὴν συζυγίαν τοῦ γάμου οὐκ εἰς ἀκρασίαν καὶ πορνείαν καὶ τὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ἔργον, ἀλλ' ὅπως μὴ ὑποπέσῃ ἀκρασία καὶ πορνεία καὶ διαβόλιω. χωρίζει δὲ καὶ τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν καινὸν ὁ Τιτιανός, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἡμεῖς φαιμέν, παλαιὸν μὲν ἄνδρα τὸν νόμον, καινὸν δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. συμφωνοῦμεν αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγοντες ἤλθῃ οὐχ ἥ βούλεται ἐκεῖνος καταλύων τὸν νόμον ὡτ' ἄλλου θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἀγῆρ καὶ κύριος παλαιὰ καινίζων οὐ πολυγαμίαν ἔτι συγχωρεῖ· τότε γὰρ ἀπήτει ὁ θεὸς, ὅτε αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνειν ἐχρήσῃ, μονογαμίαν δὲ εἰσάγει διὰ παιδοποιίαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ οἴκου κληρονομίαν εἰς ἣν βοήθως ἐδόθη ἡ γυνή, καὶ εἴ τιμι ὁ ἀπὸστολος δι' ἀκρασίαν καὶ πύρωσιν κατὰ συγγνώμην δευτέρου μεταδίδωσι γάμου, ἐπεὶ καὶ οὗτος οὐχ ἀμμιτάνει μὲν κατὰ θαυμάσιον, οὐ γὰρ κεκόλυται πρὸς τοῦ νόμου, οὐ πάλιν οὐδὲ τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείας τὴν κατ' ἐπίτασιν τελειότητα, διότι οὐδὲ αὐτῷ οὐράνιον περιποιεῖ μείνας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν διαλυθεῖσαν θανάτῳ συζυγίαν ὀχρῶντων φυλάσσωσιν καὶ τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ πειθόμενος εὐαρέστως καθ' ἣν ἀπερισπυστος τῆς τοῦ κυρίου γέρονε λειτουργείας. οὐδὲ μὲν τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ συζυγίαν κοίτης ὁμοίως ὡς πάλαι βλαπτέσθαι καὶ νῦν προστάσσει ἡ θεία διὰ κυρίου πρόνοια. οὐ γὰρ ἐπάναρχες παιδοποιίας ἀφ' ἑσθῆσι τοὺς πιστεύοντας

**δι' ἑνὸς βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸ παντελὲς τῆς ὁμιλίας ἀπολοῦσας ὁ κύριος, εἰ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ Μωϋσέως δι' ἑνὸς περιλαβῶν βαπτίσματος.**

We give the following as a very literal translation of the passage:

"Now the addition of the apostle and to assume again the same relation on account of Satan (1 Cor. vii. 5), precludes a turning aside at any time into other affections, for the temporary agreed to living apart does not suppress the yearnings of nature entirely, by means of which (yearnings) he returns again into the embraces of his wife, and not into incontinence and fornication and service of the devil; but rather in such a way that he will not fall a prey to incontinence and fornication and the devil. Now Tatinus indeed separates the old husband and the new, but not as we say, the old man—the law and the new man—the gospel. We agree with him, and we ourselves say not only to her whom the one destroying the law as of another God desires, but also the husband himself, that the Lord, renewing the old relation, does nevertheless not agree to polygamy; for then God abolished when he ought to have enlarged and completed, and introduces monogamy on account of raising children and the care of the house, for which the wife was given as a help. And if the apostle allows a second wife to any one on account of incontinence and burning desires, then indeed, by agreement, he does not sin; for he has not been forbidden by the law; and yet he does not fulfill the required perfection of his citizenship under the gospel. But having remained single, he procures thereby heavenly honor, also if he keeps the union severed by death undefiled, and yields himself cheerfully to the dispensation in which he is undistracted from the worship of the Lord.

"Neither indeed then would he, on account of (or after) sexual intercourse (*koitee*) with his wife, have in such a manner, as anciently, to be immersed (baptized) and as now the divine direction of the Lord enjoins. For the necessity of child-bearing does not drive into entire separation, the Lord having washed away the pollution of marital intercourse; if indeed by one immersion (baptism) he receives the many of Moses."

This passage settles the whole matter. It occurs a few pages before the one quoted and so much handled by my opponent. Clement is discussing Paul's directions in 1 Corinthians vii. concerning marital intercourse. He says, anciently by divine direction, they had to immerse themselves after sexual intercourse. This he calls the many immersions or baptisms of Moses, because it had to be done often, as he says in the passage quoted by my opponent. He says our one immersion answers instead of the many required by Moses. In the passage quoted by my opponent he refers to the same idea and uses *koitee* in the same sense as he did in the same connection of thought before. Then *baptizo* is used to express the action of bathing or an entire immersion in both cases, such as the law required.

12. With another notice of the oft-exploded fallacy of my opponent in insisting that because the purifications of the Jews and heathens are contrasted or compared, they must be the same inaction, we will dismiss this subject. He will, no doubt, claim that because Clement compares the Jewish purification with the heathen lustrations

of Penelope and Telemachus, they are the same in action. And because he compares the Jewish purification with the Christian rite of baptism, baptism must be the same in action also, as the heathen lustrations or washing. As well might we claim that because the inauguration of our President is compared with that of the British sovereign, and that with the inauguration of an Asiatic monarch, and we say that the inauguration of an ancient monarch was the type or origin of the inauguration of the British sovereign and the American president; therefore they are the same in action, and that all three are an anointing with oil. That swear and coronate mean anoint with oil. There is no comparison of action in either case, nor any thing which decides the action. That is decided by the words anoint, crown and swear into office.

Clement calls the bathing after sexual intercourse required by the Jewish or Mosaic law a baptism. We learn from the law and Jewish antiquities, writers and learned men, that it was an immersion of the person invariably. Hence he' used *baptizo* because it specifically and pre-eminently expressed that action—immersion. Thus do we turn the tables on our opponent, and show that his pet passage is one of the clearest proofs in Greek literature, that *baptizo* invariably means immerse.

## MR. HUGHEY'S REPLY.

*The passage from Clement of Alexandria quoted on page 16 of the Debate—Mr. Hughey's reply to Mr. Braden's argument.\**

The reader will remember that I defied my opponent, during the discussion of the mode of baptism, to show a single personal immersion required by the law of Moses, and that he utterly failed to show one such requirement, while I proved that the law did require "divers baptisms," but not a single immersion was enjoined by the law. Now he asserts that he has found one such requirement, and that Clement of Alexandria refers to this in the passage I quoted on page 16. I do not wonder that my opponent makes strenuous efforts to evade the force of this passage, for as long as it remains in our hands the controversy is at an end on the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and as I showed in collating this passage with Mark vii. 3, and Luke xi. 38, the Jewish baptisms before eating were a simple washing of hands, and thus the New Testament usage of the word fully settles the controversy. This my opponent has discovered, and hence his herculean efforts to set it aside, or take it from us. But, as we shall see, he has only weakened his cause by attempting the impossible.

1. In reply to his argument, I remark, I could admit that the passage in Clement refers to the washing after copulation, and still triumphantly sustain my argument by this passage. My opponent asserts that the law in Leviticus xv. 18, required immersion after such defilement; but where does he give us the proof of it, either from the

---

\* It is due to myself to state that I objected to this indelicate appendix going into the debate at all, knowing that Mr. Braden's position was untenable; but he would not consent, and I was forced to write a reply, much against my will.

I law itself or from any authority in Jewish antiquity, or anywhere else? He speaks of having shown it by Maimonides, Vatabalus, Grotius, and many other learned men; but where has he shown it? He has not given us a syllable from one of them on the subject, and his assumption depends for support upon his own naked assertion, without the shadow of proof or authority. On the other hand, I will prove by the law itself, and by the seventy-two Jewish elders who translated the Septuagint, that no immersion was required in purification from such defilement. Now every one knows that a law enjoining a specific act can not be conveyed by a generic term, but must be conveyed or enjoined by a specific term. The law in Leviticus xv. 18 does not employ a specific term in enjoining the purification after copulation, but a generic term, a word signifying to wash in a general sense, or in any manner, and without reference to mode, and consequently the law could not enjoin the specific action of immersion. The word here used is *rahatz*, which is thus defined by Gesenius: "to wash, to lave, etc., e. g., the human body or its parts. Metaph. To wash away the pollution of sin from man. Isaiah iv. 4. To wash the hands in innocency is to declare oneself innocent. Psalms xxvi. 6; lxxiii. 13. 2. To wash oneself, to bathe." Here it is employed to express the washing of the hands simply, and to denote purification in that way. Wash and bathe are both generic terms, and both may be done in many ways, consequently this law can not enjoin immersion.

Had immersion been enjoined by this law, *tubal*, the specific Hebrew word for immerse would have been used, and not *rahatz*, which does not have that signification. *Tubal* is thus defined by Gesenius: to dip, to dip in, to immerse, etc. The translators of the Septuagint, who were themselves Jewish elders, and understood the requirements of the law and the customs of their own nation, render this word by *louoo*, a perfectly generic term, and one which does not and can not express or enjoin any specific action. They translated this law, Leviticus, xv. 18: *kai lousoutai uđati* (kai lusontai hudati) "and they shall wash with water." The simple dative, or dative of instrument, *hudati*, used here, will not admit of the rendering, "they immersed in water;" but we are shut up to the other rendering. The water is here the instrument of the washing, and is applied to the body, and not the body put into it, as every one at all conversant with the Greek language knows; so this purification was a washing with water, not an immersion in water at all. Thus, were it true that Clement here refers to the law in Leviticus xv. 18, and its purification, still the passage must forever fail the advocates of immersion, and triumphantly sustains my position that *baptizoo* is not a word of mode at all, but of denomination, and expresses every form of the application of water to the human body, and consequently embraces sprinkling, and pouring.

