

# **VALID BAPTISM:**

**A Discussion Between**

**A. McGary**

**and**

**T.R. Burnett**

**1898**

## **M'GARY'S FIRST ARGUMENT.**

Proposition: "A belief that baptism is for remission of sins is essential to its validity."

We have agreed to affirm the above proposition and lead in the discussion of it with Brother Burnett, from choice, nor because the rules of honorable controversy make it our duty to do so, but because we could not induce him to come up to his affirmative position and lead in the debate.

It is Brother Burnett's teaching that needs proof, and he ought to attempt to furnish it, but he will not, because he knows he cannot find proof for it in the Bible. Hence, he very wisely refused to make an effort to work the laboring oar, and insisted that I should work it; because he knew he could make no headway against the strong current of revealed truth, and that he would capsize his rickety craft the first effort he made.

Brother Burnett cannot deny our affirmative teaching, that those who are baptized, understandingly that baptism is for the remission of sins, are validly baptized. Hence, there is no room for controversy between us on our affirmative teaching. But he teaches that persons may be validly baptized, who believe they were saved the instant they believed in Christ. This teaching we deny, and our denial of this brings on the discussion. We state the case as we have, that the unbiased reader may see who should affirm and lead

## ***Pages 2 and 3 are missing***

the remission of their sins. " It was, then, God's will that John should preach just what he did, and the people should believe it just as he preached it.

Was it God's will that all other nations should have the knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins? It certainly was and is. How are they to obtain this knowledge, if not through the preaching of the apostles? How will they receive this knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins, if they do not believe that baptism is for remission of sins, and submit to the ordinance with this understanding? We ask our opponent two questions just here: (1) Has God ordained that the people shall have the knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins? (2) How do they receive this knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins, if not through a belief of the apostolic teaching that baptism is for the remission of sins, and a submission to the ordinance with this understanding?

Our Lord said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. " (John 8:32.) When one hears and believes the truth of God in reference to the remission of sins, and is baptized upon a knowledge of this truth, he is made free by the truth, and has a knowledge of salvation by the remission of his sins. It is God's will that men shall have this knowledge before they are baptized. Jesus said: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me

draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. " (John 6:44, 45.) From this scripture we learn that. sinners are to be taught of God, and that they are to "learn" that which God has "taught, " and then they come to Christ. That is, (1) teaching, (2) learning that which is taught, (3) coming to Christ. Now we invite our opponent and the render to go with us to that mountain, in Galilee, where the Son of God gave to his apostles the world-wide commission, that we may see just what God has ordained shall be taught in the name of Christ, and learned by the sinner, that he may come to Christ. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, " etc. (Matt. 28:19.) In this we have instructions to the apostles as to what they shall do, but no instructions as to what the sinner shall do. The apostles are to (1) teach, (2) baptize the taught. But this does not inform us what they were to "teach. " Hence, we will consult Mark 16:15, 16: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. " Here we find what they are to "teach. " It is "the gospel. " "We also learn here what the sinner is to do. He is to "believe" that which is taught, and be baptized. But the term "gospel," my opponent argues, includes only the three facts of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. Let us see about this, as we have a third witness to examine as to what our Lord included in this commission. Luke

24:40, 47: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. " Now, we invite our opponent and the reader to go with us from this mountain in Galilee, where Jesus delivered this commission, to Jerusalem, where they were to begin the execution of it. But let us carry along with us in our minds what we have here learned, and also take our proposition along with these other things. We have learned that the suffering and resurrection of Jesus, and repentance and remission of sins in his name, are to be taught or preached, and the sinner must believe just what is preached, and be baptized. Or, to put it as we find it in John 6:44, 45, these things are to be taught, and the sinner must "learn " them, then come to Christ. So, in preaching the gospel to sinners, they were to preach, not only the three facts of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection , but repentance and remission of sins in his name, and in believing the gospel, they were to believe their teaching of repentance and remission of sins in his name. In this way, and this way only, can sinners obtain "the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins." The apostles were sent to Jerusalem with instructions from their Master to draw sinners to Christ. The drawing power they were to use was the "gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," or to every one who hears it and learns it. If one does not hear it and

learn it, it will not draw him to Christ, for no man can come to Christ, except the Father draws him; and the Father draws to Christ none, save those who hear and learn what he teaches. The Father taught the three thousand at Pentecost, and he teaches all who hear the apostles. The three thousand at Pentecost learned what the Father taught, by hearing and believing what the apostles taught. The apostles taught the suffering and resurrection of Christ, and when the people believed this and cried out to know what they should do, Peter told them to "repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins;" and when they had learned, believed, or gladly received this, they were baptized— baptized into Christ. Thus they came to Christ, by hearing and learning of the Father. It may be asked: "Why call this hearing and learning of the Father?" Because Jesus said: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." (John 7:16.) In his prayer to his Father, he said: "I have given unto them the words Which thou gavest me." Now, some questions to my opponent will bring us face to face, and at short range, over the issue. (1) Was not Peter teaching of the Father when he taught the Pentecostians to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins? (2) Did they not "learn" what Peter here taught them before they were baptized? (3) Was not Peter teaching or preaching the gospel that Christ sent him to preach, when he was teaching them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins? (4) Did they not believe this

teaching before they were baptized? (5) If they had not learned what he here taught them, could they have come to Christ? (6) If you say they could have come to Christ without learning what Peter here taught them, will you not deny the plain declaration of Jesus as found in John 6:44, 45? (7) And if you will not deny that one must "learn" of the Father before he comes to Christ, will you not be forced to acknowledge that my proposition is true? (8) If some other Jew had stood up after Peter was through preaching at Pentecost, and had denounced his teaching, calling it water salvation, and had taught that man must be saved by faith alone, and then be baptized to declare that he was already saved, and that faith comes by prayer instead of by hearing the word of God, and had called up mourners and prayed for a direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon their hearts; and if some had believed all of this, and had related such an "experience of grace" as Baptist converts relate; and if an election had been held to determine whether such had been truly converted, and had decided that they had been, and these had been baptized, would they have been "taught of God?" Would they, in learning such teaching, have "learned of the Father? "

(9) Will you say that such converts have heard and believed the gospel of Christ? (10) Would their baptism, upon such teaching, have put them in Christ? Now we hope Brother Burnett will come right up to the work we have laid out for him. We know his tactics so well that we are able to anticipate him all along the

line, but will not do so., further than to tell him he need not call for a proof text which says you must believe that baptism is for remission of sins, as he always does; for we give him the proof texts beforehand. "He that believeth not shall be damned, " is one proof text. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free, " is another. And all of those texts which teach that baptism is immersion, and that men must believe that baptism is immersion, as Brother Burnett contends they must, will be pressed into service if they are needed, and he cannot go back on them. If Brother Burnett will not deny that it is true that baptism is for remission of sins, he cannot reject the message which says: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"—that is, he cannot reject it as a proof text teaching that a man shall know that baptism is for remission of sins.