2. But secondly, I remark, it is demonstrably certain that Clement is not here speaking of the post concubital washing of the Jews, but of their custom of washing their hands while reclining upon their couches at their meals. I will first reply to Mr. Braden's arguments in support of his definition of *koitee*, and then I will examine his translation of this passage.

1. I am surprised at Mr. Braden's charge against Dr. Beecher, Dr. Seiss, and myself, of translating *koitee* couches. The charge is simply false, as the reader will see by turning back to page 16, where he will read the passage: "This was the Jewish custom (*hoos baptizesthai*) to be baptized this way, even often upon the bed or couch." In commenting on this passage I used the pronoun their, and the plural couches, because Clement evidently referred to this custom, but in rendering the passage I used neither, but gave it from Dr. Seiss, a literal rendering. So this charge falls to the ground, being entirely false.

2. It is no more ungrammatical or absurd to speak of a custom prevailing in a nation of baptizing themselves upon a couch, than it is to speak of a nation baptizing themselves after copulation. In both cases it speaks of a prevailing custom among a people, and it is a matter of perfect indifference whether we use the singular or plural, as every one knows.

3. The statement of Mr. Braden, that *koitee* never means a dinner couch in classic usage, is untrue, and only shows his ignorance of the meaning of the word. *Koitee* and *klinee* are exactly synonymous in their meaning, so much so that they are sometimes used in the Septuagint in the same verse as different words to express the same thing. Thus, Job vii. 13: "When I say, my bed (*klinee*) shall comfort me, my couch (*koitee*) shall ease my complaint." Psalm xli. 3: "The Lord will strengthen him upon the bed (*epi klinee*) of languishing: thou wilt make all his bed (*koiteen*) in his sickness." Also Proverbs vii. 16, 17. These examples settle the question as to the meaning and use of these two terms, while throughout the Septuagint they are used indifferently to express the same thing—bed or couch.

Liddell and Scott define *koitee* thus: "A place to lie down in, bed, couch; the marriage bed. 2. The lair of a wild beast, nest of a bird, etc. ii. Sleep, exp. of the act of going to bed; bedtime; to entertain at bed and board, iii. A chest, box, or case." Schrevelius' first definition of *koitee* is, "*cubile, lectus*." Leverett gives among the definitions of *lectus*, "a sofa or couch to recline on at table. This couch was provided with cushions, and contained generally three persons." But we not only have the testimony of these great masters in classic usage as to *koitee* signifying a dinner couch, for Xenophon, in his *Memorabilia* authorizes this usage. Speaking of the mark of honor due from the younger to the elder, he mentions "rising up in their presence, honoring them with a soft couch, **loith malakh** (*koitee malakee*), and giving them the precedence in speech." In this case the couch is obviously not a bed of repose at night, but one to recline on in a circle engaged in conversation and participating in the enjoyments of social life. In short, it was, as Struzius well remarks in his learned and critical *Lexicon Xenophonticum*, "*lectus quietus el convivii*," a couch on which to repose and to feast. Morell also, in his *Lexicon Prosodiacum*, gives **klinh** (*klinee*.) and **koith** (*koitee*) as synonymous. Beecher on Baptism, note 4, p. 337. Thus Mr. Braden's third argument is proven to be entirely false and groundless.

4. Clement does not here say that this custom of the Jews was enjoined by Moses. He says "the image or picture of baptism was

handed down by Moses to the poets," but he does not say that this custom of baptizing upon a couch was enjoined by Moses. He simply says that this custom of baptizing themselves in this manner upon a couch, that is, as Penelope and Telemachus did, by hand washing, or sprinkling, also obtained among the Jews. **Egoj** (*ethos*) primarily means custom, not law; and had Clement here referred to the purification enjoined by the law, he would have used **nomj** (*nomas*), law, not **eqoj** (*ethos*), custom. So Mr. Braden's fourth argument falls to the ground.

5. I have already fully answered Mr. Braden's fifth argument by showing that the law of Moses did not require immersion in post-cubital purifications; and also showing the fact that he has failed to give us one particle of authority for his assertion that this custom prevailed among the Jews, while I proved conclusively that immersion was not enjoined by the law in this case; nor is there the slightest evidence that Clement here refers to Leviticus xv. 18, but all the evidence is to the contrary.

6 and 7. Mr. Braden's sixth and seventh arguments are utterly without foundation in fact. Instead of *koitee* specifically and pre-eminently, and almost invariably having the meaning he attaches to it, in the Greek of the New Testament, and the Septuagint, this is only a metaphorical meaning, and it can not therefore attach to it at all, unless something in the passage or connection fixes that meaning upon it in any given example of its use. No rule of interpretation is more universally acknowledged and established, than that which requires that words are to be understood in their literal and most usual signification, unless weighty and necessary reasons require (that it should be abandoned or neglected, and a different meaning substituted in its place. Hence we find that when *koitee* is used in the New Testament, or in the Septuagint, in its metaphorical sense, it usually has **egein** (*echein*), as in Romans ix. 10, or **spermatoj** (*spermatos*), as in Leviticus xv. 18, joined with it to fix this meaning upon it; or if this is not the case this metaphorical meaning is fixed upon it by its connection, as in the other examples adduced by Mr. Braden. The naked word itself, without some connection to fix that meaning upon it, can not be understood as Mr. Braden translates it, without violating the most fully established laws of interpretation.

The literal and ordinary meaning of *koitee* is bed or couch. It is used but four times in the New Testament. Luke xi. 7: "My children are with me in bed" (*koiteen*). Here it is used in its literal sense. In Hebrews xiii. 4 it means literally marriage-bed. In Romans ix. 10 it is used with **exousa** (*ecchousa*), and signifies when thus used, *conception*, to have or conceive seed. In Romans xiii. 13 it is used with **aselgeiaj** (*aselgeiais*), lasciviousness, lewdness, and literally signifies "the lewdness connected with the couch," so that we see it is not used in the sense Mr. Braden translates it in a single example in the New Testament; and when used in a sense akin to it, that sense is fixed upon it by the connection.

Mr. Braden's remark, "It has this sense (bed) in Luke xi. 7, and in Daniel in two or three places," conveys the impression that it is seldom used in this literal sense in the Septuagint, and that this is



his meaning is certain, for he says it has the meaning he puts upon it almost invariably, "both in the New Testament and the Septuagint." Now, either he knows nothing about the usage of the Septuagint, or he has grossly, not to say willfully, misrepresented the facts in the case, for the ordinary and general meaning of *koitee* in the Septuagint is bed, or couch, and it is so used seven times in this same fifteenth chapter of Leviticus, in verses 4, 5, 21, 23, 24, and 26 twice. It is so used six times in Daniel, and I have examined its use in many other passages, and I have found that this is its use generally throughout the Septuagint. Here again Mr. Braden's statement is entirely false, and his argument falls to the ground.

8. Mr. Braden's eighth argument, that "this word (*koitee*) is the root of *koimao*, and that the Latin *coitus* and the English word coition, sexual intercourse, are derived from this word," is utterly groundless and untrue. Instead of *koitee* being the root of *koimao*, both of these words come from *keimai*, "to lie down." *Keimai* is the root, and it signifies to lie, "to be laid," etc. See Parkhurst, Liddell and Scott, etc. The Latin word *coitus*, and the English word coition, are not from this word at all, nor from the root *keimai*, but from the Latin *coeo*, to come together, *con* and *eo*, to go. See Webster's English and Leverett's Latin Dictionaries. Such reckless and unfounded statements as Mr. Braden here makes I have never met with before from any man pretending to any degree of learning, and they betray such a degree of ignorance or recklessness as to show that his statements are not to be relied on at all on any question requiring critical scholarship.

9. The reference to sleep in the passage has nothing to do with copulation, but sleep or night here with Clement symbolizes sin and death. We know also that it was a custom of the Jews to purify themselves after sleep in the morning by washing their hands, and the translators of the Septuagint did purify themselves in this way each morning while engaged in their work, as Josephus tells us, which we shall see more fully directly. So this argument is worthless also.

10. I did not take the passage from Potter at all, but from Beecher as furnished by Dr. Seiss, and he took it directly from Clement's own work. However learned Bishop Potter may be, he is certainly in error here, and the weight of authority is against him, and Hervetus is right when he says, commenting on this passage : "The Jews washed themselves, not only at sacrifices, but also at feasts; and this is the reason why Clement says that they were purified or washed upon a couch, that is, a dining couch, or triclinium. To this Mark refers, chapter vii., and Matthew, chapter xv. Tertullian also refers to it when he says, '*Judaeus Israel quotidie lavat*'" Dale's *Judaic Baptism*, p. 182

Alexander D. LeNeurry, in his learned dissertations on Clement, makes the following remarks on this passage : "Moreover our Clement hath shown the image of our holy baptism to have been not only among the Jews, but likewise among the Gentiles, also in that which Homer hath sung concerning Penelope and Telemachus. But among the Jews it was their custom that they would many times wash themselves upon a couch (*ut saepe in lecto tingerentur*). But Clement wisely advises that these baptisms were clearly imperfect, because we ought

not only to be clean and pure in body, but also in spirit." See Bale's Judaic Baptism, p. 184, for the Latin, which was translated by a learned friend at my request

How Mr. Braden can make Heysichius define **koitai** (koitai) lusts for women, in the sentence **koitai gunaikwn epikumai** (*koitai gunikoon epithumiai*), goes beyond my comprehension. *Koitai* is beds, *gunaikoon* is women, and *epithumiai*, is lusts, or burning desires; and the passage is literally lustful beds of women. *Koitai* in this passage does not mean lust at all, for that is expressed by *epithumiai*, nor can *koitai* be translated copulation, for it is plural, and can only mean beds or couches, and this is the very sense Heysichius here puts upon it. Equally absurd is it to render **mh koitajj peripathswmen** "That is after sexual intercourse;" for then we would be prohibited from walking about after sexual intercourse. The absurdities into which men will plunge when pressed with difficulties are inconceivable. It is Potter, and not Herveus, who makes the blunder, and Mr. Braden, following that blunder, has plunged himself into endless difficulties and absurdities.