## BURNETT'S FIRST REPLY.

Brother McGary commences with a complaint at the proposition, as though he had accepted something from his opponent that does not fully express the issue. He also complains that he did not frame the proposition, and that he has to lead in the discussion. Now, all debaters know that when a man signs his name to a proposition, it becomes his own framework, as much as if he had written it with his own hand. The proposition submitted by the publishers of the Gospel Advocate was written so as to embrace the

doctrine taught by Brother McGary. If it looks a little crooked now, it will look a good deal more so when we have put it through the crucible of criticism and shown its deformity. It is not the proposition that is wrong, but the doctrine it embraces. That may be the reason Brother McGary has affirmed a different proposition in his first speech, and has not touched the one he agreed to debate! As to his leading in the discussion, that is due altogether to the fact that he would not allow me to lead half the time. He says I "ought to have affirmed that persons may be validly baptized who do not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins." I submitted just such a proposition as that. I proposed to affirm that all Baptists who have faith in Christ as the Son of God and repent of their sins receive valid baptism, though they do not at the time of their baptism understand that it is for remission of sins. But Brother McGary would not

accept the proportion! It is too late now to complain! He intimates that the proposition was framed so as to allow me some running and dodging advantages, and that I will "cut some capers, " and "keep away from the issue. " I am not in the habit of running and dodging. Better wait and let the reader see who runs and dodges. "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast as he that putteth it off. "

It is hardly generous in my opponent to say that I stand on the "sandy foundation with Baptists and other mystics, " while he stands on the "citadel of God's truth. " That is begging the question, I do not stand with Baptists , only where they stand with God's word. And I reject Brother McGary' s doctrine only because it is not in harmony with God's word. Where does God's word say that a person must believe that baptism is for remission of sins before he can be baptized? He has not furnished the text in his first speech, and I predict that he will not furnish it to the close of the debate. Nor should he intimate that I was afraid of capsizing my craft, etc. My craft is God's truth , and that does not capsize.

Brother McGary says it is my teaching that needs proof, and not his—that we both indorse his affirmative teaching. By no means. My teaching is that faith in Christ qualifies for baptism, and there is no lack of proof on that proposition. His teaching is, that faith in Christ does not qualify for baptism, unless accompanied by an additional faith in a design of baptism. It is this new faith that needs the proof, and

that I shall call on my opponent to furnish in every speech of this debate.

He begins the proof of his proposition with a text from Luke, that John the Baptist gave "knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins. " And he thinks that teaches that those baptized by John had knowledge that remission came in baptism. But the text does not say so. It simply teaches that John gave them knowledge in regard to salvation, or that led to salvation, but does not teach that they had to have knowledge that salvation came in the act of baptism in order to obey John's commandment. It is rather amusing to see Brother McGary run to John's baptism to prove his doctrine, when he does not believe John's baptism was Christian baptism! Before the debate is over he will be affirming that persons who received John's baptism had to be rebaptized! What about the twelve at Ephesus? But he says that to believe John, "was to believe what he taught about baptism as well as all else he taught. " And he makes the point, that to believe Christ and the apostles, is to believe "what they taught. " Of course, in a limited sense that is true..

But a failure to understand some things taught by Christ and the apostles does not constitute an unbeliever. Will Brother McGary affirm that the primitive converts understood all that Christ and the apostles taught on baptism, "as well as all else they taught?" And that nil this knowledge was prerequisite to baptism? Where is the text that says all this

knowledge must be had before one can be baptized? Where will you draw the line then? I draw it where the Book draws it, at faith in Christ as the Son of God. That is the faith that qualified the eunuch for baptism. If Brother McGary had been with Philip, he would have stopped the proceedings until he could catechise the eunuch as to his knowledge of the one design of baptism! But he was not there, and so we have no scriptural example of the modern catechism and the modern faith!

He asks how people can know that their sins are forgiven, if they do not know that baptism is for remission? We are not discussing the knowledge of forgiveness, but what constitutes valid baptism. A man may be pardoned by the governor at the capital of the State, and yet not know the exact moment when it occurs. His pardon does not depend upon that knowledge. Brother McGary says that if the man does not know the exact minute when it occurred, it invalidates the pardon! A traveler might enter Dallas County, without knowing the exact location of the county line, if he makes all the steps necessary to bring him into the county. A Baptist makes the three steps of faith and repentance and baptism, and enters the kingdom of God; yet because he is in error as to which particular step put him through the door, Brother McGary will put him out and bring him in again! I affirm that the Scriptures nowhere make faith in a design of baptism a condition of baptism.

If Brother McGary knows where the text, is, why does he not produce it? Why debate about everything under the heavens except the thing contained in his proposition? When the eunuch said, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" why did not Philip say, "If thou believest with all thine heart, and hast knowledge that baptism is for the remission of sins, thou mayest?" It is a dangerous thing to add to the word of God, even to save a pet theory.

He next comes to John 8:32: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free ." But, does that mean that a person shall know all the truth before he can be baptized? Did Brother McGary know all the truth before he was baptized? What portion must be known before a person is a fit subject for baptism? Where will you draw the line? I draw the line where the Book draws it, at faith in Christ as the Son of God. Brother McGary draws it at faith in a design of baptism. Which one of us is adding to the Book, and putting in a condition which the Lord did not put in?