11. The other passage referred to by Mr. Braden, in Clement, demonstrably proves that he does not use **epi koitee** in this passage in the sense contended for by Mr. Braden. Here is the passage as furnished by Mr. Braden himself, in Strom, lib. 3, p. 198 of Sylburg's edition:

**οὐδὲ μὲν τὸν ἀπο τῆς κατὰ συζυγίαν κοίτης ὁμοίως ὡς πάλχι, Βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ νῦν προστάσσει ἢ θεία διὰ κυρίου προνοία,**

This passage properly translated reads thus: "And now divine Providence does not indeed enjoin him to baptize himself from the couch on account of copulation, like as in former times." Mr. Braden's translation of this passage is no proper translation at all, as the critical reader will see in a moment. *Koitees* in this passage does not mean copulation at all, but it is used in its literal sense, bed. **suzugian** (*suzugian*) expresses that act, and here means copulation, as every one at all conversant with the Greek language knows. This settles the controversy on this passage, for Clement himself, when speaking of baptism, or purification from the bed or couch on account of copulation, uses *koitees* to express bed, and *kata suzugian* to "express on account of copulation." Had he here simply said, *apo tees koitees baptizesthai*, baptized from the bed or couch, we could not have known what was the cause of the impurity from which he was cleansed by the baptism, for impurity might be contracted in many ways from a bed or couch, under the law. See Leviticus xv. But he here tells what impurity the man was cleansed from when baptized from the bed or couch. It was *kata suzugian*, on account of copulation.

"The use of **apo** (*apo*), with the noun indicating the source of defilement from which cleansing has been effected, is established usage; thus we have baptized from (**apo**) a dead body." Dale's Judaic Baptism, p. 182.

Also Justin Martyr says: "Baptize the soul from wrath (*apo orges*), and from covetousness, and from envy, and from hate," etc. Ibid. p. 278.

"The use of **epi** (*epi*) under such circumstances is unheard of. If,

then, **suzugian** (*suzugian*) might be omitted, **apo** (*apo*) would, in its absence, be most imperatively required to be retained, in a reference to the baptism contemplated. Its absence alone is disproof of the assumed reference." Ibid. p. 182.

This passage, occurring in such close proximity to the other, and being so diverse from it, settles the question, and proves conclusively that Clement, in the former passage, is not speaking of post concubital washings, but of the Jewish handwashings upon the couch.

12. Having thus fully answered Mr. Braden's arguments and shown their utter fallacy, I will now notice the passage from Clement, and the reasons for understanding *epi koitee* in their literal sense. Here is the passage in controversy :

**njikwa tou baptismatoj eik<sup>o</sup>ak<sup>o</sup>kai<sup>o</sup> lek<sup>o</sup>Mwusewj paradomonh toij poihtai? wdehpwj:**

'H o|ju|drhnamene kaqara xroi eiat le|ou sa (Odys. iv. 759).

**h|Phueloph epi**

**Xeifaj niyamenoj polih? a|oj eu@et]]Aqhfh** (Odys. ii. 261).

**Ego toufo loudiwn wj kai to pollakij epi koit<sup>o</sup> baptizesqai.**

Clement here states, "that may be an image (picture or likeness) of baptism which has been handed down from Moses to the poets, thus : 'Penelope having washed herself, and having on her body clean apparel, goes to prayer, and Telemachus having washed his hands at the hoary sea, prayed to Minerva.' This was a custom of the Jews, in this manner also, to baptize themselves often upon a couch."

a. This translation gives to the words their literal and most usual signification. The literal and ordinary meaning of *koitee*, as we have seen, is bed or couch, while the literal and fundamental meaning of *epi* is on, upon, etc. *Epi* is used about nine hundred times in the Sew Testament, and out of that number it is not once used in the sense Mr. Braden here uses it, nor have I ever met with such an example of its use any where.

6. In the Septuagint we meet with many examples of the use of *epi* with *koitee* and *klinee*, and in every example I have seen it means upon the bed or couch, thus: Cant. iii. 1 : "By night on my bed (*epi koiteen*) I sought him whom my soul loveth." Job xxxiii. 15: "In slumbering upon the bed (*epi koitees*)." Psalm iv. 4: "Commune with your own heart upon your bed" (*epi tais koitais*). 2 Kings i. 47: "And the king bowed himself upon the bed" (*epiteen koiteen*). It is so used in Daniel six times, and in other places; but these are sufficient to show this usage.

c. It is a fact that it was a custom of the Jews to purify, themselves often upon their couches by washing their hands. This we learn from Mark vii. 3, and also from the well-known customs of the Jews. The translators of the Septuagint purified themselves in this way each morning while engaged in their work, as we learn from Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews, book 3, chap. 2:

"But in the morning they came to the court and saluted Ptolemy, and then went away to their former place, where, when they had washed their hands, and purified themselves, they betook themselves to the interpretation of the laws."

This custom of washing the hands upon a couch prevailed long

aster it ceased to be a religious rite. Theodoret, in his Ecclesiastical History, book 1, chap. 18, speaking of Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, says:

"This celebrated and admirable empress performed another action worthy of being remembered. She assembled a number of young women who had vowed perpetual virginity, and made them recline on couches, while she presented them with meat and with a beverage mixed with wine, and waited upon them; she then brought them water to wash their hands."

d. But Mr. Braden's translation of this passage makes Clement tell a positive falsehood. It makes him say the Jews, "also often, after sexual intercourse, immersed themselves." The law did not require, nor was it a custom of the Jews, to immerse themselves often or many times after copulation; but it required one simple washing with water, and no immersion at all, as we have seen. But the baptism here spoken of by Clement, was repeated often, or many times. The Jews did baptize themselves often, or many times, while reclining upon a couch at meals; they did not baptize themselves often or many times after copulation, but simply washed themselves once. This settles the question, and proves that Clement is not here speaking of the purification after copulation, but the oft-repeated purifications of the Jews while reclining upon the couch at meals. Not only does the literal and ordinary meaning of the words demand this rendering, but the facts of the case absolutely demand it, otherwise the passage is a positive and palpable falsehood!

e. But finally, the connection fixes this meaning upon the passage. Clement is here tracing the image, picture, or likeness, of baptism, through the lustrative rites of the heathen, and of the Jews, and he even traces it up to Moses. The word *eikwn* (*eikoon*) does not mean symbol, but image, picture, etc., and is always so used in the New Testament. The Greek word for symbol is **sunbolon** (*symbolon*), not *eikoon*, and the attempt of Mr. Braden to evade the force of this term by rendering it symbol, only further reveals the straits into which he feels he has fallen. The law of Moses required a washing of the hands and the feet of the priests always before offering sacrifices. See Exodus xl. 30-32, and xxx. 18-21. To this Clement refers when he speaks of Penelope *hudrinamenee*, washing herself, that is, by sprinkling or pouring water over her person (for this is the meaning of *hudrainoo*), before going to prayer; and of Telemachus *nipsamenos cheiras*, washing his hands at the foaming sea before offering prayer to Minerva. He then tells us, "This was (or is) a custom of the Jews in this manner also to often upon a couch baptize themselves." In what manner? Why, as Penelope and Telemachus did. They purified themselves thus (*loos*) while reclining upon the couch, and preparatory to their offering prayer to God for a blessing upon their meals, for this was their uniform custom; and Clement is speaking of purification before prayer, not after copulation. They also washed their hands often during and after their meals while still reclining upon the couch. Demonstration itself could not be more certain than that Clement in this passage speaks of the Jewish custom of baptizing or

purifying, before, during, and after meals, and not of their post-concubital purifications.

But finally, Mr. Braden admits that *baptizo*, like inaugurate, is a generic term, and expresses the effects produced by the application of water to the human body—purification—regardless of the mode of application; for if this is not what he means by the comparison of *baptizo* and inaugurate, then he can mean nothing at all. Thus after all his efforts to set aside this passage from Clement, he closes up his argument by fully admitting the position I started out with and maintained throughout the discussion—that *baptizo* is not a word of mode or action at all, but of denomination, expressing, not action, but effect, state, or condition, regardless of the manner in which such effect, state, or condition, may have been" produced. Thus I close by not only triumphantly sustaining my translation of this passage from Clement, but forcing also the admission from my opponent that *baptizo*, like inaugurate, is a generic term, and embraces every mode of application of water to the human body, whether by pouring, sprinkling or immersion!

## Appendix C.

MR. BRADEN'S ARGUMENT.

### *The passage from Hippocrates.*

All who have read the Campbell and Rice Debate doubtless remember how persistently Rice reiterated a passage he quoted from a work on "Diseases of Women," which is incorrectly attributed to Hippocrates. As he rendered the passage, the writer directed a blister-plaster to be baptized in Egyptian ointment and breast-milk. Contending that a blister-plaster could not be dipped, he triumphantly vociferated that *baptizo* could not mean dip or immerse in this passage. Giving his favorite perversions, wet or moisten, to *baptizo*, and claiming that this was done by pouring or sprinkling, he vociferated and reiterated this passage, until he made it the prominent feature of the debate on his side.

Mr. Campbell was too honest to suspect his opponent of chicanery and never examined the passage in the original, and the trick was not exposed. Since then the passage has formed a staple topic of the harangues of every advocate of pouring and sprinkling, as it did in the cavils of my opponent. Several years ago Alexander Johnson, of Kentucky, now in California, called attention to the fact that there was not in the passage, nor in the preceding context, any Greek word that could be rendered blister-plaster, nor was the slightest suggestion or reference to such an idea. On the contrary, the entire context utterly forbade such an idea. He showed that it was a pessary (a small cylindrical instrument, rounded at the ends, and inserted to support the womb in certain diseases) that was baptized; and as it is always dipped in oil before insertion, *baptizo* was used as the word which specifically and unmistakably expressed that act.

Dr. Conant, in his "Baptizein," gives the passage in which *baptizo* occurs, but it does not contain the noun for pessary. He supplies it in parenthesis from the preceding context. When I quoted from his book in the debate, my opponent had the cool assurance to impeach Dr. Conant's veracity or scholarship by denying that pessary was the proper subject to be supplied to the verb *baptizo*. He evidently acted for present effect, reckless of future consequences.

We have since sent to Leipsic, Europe, by Robert Clarke, of Cincinnati, and obtained a complete copy of the original of Hippocrates, with a translation into Latin by an old Latin writer. We now give the passage with enough of the preceding context to show conclusively that it was a pessary that was baptized. Also the Latin translation, that all can see how the old Latin translator understood the Greek text. The Greek is as follows:

[772] ἐπιμῆνια κατασπῦται. ἐλατήριον δύο ποσίας, ζυμιάσγεται δὲ καὶ στέαρ ὕος ἀπὸ τῶν νεφρῶν, ὅσον τὸ ἐλατήριον μὴ θαυδρῶν-  
 τεςθαι. (487) ποίεεν δὲ δύο προσθετά. ἢ μελανθίων τὸ ἐκ τῶν  
 πυρῶν τριψας ὕδατι φορύξαι καὶ προσθετα δύο ποιῆσαι. προστιθέναι  
 δὲ ταῦτα πρὸ τῶν ἡμεριῶν ἢαι μέλει ἐπέργεσθαι. ποίεει δὲ μὴ ἕξεργό-  
 μενα ρίγχα καὶ πυρετούς. μαλθακά ὑφ' ὧν καθαιροεταὶ ὕδαρ καὶ  
 φάριμος, καὶ ἀγει ἐπιμῆνια. ἦν μὴ πολυγρόνια ἦ, καὶ τὸ στόμα μαλ-  
 θάσει. νόρκισσον, σμύρναν, κνιμον, καὶ λεβανωτόν, ἀφινθιον, κυπερον  
 ἴσον ἐκάστου, ναρκίσσου δὲ μόνου μικρας τέσσαρας, ἐπιτετένον ὠμόν ||  
 λίνον ζυμιάζας ταῦτα τρίβειν ὀργάνου ἐψημένου σὺν ὕδατι ποίεεν  
 βάλανον καὶ προστιθέναι. ἢ καὶ κοκλαμίνου μίσεε ὅσον ἀστράγαλον.  
 καὶ ἀνθα χαλκῶν, ὅσον κνιμον τριψας, μέλει δευσαὶ καὶ ποίησαι βάλου-  
 Ed. Chart. VII. [772.] Foël. I. 620. Ed. Lind. II. (487, 488.)  
 νον. καὶ πρὸστιθέναι ἢ γλήγωνα, ἢ σμύρναν, λεβανωτόν, ὕος γολήν τε καὶ  
 βοός ἐν μέλει ἀναπαράσσειν καὶ ἀναπλάττειν βάλανον. ἦν τὰ ἐπιμῆνια  
 μὴ γίνετα, χηρός ἐλακον καὶ νέτωπον καὶ ῥητίνην ζυμιάσουσα  
 προστιθεὶ τῷ εἰρίῳ ἀναλαμβάνουσα. προσθετόν καθαρτικόν μαλθακόν.  
 ἰσχάδα λεβάνου διεφθον ποίεεν, καὶ ἀποπέσας τρίβειν ὡς λείωτα-  
 τον, εἶτα πρὸσθεε ἐν εἰρίῳ καὶ ῥοδίῳ μύρω τὸ δριμύ κράμψης  
 πηλῶν ἐκατέρου μιδι τριψας, τὸν αὐτον τροπον χρεό. καθαρτικόν.  
 χηρός μελόν, ἢ βοός ἢ ἐλάφον ὅσον κνιμον παραχέοντα μύρου  
 ῥοδίον, καὶ γάλα γυναικὸς τρίβειν ὡς φάρμακον τρίβετα, εἶτα ἐν  
 τούτῳ ἀλείφειν τὸ στόμα τῆς μητρὸς. ἕτερον προσθετόν μαλθακόν.  
 χηρός μελόν (488) ὅσον κνιμον, κηρόν ὅσον κνιμον, ῥητίνης ἢ σχινίτης  
 τερεβενθίνης ὅσον κνιμον, ταῦτα τήζας σὺν μύρω ῥοδίῳ ἐπὶ πυρὸς  
 μαλθακῶν ποιῆσον ὡς κηρωτήν. εἶτα τούτῳ χληρῶ ἐναλείφειν τὸ  
 στόμα τῆς μητρὸς. καὶ τὸν κτένα καταβρέχειν. ἕτερον καθαρτικόν.  
 ἀλεγγρον σιτάριον, σμυρνης τριώβολον, χροχόν τὸ ἴσον, καστορίον  
 ὀβολόν. ταῦτα τριψας μύρω ἰρίῳ προστιθέσθω, ἢ κνίδις καροπὸν  
 Ed. Chart. VII. [772, 773.] Foël. 620. Ed. Lind. II. (488.)  
 καὶ μάλαχης γυλόν καὶ χηρός στέαρ ἄμα συμμάζοντα προσθεῖναι.  
 προσθετόν ἄλλο καθαρτικόν, ἦν τὰ γυναικεία ὑὴ φαίνωται.  
 στόμακα καὶ ὀργάνον τριψας λείον καὶ συμμάζας ἐπίχεται χηρός  
 ἐλακον καὶ προστιθεὶ. ἕτερον καθαρτικόν προσθετόν, ὡστε μητραε  
 ἐκκαθαίρειν καὶ αἷμα ἐκκενῶν. ἀφινθίου ρίξαν τριψας λειην  
 μέλει καὶ ἐλαίῳ χηρός μῆζας προστιθεὶ. ἕτερον προσθετόν καθαρ-  
 τικόν. βουπρήστωε ἀφελεῖν κεφαλὴν πόδας καὶ πτεφά. τὰ δ' ἄλλα  
 αὐτοῦ τρίβειν καὶ ζυμιάσγειν τοῦ σύκου τὸ ἐίδον. δυπλάσον δὲ τοῦ  
 συκου τὸ πῖον ἔστω. τούτο φυσῶ τὰς ὑστέρας, τούτο καὶ τὰς ἀπαι-  
 δήσας ἀριστον. ἢ λνοζώστωε τὰ φύλλα λείω προσθετά ποίεειν. τούτο

λεπτὴν ἄγει χολώδεα κάθαρσεν. καὶ ἡ ἀρτεμίσση ποιεῖ ὡς ἡ λευζώσ-  
 τες καὶ καθάριε κρεῖττον. ἐλλέβορος μέλας ἐν ὕδατι λεῖως. ἄγει καὶ  
 οὗτος οἶον ἀπὸ κρεῶν ὕδαρ. [773] καὶ στουπήρη, θε καὶ ἡ ῥήτηνη  
 τὸ ἰὼντὸ θραῖ, κύπερος ἀφινθίου, ἀμιστολογία, κύμνον, ἅλες μέλι,  
 τὰῦτα πάντα ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τριβεν καὶ προστιθέναι. καὶ ἐλλέβορος  
 ἐν οἴνῳ γλυκεῖ μετὰ ἀλέθρου αἰρώων γαί πυρίνιον μολιτε φυρηθεῖς ἐν  
 εἰρίῳ προστιθέσθω. (489.) προσθετὰ ἦν μὴ τὰ κατάποτα καθάρση.  
 Ed. Chart. VII. [773.] Fœl. I. 620. Ed. Lind. II. (488, 489.)  
 λευζώσστιν, σμύρναν, λευκόϊον, κρόμμυον ὡς ἡμεῖς τῶν καὶ μελάν-  
 θιον καὶ τὸ ἡδύοσμον, ἦν ὑποφέρῃ, συμμιξας προστιθεῖ. προσθετὰ  
 θριμῆα ἄροντα αἶμα. κανθαρίδαζ πέντε πλὴν τῶν ποδῶν καὶ τῶν  
 κεφαλῶν, καὶ σμύρναν λεβανωτῶν ἅμα συμμισγειν. καὶ μέλι μετ' αὐτῶν,  
 ἐπειτο βράσας ἐς ἄλειφα ῥόδιον ἢ αἰγυπτίων ροσθέσθω τὴν ἡμέραν,  
 καὶ ἐπὶ δάκνηται, ἀφαιρέσθαι. καὶ βαπτίζειν πάλιν ἐς γάλα  
 γυναικῶς καὶ μύρον Αἰγυπτίων. προστιθέσθαι δὲ τοῦτο ἐς νόκτα καὶ  
 θιανίζεσθαι ἐν ὕδατι ἐνώδει, προστιθέναι δὲ στέαρ.