He next quotes John 6:45: "They shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. " Does that text teach that every man that hath learned that baptism is for remission of sins cometh unto Christ, and no man can come until he hat h learned that point of doctrine? Every text that Brother McGary quotes lack s a few words of proving his proposition. We all agree that persons must b e taught, and must learn of the Father, but the amount of knowledge necessary to bring one to

Christ is the point in controversy. Brother McGary says it is "what is taught," but that may mean all that is taught, and he will not affirm that a person must learn all that is taught before baptism. Yet he will not draw the line anywhere else except at the one design of baptism! Why should persons know one design of baptism more than others? And why make the design of baptism a necessary part of the knowledge, and not the design of faith, and the design of repentance?

He quotes the commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And he affirms that the belief required is belief of the gospel (which is correct), and then affirms that the gospel consists of all the apostles preached. Here is Brother McGary's fundamental error. If the gospel consists of all that the apostles preached, and a person must believe the gospel before he can be baptized, he must understand and believe all that the apostles preached before he can be baptized! Who is ready for this? Does Brother McGary understand all that the apostles preached? Did he understand it all before he was baptized? Paul defines the gospel to be the death and burial and resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. 15), but Brother McGary will not accept this definition, He says it means everything that was preached by the apostles! If he is correct, there is not a baptized person on earth! The apostles preached some things that our most learned scholars do not understand. Brother McGary and Prof. McGarvey do not alike understand the

promise of the "gift of the Holy Ghost," in Acts 2:38. The reception of that gift is a design of baptism too! And I can prove that Brother McGary does not understand another design of baptism, as taught by the apostles. Paul says we are "baptized into Christ." Brother McGary does not understand what that means, for he recently said that Alexander Campbell was baptized into Christ, but not into the church or body of Christ! According to his own doctrine, he is yet unbaptized, and in the kingdom of Satan! We are taught in 2 Thes. 1:8, that persons must "obey the gospel," but if the gospel includes everything that was preached by the apostles, then we must obey everything that was preached before we have obeyed the gospel. But the apostles preached facts, commands, promises, penalties, prophecies, acts of church worship, and hundreds of other things. Brother McGary says a man cannot obey a fact, but the facts are a part of the gospel according to his definition. So are the promises and penalties. The unbiased reader can readily see that he has laid off more land than he can cultivate.

If, then, a person is not required to understand all that the apostles preached, and there is a limit to his knowledge and his faith, where shall the line be drawn? I say it shall be drawn where the Scriptures draw it, at faith in Christ as the Son of God. The eunuch said, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The eunuch answered, "I believe that Jesus

Christ is the Son of God." That faith qualified him. Why do we ask that confession when we baptize a person? Is it a confession of the faith? If Brother McGary's doctrine is true, we need a new confession. The old confession does not contain his new faith. He will have to add a codicil to the old confession, and make it read, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that baptism is for the remission of sins!" The confession must be as long as the faith. It is said that some of the rebaptism preachers out West have attached the codicil, and are practicing what they preach! That is consistent.

Brother McGary asks if a man should have stood up on Pentecost and preached Baptist errors, as they are preached to-day, and some had accepted the errors and been baptized, would the baptism have been valid? We do not measure a man's obedience by his errors (for the errors do not produce the obedience), but by the faith he has, despite the errors. If a man has faith in Christ and repents of his sins, and that faith leads him to baptism, his baptism is valid, despite the errors he may hold. We believe there are thousands of honest-hearted men and women among the Baptists who have been wrongly taught on the work of the Spirit, and how faith is produced, yet along with the erroneous doctrine that has been preached to them they have acquired enough Bible truth to produce faith in Christ and a loving obedience to him in baptism.

At the very close of his speech, Brother McGary remembered his proposition, and hastened to give one



single text in proof of it, viz.: "He that believeth not shall be damned." If the text had read, "He that believeth not that baptism is for the remission of sins shall be damned," he would have had something. But it does not read that way, and hence he has nothing in the only text he has quoted in his whole speech that even squints at proof of his proposition.

Now I ask that in his next speech Brother McGary shall come up to the work and give us something that bears upon the issue. His brethren will expect it of him, and if he does not furnish it, they will be disappointed.

I reject Brother McGary's doctrine, not only because it is unscriptural, but because there are consequences attached to it that no Bible man can accept. If his doctrine be true, there was no church of Christ on earth one hundred years ago. Can we accept a doctrine that requires us to believe that the church of Christ was destroyed? If a person must believe that baptism is for remission of sins before he can be baptized, there were no baptized people one hundred years ago, and no kingdom of God on earth! Will Brother McGary name one baptized person in 1812, before the baptism of Alex. Campbell? If there were no baptized people, the church was dead, and the Bible is false. Moreover, Brother McGary belongs to a church that was set up by a lot of sinners in the devil's kingdom! Is he ready to accept that conclusion? He has either to accept it, or reject the doctrine of his proposition.

## M'GARY'S SECOND ARGUMENT.

Brother Burnett is mistaken in saying we are complaining at the proposition. We never complain at such light and easily accomplished tasks as this. We were only calling attention to the fact that Brother Burnett would not assume the logical position that devolves upon him, but insisted on being allowed to deny our denial of his affirmative teaching. This fact is remarkable because it is so very suggestive of his realization of his utter inability to find any Bible support for his position. He thinks he offered to be liberal in proposing to lead half of the time, affirming that "all Baptists who have faith in Christ as the Son of God, and repent of their sins, receive valid baptism." But we preferred to lead throughout the discussion, rather than have to play such a sham as that. Instead of denying that proposition, we would not object to affirming it ourselves, for we believe it. But what we do deny is this: Baptist doctrine produces genuine faith in Christ or genuine repentance. We, like Brother Lipscomb, for whom Brother Burnett is debating this question, believe that Baptist doctrine "drives God out of the work, and is wholly of men," and, with Brother Lipscomb, we believe "they have more faith in visions, dreams, and imaginations than in the word of God." Hence, we deny that such faith as this is genuine faith in Christ, or that it can lead to true repentance.

Now, we are writing to disprove Brother Burnett's teaching that baptism submitted to from this false faith

and untrue repentance is valid. And Brother Burnett is writing to prove this teaching of his, by denying that people must believe what the Scriptures teach. This is the hidden issue, hidden because he was afraid to bring it to the front. And as we have the entire word of God to sustain us, and he has nothing to depend upon but human speculation, we agreed to affirm the proposition we have, which stands at the head of our first argument.

We do not know what he means by saying we affirm a different proposition from the one we agreed to affirm. We suppose he does not mean anything, but is just talking around because there is nothing else he can do. We have affirmed verbatim et literatim what he asked us to do, as we knew we could safely affirm anything he would deny on the question. He has commenced his old singsong he sang all through the Wilmeth debate: "Where does God's word say that a person must believe that baptism is for the remission of sins before he can be baptized?" I will ask him a question that will break his music box, if he will answer it. But he will evade it, just as he did our question about the supposed preaching at Pentecost, denying Peter's preaching, asked in our first.

Now we ask the reader to note his evasion of these questions. He will never, as long as his head is hot, answer either of these questions in an open, straightforward way, because he is afraid to. I now ask him: "Must one believe that baptism is immersion, or a

burial in water, before he is baptized?" If he should say yes, I would ask him: "Where does God's word

say that a person must believe that baptism is immersion before he can be baptized?" But he will not answer the question. We have told him where God's word says that one must believe baptism is for the remission of sins. It is "where" God's word says: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Will he deny that baptism for the remission of sins, as taught in the word of God, is the truth? No, for he affirms that it is true, and debates it with Baptists. Then, when he affirms that it is the truth, and God's word says, "You shall know the truth," he ought to stop singing this old senseless song. But, as such as this is all he can find to say, we must allow him to continue saying it, else the discussion would have to end at once. But we challenge him to answer the questions propounded in our first argument. Will he answer in a straightforward way? He will if he is not afraid to.

He says, "My teaching is that faith in Christ qualifies for baptism," and that "Brother McGary's teaching is that faith in Christ does not qualify for baptism." This is a very false way of stating it. We both agree "that faith in Christ qualifies for baptism;" and he goes further and teaches that faith in Baptist "visions, dreams, and imaginations" also qualifies for baptism. I deny this, and call on him to prove it, and he says: Not I! I am too sharp for that. But I will deny your denial of my teaching, provided you will let me frame such a proposition as will keep the people from

seeing how shy I am! And I have agreed to this to accommodate him.

He says: "It is amusing to see Brother McGary run to John's baptism to prove his doctrine. Before the debate is over he will be affirming that persons who received John's baptism had to be rebaptized." But "Brother McGary" did not run to John's baptism to prove his doctrine. We merely showed that in both John's and Christ's baptism the people were given the knowledge of salvation through the preaching of those sent to teach them. He knows as well as "Brother McGary" does, that after Christ's baptism commenced, those who were afterwards baptized unto John's baptism had to be "rebaptized." He knows that if persons should now be baptized unto John's baptism, in fact, it would not be valid baptism. But the Baptists practice a perversion of John's baptism, calling it John's, and Brother Burnett is contending that it is valid baptism. That is, he contends that John's baptism in fact would be invalid, but that a counterfeit of it is valid!

He wants to know if I will affirm "that the primitive converts understood all that Christ and the apostles taught on baptism, as well as all else they taught, and that all this knowledge was prerequisite to baptism." He finds that I am getting along so well with the proposition I started out with, that he wants to change it and give me a bigger and a harder one! He does not like our present one as well as he thought he would! But he must meet me on it, or dodge around and

pretend to try to, for I intend to carry it through to signal victory. He asks: "Where will you draw the line?" We answer: Right where Christ and the apostles drew it, just where we drew it in our first argument . But he will never come up and toe it!

He says: "We are not discussing the knowledge of forgiveness, but what constitutes valid baptism." We know he is not discussing this, or anything else, but we are, and intend to keep it up to the end of the discussion. He is merely whistling to keep up appearances of courage. He will talk about the church when Campbell was born, and about what he calls a modern catechism, and anything else he can conjure up, just to make a noise and fill up space.

He says: "A man may be pardoned by the governor at the capital of the State, and yet not know the exact moment when it occurs." This is very true. But the Lord has provided something better than this for the poor sinner. He has given him the means of knowing just when he is pardoned, or just how he may be pardoned. Your prisoner in the penitentiary suits the case of your Baptist clients very well. He must linger in prison waiting the "governor's own good time" to pardon him. He can do nothing but just wait till the governor gets ready! Not so with the God of the Bible. He says: "He that believeth [the gospel] and is baptized shall be saved." All that can keep the sinner from having the knowledge of salvation, or pardon, is unbelief! If he believes God, he has the knowledge! If he wants the salvation and believes God, he knows

when, where, and how to get it. Not so with your prisoner, nor your Baptists he illustrates; they don't know how they were pardoned, where, nor when, because they have not been pardoned! They are still prisoners in sin; but they are crazy, religiously speaking, "deluded," hence they are as happy in prison as they would be out. Your theory is in harmony with the old adage which says: "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

It is also true, as you say, that a "traveler might enter Dallas County without knowing the exact location of the county line, if he makes all the steps necessary to bring him into the county. But the Lord has made the "line " between sin and salvation plainer than you people up there have made the Dallas County line! You must remember that is a prairie country. A man could cross the line into Dallas County without even believing there was such a county in the world as Dallas County, could he not? If a man should pick a goose, thinking he was picking cotton, when he got through it would be a picked goose all the same, would it not? Suppose you use that for an illustration. It is a good one for you, and I am willing to help you out, as the truth is what we are after!"