The following is the Latin translation:

Quod menses detrahit. Elaterii quantum ad duas potiones satis sit sumito, cui oviculae adeps ex renibus adraissetur, pari cum elaterio copia, minime conterito, duas glandes subdititias parato. Aut melanthium ex tritico terito, aqua subigito et glandes duas subdititi is conficito. Has autem paucis ante diebus quaiu prodire debeant supponito. Cum vero non prodeunt, rigores et febres excitant. Emolliejtia ex quibus aqua et arena purgatur, menses etiam, nisi diutius restiterint, educunt et uteri osculum emolliunt. Narcissi, myrrhae, cumini, thuris, absinthii, cyperi, singulorum aequales portiones, narcissi vero solum quadruplum sumito, cui lini crudi lanuginem pectini insidentem ammisceto, haec cum origani decocto terito, glandem essingito et supponito. Aut etiam cyclamirrum ad astragali magnitudinem adniisceto et aeris florem ad fabae quantitatem tritum melle excipito, glandem efformato et supponito. Aut p.ulegium, vel myrrham, thus, suillum fel et bubulum cum melle agitatum, glandulam essingito. Si menses non eant, anseris adipem, netopum, resinam, simul permixta et lana excepta, mulier in subdititio apponat. Medicamentum subdititium purgans et emolliens. Caricas probe percoctas et expressas laeissime terito deinde in vellere cum unguento rosaceo subdito. Acrius efficies si brassicae et rutae utriusque dimidio trito, ad eundem modum utaris. Purgans. Anseris aut bovis aut cervi medullae ad fabae magnitudinem, unguentum rosaceum et lac muliebre affundito, in meicamenti fornac terito, uteri osculum inungito. Aliud subdititium emolliens. Anseris medullam nucis quantitate, ceram fabae magnitudine, resinae lentiscinae et terebinthinae fabae magnitudinem. His cum unguento rosaceo lento igne liquatis velut ceratum consicito, deinde ex eo tepido os uteri inungito, pubem perfundito. Aliud purgans. Farinam sitianiam, myrrhae obolos tres, croci tantundem, castorii obolum, haec ex unguento irino trita in subdititio apponito. Aut urticae semen et malvae succum cum adipe anserino simul permixta supponito. Aliud subdititium purgans, si menses non appareant. Ad styracem et organum tenuiter trita et permixta anseris adipem assundito et supponito.



Aliud subditium purgans, quod turn uteros purgat turn sanguinem vaeuat. Absinthii radicem tenuiter tritam, cum melle et anserino adipe admixtam, in pesso apponito. Aliud subditium purgans. Detractis a bupresti capite, pedibus et alis, quod est reliquum terito et sicut iutiorem partem admisceto. Sit autem duplum quod in feiu pingue est. Hoc uteros inflat et vivibus defectis est optimum. Aut mercurialis folia ad laevorem trita in pesso supponito. Hoc tenuem biliosam purgationem educit. Idem etiam artemisia quod mercurialis praestat et essicacius purgat. Veratrum nigrum ex aqua tenniter tritum, etiam aquam velut a carnibus educit. Et vero alumen et resina hoc idem essicit. Cyperus, absinthium, aristolochia, cuminum, sal, mel, haec omnia simul trita in pesso subdito. Neratrum etiam ex vino uulci, cum farina lolii et tritici melle subactum, in vellere subijcto. Medicamenta subditia ubi quae devorantur minime purgarint. Mercurialeni, myrrham, violam albam, cepam acerrimam, melanthium et mentham si serre possit, simul mixta in pesso apponito. Subditia medicamenta acria sanguinem ducentia Cantharidas quinque exceptis pedibus et capite et myrrham et thus simul commisceto, melle addito. Deinde oleo rosaceo aut Aegyptio intinctum per diem supponat et ubi morsum senserit detrahendum, rursusque in lac muliebre et unguentum Aegyptium immergendum. Hoc autem per noctem supponendum et aqua odorata perleudum et adeps supponendus. [Hippocrates, vol. ii.]

We give the following as a literal translation of the Greek:

"Something that forces the menses to flow. Take a quantity of *elaterium* that would be sufficient for two potions, and mix with it the fat of a lamb taken from the reins, a quantity equal to the *elaterium*; bruise these slightly together, and make two pessary suppositories; or bray wheat with fennel, mix with water and work together into two pessary suppositories. Insert these a few days before that on which the menses should appear. If they do not appear, they cause chilly sensations and flushes of fever. Emollient substances, out of which water and sand have been cleansed, soften the mouth of the womb and cause the menses to flow, if they have not been suppressed too long. Take equal portions each of narcissus, myrrh, cumin, frankincense, absinthium, cyperos; but of the narcissus alone a quadruple portion; mix with tow of raw flax drawn out by a heckle; bray these together with a decoction of origanum, and make a pessary and insert it. Or mingle cyclamen to the size of an astragalus, and flowers of copper to the size of a bean mixed with strained honey, and make and insert a pessary. Or pennyroyal, or myrrh, or frankincense, hog's gall and bubulus shaken with honey, and make a pessary.

"If the menses do not appear, let her, having mixed goose-fat and oil of bitter almonds and resin, rubbing these together in her hands with wool, apply it.

"A purgative pessary. Taking a dried fig, boil it well, having squeezed it thoroughly, pulverize it as finely as possible, then apply it with wool and rose-oil, having rubbed on the acid of cabbage and rue, use it in the same way.

"A purgative pessary. Mix the marrow of a goose, or of an ox, or

of a deer, the size of a bean, pouring on rose-oil and breast-milk, as a medicine is mixed, then anoint the mouth of the womb with it.

"Another emollient pessary. Goose-marrow, the size of a nut, wax the size of a bean, resin from the mastich-tree or turpentine-tree the size of a bean, having melted these with rose-oil over a gentle fire, make it into a salve, then with this lukewarm anoint the mouth of the womb, and wash the *pubes* well.

"Another purgative pessary. Bolted flour, three obols of myrrh, the same amount of saffron, an obol of castor, having brayed these in iris-oil into a pessary, let it be applied; or apply nettle-seed and mallow-juice and goose-fat mixed together.

"Another purgative pessary if the menses do not appear. Pour goose-fat on storax and organum rubbed fine, and work it into a pessary, and apply it.

"Another purgative pessary. Pluck off the head, wings and feet of a buprestidan, and the remaining parts of it bray and mix with the interior part of a fig, but let the fat of the fig be double in quantity. This inflates the womb. This is best, also for the weakened.

"Or work the pulverized leaves of mercury into pessaries. This carries off thin bilious purging. Motherwort also works as mercury does and purges better. Black hellebore, brayed fine in water, this carries off as it were water from the flesh; and indeed alum and resin accomplish the same. Cypress, wormwood, birthwort, cummin, salt and honey, rub all these together into a pessary and apply it. Also hellebore in sweet wine with flour of darnel and wheat, having been mixed with honey, let it be applied with wool.

"Pessaries, if these do not purge. Having mixed mercury, myrrh, white violet, onion as pungent as possible, melanthenui and mint into a pessary, let her apply it, if she can endure it.

"Pungent pessaries carrying off the blood. Mix together into a pessary five Spanish flies, except the feet and heads, and myrrh and frankincense and honey with these, then having dipped (bapsas) the pessary into oil of roses or Egyptian oil, let her apply it during the day, and as soon as it stings, withdraw it; and again immerse (baptizein) it in Egyptian ointment and breast-milk, and let this be applied till night, and then let it be rinsed and apply tallow."

This translation settles this long disputed passage:

1. The diseases are just such as require the use of a pessary. They are diseases in which it has ever been used, diseases of the womb.

2. The way the articles described are to be used shows that they must have been pessaries.

3. The bare suggestion of using a blister-plaster in such cases, caps the climax of absurdity. Nothing but the grossest ignorance, or the most reckless and desperate determination to bolster up a sinking cause, no matter how, could have led to such an idea or perversion of the original.

4. The Greek word for pessary (*prostheton*) occurs in the context preceding the passage, and is clearly understood in nearly a dozen of places. The verb *prostitheemi* means to make a support or prop or pessary, being used instead of its derivative *prostithetoo*, which means specifically to make a pessary. Hence in connection with the verb

rub, the idea is literally rub them together and place them together into a pessary.

5. Pessaries were made then in this way, and of these materials, as we learn elsewhere in Greek medical works.

6. The Greek for blister-plaster is neither expressed nor understood in the preceding context; but is utterly repugnant to the whole meaning of the context.

7. The Latin translator has in his translation *subdititium*, a prop, support or pessary; and *pessus*, a pessary. He supplies pessary in the very passage over which the dispute arises. Every physician knows that a pessary must be dipped before insertion, and the Greek writer uses *baptizo*, the word which peculiarly and specifically expresses that action.

Hence we rescue this much-perverted passage from our opponent's distortions, and show again that *baptizo* means dip and dip only in action. I regret to have to dwell so long on passages of the nature of these, but the cause of truth demands that they be rescued from the service of error and misrepresentation, and nothing but an exhaustive discussion can do this work. I regret, too, that I did not claim in debate the privilege of thus examining every passage in the original which my opponent quoted. Every one could be turned against him as effectually as we have these. If God permits by sparing my life, I hope to do this work for the cause of truth.

MR. HUGHEY'S REPLY.

The reader will please turn back to page 81, and read my remarks on the passage from Hippocrates, and see how faithfully (!) Mr. Braden has represented the matter. I gave the passage from Dr. Carson, the ablest, and one of the most learned writers on the side of exclusive immersion. I did not give the passage from Dr. Rice at all—said nothing about his argument on the passage, for I knew that Dr. Carson would be authority with my opponent that he could not deny; but still, in his appendix C, he represents the matter as though I had quoted the passage from Dr. Rice. It is true Dr. Rice, in his debate with Mr. Campbell, brought forward this passage as an example where *baptizo* could not mean immerse; but Mr. Campbell, instead of being "too honest to suspect his opponent of chicanery, and never examined the passage," had too much sense, and was too fine a scholar, to expose himself as Mr. Braden has done in his translation of this passage, and he therefore said nothing about it. Had Mr. Braden pursued a similar course it would have been much to his credit as a scholar and a man of refinement.