You say: " A Baptist makes the three steps of faith and repentance and baptism and enters the kingdom of God; yet because he is in error as to which particular step put him through the door, Brother McGary will put him out and bring him in again." We deny, first, that he takes "the three steps of faith, repentance, and

baptism." Prove it! But as you will not attempt to prove anything, we will prove this negative. And we will use you, Brother Burnett, as our witness. We have already shown that Brother Lipscomb (whom you say, and he says, is perfectly agreed with you on this question) says that Baptist conversion "drives God out of the work and is wholly of men." Now can a doctrine that drives God out and is wholly of men take one through those three gospel "steps of faith and repentance and baptism?" But now we put you on the witness stand. Hear our witness: "Do they (the Baptists) not to-day wear an unscriptural name, have a human creed, use the anxious seat, relate experiences, confess feeling? instead of faith, teach a direct operation of the Spirit, deny that the gospel is the power unto salvation, teach that faith comes by praying and not by hearing, and many other things contrary to the apostolic doctrine?" ("Ray-Burnett Debate," page 9.) Stop, that's enough! Talk about such people taking "the three steps of faith, repentance, and baptism!" What kind of faith? What kind of repentance? What kind of baptism? Is it any better than if they had walked in their sleep at midnight and fallen into a cistern? Brother Burnett, you are a good witness, only you are a supererogation one, testifying far more than is necessary to convict!

He says: "I affirm that the Scriptures nowhere make faith in a design of baptism a condition. If Brother McGary knows where the text is, why don't he produce it?" Hold on, you are not affirming in this



discussion. That is what you ought to be at, but you would not, and now I want you to follow me and stick right close to me, and we will soon make this discussion interesting. I have already given you several "texts; " but as you are so forgetful, I will go over them again. Now listen: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Coming to Christ is the very thing we are discussing, is it not? Well, he can't come unless he is drawn of the Father . Now how does the Father draw him? Listen: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." (John 6:44, 45.) What does the Father do? He teaches. What is the comer to do before he comes? He is to hear and learn what the Father teaches. Did the Father use any means in this teaching? Yes; his Son and his apostles. The Son said: "I have given them the words thou gavest me." Again: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which believe on me through their word." No such believing on Christ (?) as Brother Burnett talks about is taken into consideration by the Lord as faith at all.

Now then, the Father sent the Son, and the Son sent the apostles, and told them what to preach. We give this to Brother Burnett again. "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Now they had become the mouthpieces

through whom God was to "teach" the sinner in order that he might come to Christ, Will Brother Burnett deny this? No indeed! Very well. When Jesus commanded them to preach his suffering and resurrection, and repentance and remission of sins in his name, beginning at Jerusalem, was he not naming that "teaching" of the Father that was to draw the sinner to Christ? We challenge him to say Nay! Then, when they did preach it at Jerusalem on Pentecost, were they not teaching of the Father? He knows they were. When the sinners cried out to know what they should do, and Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," was it not a part of that teaching the Father was to do, and was doing through this agent, Simon Peter? Did these three thousand not hear and learn this teaching? When they heard this, were they not hearing part of that gospel Jesus sent them to preach, and were these sinners not to "believe" it? Did not these three thousand then and there come to Christ by means of that which they then heard and learned? We challenge you to meet us right here now. For we have made out our case and you can't escape this truth. It establishes my proposition, beyond all doubt, and beyond all powers of sophistry that may be employed to escape it. The reader will see it if you cannot. They will also see that if you overturn this proposition you will have to put forth power enough to loose on earth

what Jesus Christ has bound in heaven, for he has bound the very truth we are contending for.

You have condemned the faith of the Baptists by what you said in your debate with Ray. And we have shown from the incontestable word of God Almighty that sinners shall hear and learn before they come to Christ. And we have shown clearly as the noonday sun that in preaching what sinners are to hear and learn, the apostle of God taught baptism for remission of sins, just as my proposition affirms. Therefore you cannot further fight my proposition without fighting the plain word of God. "Learning" that baptism is for remission of sins, is believing that baptism is for remission of sins. Jesus says they must "learn" to come, and they must "believe" to be baptized. I challenge you to meet it and I beg you not to try to quibble around it. John 6:44, 45, and Luke 24:46, 47, to say nothing of other scriptures that we can and will adduce, lay a foundation for my proposition as solid as the everlasting hills, and Brother Burnett cannot cudgel his brains enough to get up sophistry sufficient to prevent these scriptures from utterly pulverizing his untenable theory, that people can sink down into the waters of baptism believing the "visions, dreams, and imaginations" of so called "orthodoxy" and disbelieving the word of God, into valid baptism. God does not come back into their work out of which they have driven him, simply because they have gone into the water. As you have said, the drawing power that pulls Baptists into the water, is their human creed,

anxious seat, related experiences, confession of their (delusive) feelings instead of faith, direct operation of the Spirit (of the Evil One), denial that the gospel is the power unto salvation, faith that came by praying and not by hearing. Hence they are drawn into the water by an aggregation of "fables." And you had as well be trying to make sensible people believe that the story of Sindbad, the sailor, is inspired of God, as that God approves and accepts such a baptism as this.

## BURNETT'S SECOND REPLY.

Brother McGary affirms that he is not complaining at the proposition, yet he spends nearly half his speech in such complaint. If the proposition is all right, and he believes the doctrine it contains, why not stop grunting over it and go ahead with the debate? But he says he is just showing that Brother Burnett ought to affirm. Why, then, did he not let Brother Burnett affirm? But he says Brother Burnett offered a "sham" proposition, and that he would affirm it himself. Here is the proposition I offered to affirm: "Persons who at the time of their baptism believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and repent of their sins, and are baptized to obey God, receive valid baptism, although they do not at the time understand that baptism is for remission of sins." (See *Gospel Advocate*, March 17.) Brother McGary would not print this proposition in the Firm Foundation, and the readers of that paper have never seen it. And in quoting it here in his second speech, he leaves out one-half of it! Who is trying to sham now? But Brother McGary says he would affirm the proposition, for he "believes it!" One part of the proposition says that persons may receive valid baptism who do not understand that baptism is for remission of sins! So Brother McGary has surrendered the whole question!! Sing a song, brethren, and we will "shake him in!" I expected to convert some of his followers before this debate was over, but I did not expect to convert Brother McGary himself so early in the contest! Now let him never say again that an

understanding that baptism is for remission of sins is essential to its validity, for he says he "believes" the very opposite!

But after knocking the flimsy foundation from under his whole fabric, by saying he believes my proposition, he rallies and makes a little stand on the assertion that "Baptist doctrine" does not produce genuine faith and repentance. Who said it did? Nothing that comes from the New Testament is "Baptist doctrine." But Baptists receive enough of the doctrine of Christ from the New Testament (despite their errors) to produce genuine faith and repentance. What is genuine faith? It is no more and no less than faith in Christ as the Son of God. (John 20:31.) Do the Baptists we receive have this faith when they are, baptized? Most assuredly they do. You may ask a thousand of them, and every one will answer in the affirmative. Now where did they obtain this faith? It either came from the "word of God," or "Baptist doctrine" produced it. Which side of the issue will Brother McGary take? He must either admit that Baptists have genuine faith, or deny that faith in Christ as the Son of God is genuine faith! But the brother is so mad at the Baptists, that he would rather deny the Bible and say that faith in Christ is not genuine faith, than to admit that some Baptists are in the kingdom! But he says Brother Lipscomb stated that Baptist doctrine drives God out. It is likely that Brother Lipscomb had reference to the doctrine that is peculiarly Baptist (or their errors), and not to the truth they receive from the New Testament, which

leads them to faith and repentance and "understand." But I do not care for that. He cannot sustain the proposition, no matter how he twists it.

But Brother McGary will have it that he is writing "to disprove Brother Burnett's teaching," notwithstanding the proposition that stands at the head of these pages is Brother McGary's doctrine and not mine. But as he has given up the proposition he set out to affirm, and admits that persons may receive valid baptism without understanding it to be for remission of sins, he might as well debate something else! He says he is combating Brother Burnett's idea that persons who submit to baptism from "this false faith" receive valid baptism. But Brother Burnett has no such idea. Faith in Christ as the Son of God is not a false faith. Persons who have this faith may also hold some errors, but as the faith leads to baptism (and not the errors), the baptism is valid. If errors in regard to Bible teaching invalidate baptism, then Brother McGary and his rebaptist brethren need a new baptism.

But he will have it that there is a "hidden issue," which I dare not bring out, because I have nothing to sustain it. He is mistaken—woefully mistaken. I have scripture to sustain all my teaching and practice (plenty of it), and I proposed to bring out my teaching in a specific proposition, but he would not let me. I wish I could drive it into Brother McGary's head that I am not trying to evade him, or dodge him, or keep back something, because I am fearful he will tear me all to pieces. Now I assure him, once for all, that I

keep back nothing, and dodge nothing, and evade nothing, and have no possible fears of anything he can do to me or the doctrine I hold. I am fully able to defend anything I teach, and have no fears at all. And if I do not convince Brother McGary on this point before the debate is over, I am sure that I will convince every unbiased reader.

He says I have commenced my old singsong, "Where does God's word say that a person must believe that baptism is for remission of sins before he can be baptized?" Yes, that is my song, and I expect to sing it till his bones rattle, unless he brings the text. It ought not to be considered an unfair demand for a negative to require a n affirmative to bring proof of his proposition. I do not doubt that it is a pretty hard song for Brother McGary—a sort of "Hark-from-the-tombs-a-doleful sound"—but it will be poured into his ears until he produces the text, or gives up his unscriptural doctrine. But he says he will ask me a question that will break the music box. Not much, beloved! Here is his question: "Must one believe that baptism is immersion before he is baptized?" Baptism is an act performed by man, and he must know what it is before he can perform it. Remission of sins is an act performed by God for man, hence man may be forgiven and not know just the moment it occurs. There is a vast difference in a man's knowing what an act is which he must perform, and knowing God's design of an ordinance. The two things are not parallel. Why don't you ask me something hard, Brother McGary?



But the text that he thinks proves that a man must understand that baptism is for remission before he can be baptized (although he has surrendered that point) is the following: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Baptism for remission is a part of the truth, and he thinks a man must know that before he can be free. I fully answered that text in my other speech, but the brother paid no attention to the answer. Does a man have to know all the truth before he can be made free? The statement that the whale swallowed Jonah is a part of the truth. Does a man have to know that part before he can be baptized? Why, then, do you not put it in the confession? Why do you ask persons about their faith in Christ, and not about Jonah and the whale, and the design of baptism? All, there is a reason! I asked him where he would draw the line, and he said he would draw it where Christ and the apostles drew it. But they drew it at faith in Christ (Acts 8:37), while he draws it at a design of baptism! Quite a difference, you see.

Brother McGary says we both believe that faith in Christ qualifies for baptism, but that I go further and say that faith in Baptist visions and dreams also qualifies for baptism. He makes a terrible mistake. Nothing could be further from the truth. I have asserted all the time that Baptist errors do not qualify for baptism, and do not produce baptism, but the truth they hold despite their errors. When they lay down their errors, they need not lay down their baptism, nor the truth that produced it. I wish I could get Brother

McGary to meet me on the real issue, that persons may have faith in Christ and yet entertain some erroneous views. But he will not come to the mark. He can diddle-daddle around about dreams and visions to a better purpose. I deny flatly that Brother McGary believes faith in Christ qualifies for baptism, for he says that persons who have that faith are not qualified unless they also have faith in a design of baptism! He makes a bad break when he says Baptists practice a perversion of John's baptism, and that I say it is valid. No, sir ! Baptists baptize by the authority of Jesus Christ, and into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that is Christian baptism. It requires more labor for me to keep Brother McGary on the question than it does to meet his arguments.

He admits the correctness of my illustration, that a man may be pardoned by the governor and not know when it occurs, but says that all that keeps a sinner from knowing when he is pardoned is unbelief. That is not correct. A failure to understand certain texts is not unbelief. The Baptists (whom he calls my clients, in order to conjure up a little prejudice to help him bridge over his tight places) do not disbelieve any part of God's word which they understand. If a failure to properly interpret certain texts is unbelief, Brother McGary is a bad infidel. He also admits the correctness of my other illustration, that a man may come into Dallas County and not know the location of the county line, but he thinks the line of God's kingdom is plainer than the county line. Not to all

people. If a man makes all the steps necessary to enter the county, he is in the county, without any regard to his knowledge of the county line. If a man makes till the steps necessary to entrance into God's kingdom, he is in the kingdom, without regard to his knowledge of the place of entrance. I challenge the world to show that a man who believes and repents and is baptized is not in the kingdom of Christ. If my opponent would come up and toe the mark on the real issue, we would have some debating. He advises me to try the illustration of picking a goose. Very well I think I have got all the feathers off the goose now! The picking is getting to be quite thin! If he does not feather out soon, I will have nothing to do!