The reader will remember that I state on page 94, "But the word pessary is not in the quotation that Dr. Conant gives," and I demanded of Mr. Braden the passage in the original with that word in it. Dr. Conant supplied the word pessary, and I wanted to know his authority for so doing. Mr. Braden failed to give the authority for supplying the word then, but he gives it now in his appendix C. He says:

"The Greek word for the medical appliance of which so many

varieties are described, is *prostheton*, a pessary. The Greek verb used is *prostitheemi*, to make a support or prop, used instead of *prostheteoo*, to make a pessary."

This is Dr. Conant's, Alexander Johnson's, and Mr. Braden's authority, and the whole of it, for making a pessary out of a blistering ointment. Now let us examine these words and see if they will bear the translation Mr. Braden has given them. The whole controversy turns upon the meaning of *prostheton* in this passage and connection, for *prostitheemi* can give Mr. Braden no support, but stands directly against him, as we shall see. *Prothetos*, *on* is thus defined by Liddell and Scott: "1. Added, put or fitted to; put on, of false hair; 2. Given up to the creditor (of debtors). 3. *Prostheton*, *to*, like *prosthema*. iii. A pessary." Donnegan defines it thus: "*Prosthesis*, *on*, adjoined; put to, near, or on—affixed, as of false hair; adjudged, or appropriated, as a slave, viz: an insolvent debtor to his creditor, in Roman law, *addictus: ta prostheta pessaries*."

Schrevelius defines it thus: "*Prothetos*, *ee*, *on*, put on, added." He does not give pessary as a meaning of *prostheton* at all, while they all agree that the primary and usual meaning is, "put on, put to, added," etc. Liddell and Scott give as a third and remote meaning of *prostheton*, pessary.; and Donnegan does the same thing, and Schrevelius does not so define it at all. Now the rule we are to be governed by in ascertaining the meaning of words which are susceptible of different meanings, is to adopt the primary, or most usual meaning, and never depart from that, unless the connection shows that a different meaning must be adopted." This rule Mr. Braden and myself have both fully admitted throughout the entire discussion. *Prostheton* is a verbal adjective from *prostitheemi*, here used in a substantive sense, and properly means, "put on, or applied—an application or preparation to be used either internally or externally, as the connection indicates." Understanding *prostheton* thus in its primary and ordinary sense, the whole connection from Hippocrates is plain and intelligible, but to translate it uniformly pessary, as Mr. Braden does, makes the most absurd contradictions and nonsense, as we shall see.

But *prostitheemi* has no such meaning as Mr. Braden gives it. It does not mean, "to make a support or prop," at all, and can not have that meaning. *Hupotitheemi* might have this meaning, for it literally means "to put under." *Prostitheemi* signifies "to put to, to place unto, apply, add, annex, unite," etc. It is thus defined by Liddell and Scott, Donnegan, Schrevelius, Parkhurst, and Greenfield, not one of whom gives to "make a support or prop," or anything approximating to it as a definition of it at all. Mr. Braden's definition of *2'ros'itheemi* is thus shown to be entirely false and unsupported. The etymology and use of the word alike forbid the meaning he puts upon it. His assumption that the writer here uses *prostitheemi* for *prostheteoo* is as groundless as his other assumption, and only the more fully reveals his conscious weakness. The writer certainly understood his own language, and knew the word he wished to use to convey his exact meaning, and he certainly would not have used one word for another of a totally different meaning; such a supposition is wholly out of the question. *Prostheteoo* is defined, "to make or apply a pessary;"

but *prostitheemi* is never so defined, and never so used, nor can we suppose that the writer in question could have committed such a blunder as to use *prostitheemi* for *prostheteoo*. Hippocrates uses *prostitheemi* hundreds of times, and in all of its forms; but when he speaks of applying a pessary he uses *pessos*, pessary, with it, as on page 594 of this same volume. *Pessous prostithesthoo*, or *balanon*, as on page 707, in this identical connection: "*Balanon kai prostitheemi*." If *prostitheemi* is used by Hippocrates, "to apply a pessary," or "apply in a pessary," as Mr. Braden translates it, why should he use those words which unmistakably mean pessary, with it? The very fact that Hippocrates uses *prostitheemi* thus, proves that he does not use it in the sense of "to apply a pessary," but simply and literally "to apply," while he expresses pessary by *pessos* or *balanon*, which both mean pessary. Mr. Braden translates *prostitheemi*, in this connection, sometimes "apply," which is its proper meaning, sometimes he translates it "apply a pessary," and sometimes he translates it "apply in a pessary," meanings it never has and can not have. By such liberties as this you can make a passage mean anything you please, by putting any meaning upon a word you choose, regardless of whether it ever has such a signification or not. What confidence can be put in a man's translation of a passage who takes such liberties with the words of the passage?

But the connection shows clearly that *prostheton* is not used in this entire connection in the sense of pessary at all. In his first example he translates *prostheta*, *pessary suppositories*. Now, I ask, what authority has he got for so translating this word? What is a *pessary suppository*? I know what a pessary is; I also know what a *suppository* is, but what is a *pessary suppository*?

Pessary is thus defined by Dr. Webster: "An instrument that is introduced into the female vagina to supposit the mouth and neck of the uterus. It is made of wood, caoutchouc, waxed linen, etc." For suppository see Dr. Webster. Now remember, Mr. Braden's definition of pessary, "a small cylindrical body, used to support," etc., and see if one single one of the *prostheta* of which Hippocrates speaks in this connection, was such "a cylindrical body," or could be used for any such purpose? The two first *prostheta* of which he speaks, made of "*elatcrium* mixed with the fat of a lamb," were simply two potions of purgative medicine, to be taken a day or two before the time of the appearance of the periods, which is a most excellent medical treatment in such cases. "*Elaterium* is a purgative medicine made of the juice of the wild cucumber." This juice and lambs fat, in equal parts, would not make a pessary. But why make two pessaries and apply them? You could not apply but one at a time. The whole rendering of Mr. Braden is an absurdity. These two *prostheta* were simply, as the passage plainly shows, two potions of purgative medicine for the patient to take. So were several other of the *prostheta* here spoken of, as we shall demonstrably prove.

The mollifying pessaries of Mr. Braden were simply mollifying applications, or ointments. One of these was made of "goose marrow the size of a bean, rose oil, and breast milk." A man must be absolutely mad to talk about making a pessary of such ingredients as

these, and the absurdity reaches its climax when we are seriously told the diseased part must be anointed with this pessary; just as though a pessary was an anointing substance! The next mollifying pessary of Mr. Braden is equally as absurd as this. It was made of "goose marrow the size of a nut, wax the size of a bean, resin the size of a bean, melted in rose oil made into a salve." Here was a pessary made into a salve, and to cap the climax of absurdity, the diseased part was to be anointed with this pessary in a lukewarm state, and the external parts—the pubes—were to be moistened or wet with it! Mr. Braden's accuracy and faithfulness in translating is shown again in his translation of this passage: "*Eita tauto chliaoo analciphein to stoma tes kai ktena katabrechein*," is, literally, "Then, with this warm, to anoint the mouth of the womb, and to moisten or wet the pubes." *Katabrechoo* does not mean to wash at all, and the idea of wash is not in the passage. This salve, which Mr. Braden calls a pessary, was to be warmed, and then the internal part affected was to be anointed, and the external part was to be moistened or wet with it. A strange way this truly to us a pessary!

His next purgative pessary is simply a purgative medicine, without either pessary, or *prostheton* in the entire prescription. In order to get pessary in it at all, he supplies it in one place, and translates *prostithesthoo*, let it be applied in a pessary in another place. With such liberties a man can make an author say any thing he wishes him to. He gives a meaning here to *prostitheemi*, it never has and can not have. If *prostithesthoo* in this passage means, "let it be applied in a pessary," how comes it that Hippocrates, on page 594 of this same volume, says: "*pessary prostithesthoo*," let the pessary be applied, using *pessos*, pessary with *prostithesthoo*? Such a translation as that given of this prescription by Mr. B., is sufficient to ruin the reputation of any man both for scholarship and candor. *Prostithestoo* here means, let it (this purgative medicine) be applied or used.

His remaining purgative pessaries are purgative medicines to be taken into the stomach to carry off the billious matter from the system. The leaves of the mercury plant, the motherwort, black hellebore, &c, are all medicines to act on the liver, and to produce catharsis. In connection with these, external applications were to be applied as fomentations to facilitate their cathartic effect. That this is the true state of the case, is fully proven by the very next sentence which follows, *prostheta, een mee ta katapota kathairee*, which Mr. B. translates: "Pessaries if these do not purge," entirely suppressing *ta katapota*. Why does he do this? Simply because to translate *ta katapota*, the passage would send his pessaries down the patient's throat, and this would be worse than anointing the external parts with a pessary. But what is to be thought of a man's candor who will deliberately suppress a part of a sentence, so as to make the writer utter sentiments he never thought of? This Mr. B. has here done, and without this bold act of iniquity he knew his whole argument to make a pessary out of the following prescription would fall to the ground. Now, I ask again, what confidence can be put in any assertion he may make, or in any translation he may put forth? Liddell and Scott define *katapota*, that which can be gulped down or swallowed, a draught or

pill. Hipp, strictly *neuter*; from *katapotos*, *on* (*katapinoo*), to be drunk or swallowed. Donnezan and Schrevelius agree with Liddell and Scott. Now translate *prostheta*, pessaries, in this sentence, as Mr. B. does, and it reads: "If these pessaries swallowed down do not purge." *Prostheta* in this sentence, and in the preceding prescription, to which reference is here made, is thus demonstrably proven not to mean pessaries at all. *Prostheta* in this sentence is an adjective and qualities *katapota*, "draughts, pills, or potions to be swallowed," which were made by adding together the medicines as directed in the preceding prescription. The sentence properly rendered would be: "If these potions, or pills (to be swallowed) thus added or prepared," &c. This gives the sense of passage, and is as nearly literal as can be made. Or if *prostheta* here is to be understood as a noun, and *katapota* as a verb, as the Latin translation has it, this will not help the matter, for the *prostheta* must be *devorantur*, swallowed down. Take whatever view of it you please, *ta katapota* overturns his whole pessary argument, and proves that his entire translation of the passage from Hippocrates is a most foolish and absurd perversion of the writers meaning.

Mr. B.'s next pessary he calls a pungent pessary, and is the passage in controversy. We have seen that *prostheton* signifies properly "an application or preparation," and this is "a *drimea*, sharp, cutting, painful, poignant, application"—that is, a blistering application. The ingredients here used prove demonstrably that it is a blistering preparation and nothing else. 1. A pessary could not be made of such ingredients. This every one knows who knows what a pessary is, and what it is used for. This alone must settle the question in every reflecting mind. 2. The preparation is a blistering preparation, and a very powerful one at that. 3. The amount of Spanish flies here used is fully sufficient to make an ordinary blister-plaster. 4. The treatment, if too painful and after removal, is the precise treatment of a blister. Take the common blistering preparation of the United States Dispensatory and see how nearly it resembles that used by Hippocrates. It is thus composed: "Take of Spanish flies, in very fine powder, a pound; yellow wax, resin, each seven ounces; lard ten ounces." Hippocrates used myrrh and frankincense, which is turpentine in its crude state, taken from the tree in tears or drops, instead of the yellow wax and resin, and he mixed it with honey instead of lard. Any one acquainted with the medical properties of these ingredients will see at a single glance that the blistering preparation of Hippocrates was much stronger than that now in common use. A man must be absolutely mad to seriously talk of making a pessary out of such ingredients.

In his translation of this prescription, Mr. B. says: "Then having dipped the pessary," &c. Now he knows that neither *prostheton*, nor any word which can mean pessary, occurs in this place at all, yet he deliberately substitutes the word pessary in this connection: "*epeito Bapsases aleipha rodinon ee aiguption prosthethoo teen heemeran*" is literally, "then bapsing (moistening) by means of rose or Egyptian oil, apply during the day." He also translates *aphaireesthai*, withdraw, giving it a meaning, contrary both to its etymology and use, according to the lexicons. It means, "to take from, to take away from, pluck off,"

etc.; not to withdraw one thing from within another, but to take one thing off of another. It is from *apo*, from, and *aireoo*, to take. *Dak-neetai* signifies "to bite or sting, so as to become very painful," and the Doctor directs, and should it be very painful, take it off, and *baptizein*, baptize it again (that is, moisten it again) by means of breast-milk and Egyptian oil, and apply till night, and "*dianixesthai*, wash thoroughly, rinse or rub clean." Donnezan (that is yet of all the particles of the plaster which had adhered to the skin,) and apply tallow, which is just the treatment of a blister precisely. Thus we make it demonstrable that it is a blister-plaster which Hippocrates here directs to be baptized, and not a pessary; consequently *baptizein* in this passage can not mean to dip or immerse at all, but it means simply to moisten the plaster by applying breast-milk and Egyptian ointment to the surface of it, and it is utterly impossible for the advocates of immersion to set aside the force of this passage.

In order to get pessary in this passage, Mr. B. has been compelled: 1. To give to *prostheton*, which literally and ordinarily means "an application," etc., a remote meaning which it seldom, if ever, has. 2. He is compelled to give *prostheemi* meanings which it does not have and can not have. 3. He is compelled to assume that the writer did not know what word he wished to use, and actually used one word instead of another of a totally different meaning. 4. He is compelled to suppress an important part of a sentence, or send his pessaries down the throat of the doctor's patient!! 5. He is compelled to make pessaries out of purgative medicines taken into the stomach, of melted salve, and then anoint the external and internal parts affected with this pessary in this melted condition, and finally to make pessaries out of blister-plasters. And why all these absurdities, assumptions and follies? Simply because a blister-plaster can not be dipped or immersed, and yet this was commanded to be baptized. But suppose he could have shown it was a pessary and not a blister-plaster, which Hippocrates here ordered to be baptized, would that have helped his cause? Not in the least, for a pessary is not immersed before applying once in five hundred cases, I presume; but, on the other hand, is simply anointed by rubbing lard or oil upon it. So if he could have made a pessary out of a blister-plaster he could not have made immerse out of *baptizo* in this case, for then it would have meant simply to anoint, as every physician in the land knows, and every one else who knows any thing about the use of a pessary.

The Latin translation accompanying the Greek text of Hippocrates amounts to nothing in the controversy, and only shows how the translator understood the text; and I have neither time nor space to spend in criticism upon it, though I find it is quite open to criticism in this place.

I think Mr. Braden ought to be fully satisfied with the appendices he has already got into the book, for he could hardly survive many more such. I am truly sorry to have to write as I have done in this appendix; but I was compelled to do it in order to show up the absurdities and groundless assumptions of my opponent; and I think after this we shall hear no more of immersing pessaries in connection with this passage from Hippocrates. Mr. Braden's uncalled for in-



situation in his conclusion in regard to my "perversions," is in keeping with his other groundless assumptions, and is as false as it is unkind; and if even true, it ought never to have been mentioned by him, after the course he has pursued during the debate and in his appendices.

---

NOTE.

In looking over the printed sheets of the debate, I find on page 341 a full paragraph of 24 lines on the 430 years of Paul, Gal. iii. 17, which was not in the oral discussion at all in any place, but has been added by Mr. Braden, when correcting his speeches for the press, and consequently I could have no chance to reply to his statements and arguments. It also makes my reply contradict the facts of the debate as published, while my reply met his speech exactly as delivered. Will the reader please turn and read the paragraph referred to, and then read the following reply:

In Genesis xv. 16 we read: "But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again;" so that the exodus of Israel was to take place in the fourth generation from that which went down into Egypt. Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses, make four generations, and there could be no more generations than these intervening between the descent and the exodus, or the divine promise fails. Now, as I showed, the whole lifetime of Kohath, Amram and Moses up to the exodus was only 350 years, so the door is shut in this direction completely against Mr. Braden.

But he says: "Mankind doubles in twenty years. That would give them less than 150,000—less than one-twentieth what was given as their number." Now let us see. Suppose the Israelites doubled once in twenty years, and that they were in Egypt 430 years, this would make them double twenty-one and a half times. Now, put your figures to work, and take 70 to begin with, and double it twenty-one and a half times, and it reaches the snug little sum of 220,200,960 souls. So much for Mr. Braden's infidel objections to the Bible on account of the common chronology.

Now suppose that, under the special blessings of God, the Israelites in Egypt multiplied much more rapidly than common, and we are warranted in this supposition by their history as recorded in the Bible—suppose that they doubled once in fourteen years and four months, instead of once in twenty years, then we would have in 215 years 3,058,340 souls at the time of the exodus, which is about correct. So we see that with no special miracle we get 3,000,000 of Israelites in Egypt in 215 years, while taking Mr. Braden's own figures, in 430 years, we would have 220,200,960 souls. Thus we see the absurdities and contradictory Mr. B. has involved himself in in his endeavor to set aside the plain declarations of the word of God.

There are other passages equally open to criticism as this, but I can not notice them now. His closing speech on the second proposition covers 19 pages, while his opening speech on the third proposition

only covers 11 pages, yet they were both hour speeches. In his closing speech on the second proposition, as written, there is nearly twice as much matter as his spoken speech contained, and of course I could not reply to what was not in his speech when delivered, though I fully answered every thing in his speech as delivered. The report I know was bad, and it was difficult to get the speeches just as they were delivered; but a man could hardly make a mistake of such a character and such magnitude as the above, and not know it.

G. W. HUGHEY.

MR. BRADEN'S REPLY.

My opponent is like what women are represented to be. He is determined to have the last word. God said the Israelites should be in Egypt 400 years. The Holy Spirit through Stephen says so too. I believe it. My opponent denies it. Who is the infidel? The Bible in Exodus xii. says they were in Egypt 430 years to a day. I believe it. My opponent denies it. Who is the infidel?

His arithmetical calculation is based on the absurd hypothesis that none of the Israelites died in 430 years. Make the proper deductions for death and it would leave about the number that went out of Egypt.

In reply to his insinuations concerning my last speech on the second proposition, I will merely say I read nearly all that speech from manuscript, and luckily I have the old manuscript yet. I can read the speech in the book in fifty minutes. The other speech he refers to is the abbreviated report of the reporter, and would not take over thirty-five minutes to deliver.

## MR. BRADEN'S ERRATA.

Wherever Parson or Dr. Parson occurs read Porson.

Page 44, sixth line from the top, instead of "as we are" read "or we are."

Page 45, fourteenth line from the bottom, instead of "proflunious" read "propluvius."

Same page, fifteenth line from the bottom, instead of "sacks" read "seahs."

Page 74, in Leigh's definitions for "votive" read "native."

Page 75, for "Boyster" read "Bagster."

Page 76, for "Riordes" read "Brandes."

On page 5, ninth line from the bottom, read "Monroe Linn."

Page 20, eighth line from the bottom, for "hence I drew these" read "and I knew this."

Page 24, eleventh line from the top, for "regarded these things" read "regarded three things."

Page 28, fifth line from the bottom, instead of "are the secondary" read "or the secondary."

Page 32, ninth line from the bottom, instead of "Chuo se" read "Cheeo se."