He denies that Baptists make the three steps of faith and repentance and baptism, and proves it by Brother Lipscomb, who said Baptist doctrine drives God out. But Brother Lipscomb never said that faith in Christ as the Son of God (which Baptists obtain from the Bible) drives God out. He also perverts the quotation from my book. Why doesn't he bring some proof that "a belief that baptism is for remission of sins is essential to its validity," instead of discussing Lipscomb and Burnett and the Baptists? If you will just say that you cannot defend your proposition, we will drop it and take up Lipscomb and the Baptists.

Nothing shows the unfairness and prejudice of my opponent toward the Baptists more than his illustration of a man falling into a cistern while asleep. A Baptist believes in Christ as the Son of God, earnestly repents

of his sins, and loyally obeys God's commandment to be baptized, yet Brother McGary y flippantly says that is no better than to fall in the water while asleep! Faith in Christ is nothing, repentance is nothing, obedience from the heart is nothing, unless the man believes in a certain design of baptism! He pets up a new object of faith, and demands that every one shall fall down and worship before this water idol! I told you a while ago that Brother McGary did not believe that faith in Christ qualified for baptism. This proves the charge fully. I produce hundreds of persons who believed in Christ as the Son of God with all thei r hearts at the time of their baptism, and were baptized to obey his will, ye t Brother McGary dogmatically decides that they have no better baptism than a man who falls in a cistern while asleep! I recently propounded five questions to the leading preachers and editors of the Baptist denomination in the United States, and they all answered them exactly alike. Here are the questions and answers:

"1. Are Baptists baptized to obey God? Yes.

2. Do they believe at the time of baptism that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? Yes.

Are they baptized to fulfill righteousness? Yes.

Are they baptized to answer a good conscience? Yes.

5. Is faith in Christ and a desire to obey him the impelling motive that causes them to be baptized? Yes." But Brother "McGary's man that falls into a

cistern gets as good baptism as a Baptist, especially if he confesses after he gets out that he believes baptism is for remission of sins!!! Now, honest reader, do you not think that if a debater had some good arguments and some texts of scripture to support his doctrine, he would bring them out and stop such unjust ridicule of his religions neighbors? But as Brother McGary admits that a person may receive valid baptism without understanding that baptism is for remission (see first part of his second speech), and has surrendered the issue, he has nothing left but to abuse the Baptists!

He comes again to his first quotations, about being "taught of God," and "hearing and learning of the Father," etc., and shoots the same powder again. I met all those texts in my first speech, and need not repeat. A man must be taught of God, and must learn, but how much? Must he learn all that Christ and the apostles taught before he can come to Christ? I asked my opponent where he would draw the line, but he would not say. He stated (indefinitely) that he would draw the line where Christ and the apostles drew it. But that is a mistake. They drew it at faith in Christ. (John 20:31; Acts 8:37.) He draws it at faith in a design of baptism! Which will you follow?

Brother McGary did not notice the questions I propounded to him, and passed by in silence nearly every point I made against his theory. Why did he not notice what I said about the confession containing the faith? And if a design of baptism is a part of the faith, why is it not a part of the confession? Why did he not

give a reason for requiring persons to believe one design of baptism, and not other designs of baptism? Why require faith in the design of baptism, and not require faith in the design of faith, and the design of repentance? Why did he not try to meet me on the point that his doctrine requires us to believe that the church was dead when Alex. Campbell was born? If a belief that baptism is for remission of sins is essential to valid baptism, there were no baptized persons on earth when Alex. Campbell was born, and no church of Christ, and the kingdom of God had failed, and the Bible is false! The consequences of a doctrine are as true as the doctrine, and this consequence of his doctrine shows that his doctrine is false and unscriptural! If those old Baptists, who taught our fathers the right way of the Lord, were outside the kingdom because they did not understand one design of baptism, then the church that Brother McGary belongs to was set up by a lot of sinners in the devil's kingdom, and is only seventy years old! Now will he march right up to this point and meet it like a man, and try to explain the difficulty? His brethren will expect it of him, and he must not fail. If those old demands a new faith. 2. A new confession. 3. A new definition of the gospel.

4. New terms of fellowship. 5. A new church, that had its origin in the days of Alex. Campbell. 6. That all its adherents must flatly contradict plain statements of the Scriptures, or else play shut-mouth on the subject of the perpetuity of the church of Christ!!! I have other

impeachments, but will reserve them for a future speech.

## M'GARY'S THIRD ARGUMENT.

Brother Burnett was so badly rattled by our last that he sent his reply away over to Mississippi—to Midway, Miss., instead of Midway, Texas. My brother, the Midway to which we cited you, is the Midway, Texas, near where you debated with Mr. Dalton, trying so hard to convince him and his people that baptism is for the remission of sins. Don't you remember the place and circumstances? We moderated that debate for our brother, and one would have thought from his efforts then, that it is very necessary to understand that baptism is for the remission of sins! But his reply (?) missed our argument further than it misled its proper destination, when it went to Midway, Miss., instead of Midway, Texas. He persists in saying that we are complaining at our proposition. But we are not; we are complaining at the unfairness and cowardice of our brother and his stiff-necked and hard-headed associates, who refuse to discuss with us unless we will lead in discussion and allow them to follow in a denial of our denial of their teaching! Our proposition is as solid as the everlasting hills, and he knows we have already supported it by such incontestable proof texts as are ungetoverable. This is why he thinks about Midway, Miss., and writes about other far-off and irrelevant thing". He says we are "grunting at our proposition." Well, that is more than he is doing for it; he is "grunting" away from it, instead of at it!