Page 184, fourteenth line from the bottom, for "what" read "and."

Page 186, eighth line from the bottom, for "as" read "or."

Page 188, ninth line from the top, for "date" read "state."

Page 193, third line from the top, for "connects" read "corrects."

Page 194, fourth line from the bottom, instead of "or" read "and."

Page 195, seventeenth line from the top, instead of "as" read "or." Sixth line from bottom, instead of "scraped" read "scrapped."

Page 210, first line of third paragraph, for "when" read "where."

Page 211, fourth line from the bottom, for "mobility" read "inability."

Page 214, first line second paragraph, for "opposition" read "aposition."

Page 227, place a semi-colon at the end of the ninth line from the top, "No; one," etc.

Page 228, second line of the third paragraph, for "solution" read "salvation."

Page 239, fourth line from the top, instead of "school" read "shoal" (shallow water.)

Page 241, second line, fourth paragraph, for "rewarded" read "removed."

Page 244, sixth line, second paragraph, for "acquired" read "required."

Page 266, first line, instead of "naturalizes" read "materializes." In second line, instead of "water not" read "material fire." Sixth line, instead of "fetch" read "patch."

Page 268, third paragraph, seventh line, instead of "as" read "is."

Page 280, third line from the top, instead of "because it" read "because of."

Page 339, third line from the bottom, instead of "work" read "mark;"

Page 506, ninth line from the top, instead of "words" read "mind's."

Page 508, last line in second paragraph, instead of "independent of the word" read "independent of the agent."

Page 512, seventh line from bottom, instead of "faith" read "path."

Page 532, sixth line, instead of "comparison" read "quandary."

Page 538, second paragraph, third line, place a period after abolished.

Page 541, ninth line from the bottom, after "who" insert "when a lad of ten years."

Page 606, paragraph marked 8, third line, instead of "chafed" read "chapped." So also in paragraph marked 9, ninth line.

Page 607, second paragraph, instead of "Erdians" read "Endians."

Page 608, third paragraph, instead of "utility" in fifth line read "vitality."

---

#### MR. HUGHEY'S ERRATA.

Owing to the fact that the manuscript was bad, and the author being unable to remain in the city while the work was being done to read the proof-sheets, there are many typographical errors in the book, and it becomes necessary to prepare an errata so as to correct the most glaring at least. T stands for top and B for bottom, while the figures annexed show the number of lines from the top or bottom, as the case may be.

Page 12, T—10, read "Porson" for Parson, and so wherever this name occurs.

Page 15, T—23, read "strongly" for "strangely."

Page 16, T—17, "nipsoontai" for "niphontai."

" T—23, "Seiss" for "Leiss."

" T—28, "eikoon" for "reikoon."

Page 19, B—6, "ebaptizato" for "ebaptizeto."

Page 35, T—18, "single" for "simple."

" B—25, "deipnon" for "diplou."

Page 37, B—19, "Hesyehius" for "Hersyehius."

- Page 37, B—15, "Suidas" for "Snidas."  
 Page 40, T—3, "sufferings" for "superfusions."  
 Page 48, B—7, "in" for "is."  
 Page 50, B—18, "nipsoontai" for "niptontai."  
     B—5, "hoos" for "loos."  
 Page 52, B—20, "Athenagoras" for "Atenageras."  
 Page 60, T—20, "Hesychius" for "Hysechius."  
 Page 65, B—13, "Gregory Nyssen" for "Gregory Nipson."  
 Page 80, B—24, "kataduseon" for "Katadunoon."  
 Page 81, T—23, "bapsas" for "bapsus."  
 Page 92, B—17 and 13, "hoos" for loos."  
 Page 94, T—1, "bapsas" for "bapsus."  
     " B—6 and 7, "Kataduoo se eis to onoma tou Patros kai  
 tou huiou kai tou agiou Pneumatos."  
 Page 122, B—24, "immerse" for "immersed."  
 Page 149, B—19, "by baptism" for "into baptism."  
 Page 196, B—18, "Penitent sinner" for "penitent believer."  
     " B—15, "relieved" for "released."  
 Page 197, T—22, "had a discussion" for "had discussion."  
     " B—4, "course" for "case."  
 Page 198, B—18, "an intention," etc., for "but an intention," etc.  
 Page 198, B—14, "looketh" for loveth."  
 Page 199, T—25, "determination" for "destination."  
 Page 200, T—25, "the" for "these."  
 Page 203, T—18, "It" for "I."  
     " B—16, "passages" for "passage."  
 Page 204, T—8, "passages" for "passage."  
 Page 205, T—17, "declaration that they" for "declaration they."  
 Page 207, B—20, "becomes" for "because."  
 Page 218, T—23, "stated" for "started."  
     " B—9, "Christians" for "baptism."  
 Page 222, B—21, "has been" for "is."  
 Page 223, T—15, "make it the antitype for "make it antitype."  
     " B—18, "drop out itself."  
     " B—7, "those" for "these."  
 Page 224, B—10, "but it answers to" for "but in answer to."  
     " B—4, "our opponents tell" for "our opponent tells."  
 Page 235, B—12, "are all expressions," etc., for "all expres-  
 sions," etc.  
 Page 337, T—17, "inquirer" for "inquiring."  
 Page 250, T—9, "those" for "these."  
 Page 285, B—11, "work" for "word."  
 Page 303, T—17, "fruit of faith" for "first of faith."  
 Page 307, T—9, "sense" for "state."  
     " T—14, "subjects" for "objects."  
 Page 308, T—9, "are members," etc., for "members."  
     " T—10, "and are graciously," for "are graciously."  
     " T—25, "any principle," for "in any," etc.  
 Page 313, T—26, "of the faith" for "of faith."  
 Page 314, B—2, "men" for "man."  
 Page 317, T—, "an agreement" for "an equivalent."

- Page 319, B—21, "olive-tree" for "olive-tree."  
 Page 320, T—22, "those" for "these."  
 Page 321, B—3, "throughout" for "through."  
 Page 334, B—7, "thirty" for "twenty."  
 Page 354, B—7, Drop out "the" and read "ultimate glory."  
 Page 362, B—7, "speech" for "position-"  
 Page 367, B—18, "Matheteutheis" for "Matheteuthei."  
 Page 368, T—19, "scriptural" for "scripture."  
 Page 377, T—18, "coutinues" for "continuing."  
 Page 378, T—22, "meaning" for "meanings."  
 Page 380, B—12, "those" for "these."  
     "    B—7, "is" for "in."  
 Page 382, B—24, "miss" for "ruin."  
     "    B—8, "Decian" for "Dacian."  
 Page 384, B—11, "persons" for "one-"  
 Page 396, B—16, "art" for "act."  
     "    B—9, "we" for "be."  
 Page 400, T—18, "delay" for "duty."  
     "    B—20, "was no question" for "was question."  
 Page 402, T—19, "argument fails" for "arguments fail."  
 Page 404, T—14, "is" for "was," also in the next line.  
 T—22, "can" for "could."  
     "    B—6, "specifications" for "specification."  
 Page 407, T—4, "was .drawn" for "is drawn."  
 Page 439, T—11, "is the word of truth" for "as," etc.  
     "    T—23, "proposition" for "position."  
 Page 443, B—25, "those" for "these."  
 Page 445, T—3, "Wind" for "Spirit."  
 Page 446, B—11, "establisheth" for "established."  
 Page 447, B—21, "our" for "an."  
 Page 448, B—24, "are we not only," etc, for "are we," etc.  
     "    B—21, "spake" for "spoke."  
 Page 449, T—1, "baptizing" for "baptized."  
     "    T—4, "renewing" for "cleansing."  
 Page 464, B—4, "would" for "mil."  
 Page 465, T—6, "but the immediate" for "but immediate."  
 Page 467, T—3, "re-formation" for "reformation."  
 Page 469, T—2, drop out "not."  
     "    T—25, "into" for "unto."  
 Page 475, B—17, "without" for "with."  
 Page 476, B—20, "them" for "their."  
     "    B—14, "In this sense only" for "In this sense where."  
     "    B—6, "men" for "man."  
 Page 447, T—7, drop out "not."  
     "    T—10, "Lexicons" for "Lexicon."  
     "    T—12, "spiritual birth" for "Spirit birth."  
 Page 480, B—2, "wish" for "wished."  
 Page 498, T—11, "sanctification" for "sanction."  
 Page 526, T—9, "glorying" for "glory"  
 Page 531, B—22, "that" for "and."  
 Page 543, B—23, "and this," etc., for "as this."

- Page 544, T—8, "we shall bear" for "we will bear."  
 Page 545, T—5, "reaches" for "reached."  
 " T—6, "declare" for "declared."  
 " T—18, "article of" for "article on."  
 Page 548, T—6, "men's" for "even."  
 Page 549, T—9, "differs" for "differ."  
 Page 565, B—18, "our" for "an."  
 " B—2, "sprang" for "sprung," so in the two following  
 lines.  
 Page 575, B—13, drop out "but" and read "Something," etc.  
 Page 577, T—3, "success and efficiency" for "successful effi-  
 ciency."  
 Page 593, T—13, "dogma" for "dogmas."  
 " T—23, "receive" for "received."  
 Page 594, T—7, "Mr. Spear" for "Mr. Spears."  
 " T—12, "comes in play" for "came in play."  
 Page 596, B—5, "enlargement of" for "enlargement to."  
 Page 597, B—9, "ye" for "we," three times in 2 John, verse 8.  
 Page 598, T—22, "Trallians" for "Trullians."  
 Page 610, T—22, "guide in" for "guide to."  
 Page 614, B—2, "Atenicine" for "Antonicine."  
 Page 615, B—25, "tells us that" for "tells that."