He says we have surrendered the proposition in stating that we would not deny but would affirm what he proposed to affirm—that is, that "persons who at the time of their baptism believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and repent of their sins, and are baptized to obey God, receive valid baptism, although they do not at the time understand that baptism is for the remission of sins." But the reader knows we have not surrendered anything in saying this. No one can truly believe Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and truly repent, and truly be baptized to obey God, who does not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins; because no one ever did so in apostolic times. It takes the same knowledge of salvation to prepare one for baptism to-day, that it did in those days. God is no respecter of persons. Hence, he does not approve of any system of conversion that drives him out of the work of conversion, and is wholly of men. This is just what Brother D. Lipscomb says Baptist conversion does, and Brother Burnett says he and Brother Lipscomb are a unit on the question. In fact, he is debating with me now for D. Lipscomb, Brother Lipscomb paying him for taking the flogging he was not willing to take himself. Brother Burnett is willing to take it for the pay Brother Lipscomb has offered, and we are more than willing to give it to him gratis! And now, as we have already got him tied hand and foot to the whipping post, all we have to do is to repeat the gospel truths with which we have fastened him, and lay it onto him with the keen, cutting whips platted by his

own band and the hand of the man who has hired him to lay bare his back to these lashes. So stand up, Brother Tom , and take it like a faithful hireling. Don't try to run off to Mississippi nor other irrelevant grounds, but stand your ground, grin and endure it; it will do you more good than the cash the Advocate folks have agreed to give you for submitting to it.

Now, we will again show him, or rather the reader, how we have him tied up with gospel truths, and then will just stand by and lay it onto him hard and fast with the Lipscomb and Burnett black-snake whips ready-made, with keen crackers that will cut to the red every lick!

1. We have shown that Jesus said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:32.) Now, reader, we are discussing about how people are to be made "free." Jesus says you shall (1) "know the truth," and (2) through the knowledge of this known truth be "made free."

Jesus spoke of doing the truth as well as knowing it. The gospel order then, is, (1) hearing the truth, (2) knowing the truth, (3) doing the truth, (4 ) made free by the truth.

Question: Brother Burnett, is the teaching that baptism is for the remission of sins, gospel truth, or is it "Campbellite" falsehood, as the Baptists say it is? If you say it is gospel truth, then, inasmuch as Jesus says, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," this gospel truth that baptism is for the remission

of sins must be known before one can be made free from "sins that are past." But you ask, How much must one know before they can be made free by the truth? We answer, just as much as the apostles of Christ taught sinners then in preparing them to be made free. Bid they teach sinners that baptism is for the remission of sins, before they baptized them? Yes. See Acts 2:38; Acts 22:10, etc. Did these sinners know this gospel truth before they were baptized? Yes. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." (Acts 2:41.) Were any save those who "gladly received his word" baptized? Not then, nor during the apostolic age, that any of us have ever heard of! But some, in later days, who have madly rejected "his word," calling it "Campbellism," have been baptized, and Brother Burnett teaches that they have been made free all the same! He will not affirm this teaching and discuss it, but he and Brother Lipscomb have framed a proposition for me in such a shape as to have me to affirm in such a way as to deny what they teach, and he, for a price agreed upon between himself and Brother Lipscomb, is now denying my denial of his teaching!

But, when we see that Jesus has said, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," and that Brother Burnett says and debates that baptism for the remission of sins is "gospel truth," we at once see why he could not affirm in this discussion, and also see how we have him tied hand and foot, as powerless as a suckling babe!

2. We have shown that persons must have a "knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins." Now we have argued and still argue, that this "knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins" must come by or through a knowledge of what God's word teaches, or it must come by a direct operation of the Holy Ghost as the Baptists and other sectarians claim to have received it. But what is Brother Burnett's position on this? If he say? this knowledge is only imparted through the word of God, he is doubly tied! Now, we ask him, Do the Baptists, whose cause he is now pleading for the revenue offered by Brother Lipscomb, have that knowledge of salvation God designed people should have—that knowledge imparted in the word of God, which teaches that baptism is for the remission of sins? Will he answer? Not much! Those who "know the truth"—gospel truth—by which sinners are "made free"—the truth that baptism is for the remission of sins—and do this truth, have the "knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins," and we deny that any others do; but we cannot find a man of Brother Burnett's school who will affirm what we deny, and what they teach.

8. We have shown from John 6:44, 45, that none can come to Christ save such as "hear and learn of the Father." Or, to put the same imperishable truth as Paul put it in 2 These. 1:8, one must (1) "know God," (2) "obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now, we have argued (and we challenge him to meet us on this argument), that when Jesus Christ, after his

resurrection, commissioned his apostles to go and "teach or preach the gospel" and baptize those who believed it, that in preaching or teaching under this commission, they were thus enabling sinners to "hear. and learn of the Father" that they might "come to" Christ. We showed from Luke 24:46, 47 , that Jesus required his apostles to preach the suffering and resurrection of Christ, and repentance and remission of sins in his name, beginning this teaching at Jerusalem. We then showed just how they taught these things at Jerusalem, and just as they taught these things, sinners gladly received them and were baptized, and that this was believing and obeying the gospel they preached. We then failed upon Brother Burnett to say whether or not, if some had rejected this teaching of Peter, then and there, calling it "water salvation and Campbellism," just as Baptists do now, and had believed and obeyed a contradiction of Peter's teaching—just as Baptists have done in Inter days and are still doing—would they have been baptized into Christ? We again challenge him to answer this question without evasion or equivocation! We are leading, and he would not debate with us until we agreed to take the lead. Now let him follow and come up to the work we have laid out for him, instead of running and crying as he goes: "Where was the church when Alexander Campbell was born?" Right here we take up his own whip, platted by his own hand for use against Mr. Ray (he says we misquoted his book, and in saying this he makes a false charge, just as he does when he says we

are not discussing the proposition we agreed to discuss) . Hear him as we quote from his "book." Get the book, reader, and see if we misquote him—perhaps he is charging us with misquoting, hoping to thus induce the reader to buy the book. Listen at him: "Succession proves nothing, unless it succeeds to the apostles' doctrine and practice, and this neither the Catholic nor Baptist succession can claim." ("Ray-Burnett Debate," 1, pp. 15, 16.) This is just what we claim when he tries to run his line through Baptist territory! We tell him that, as the Baptists have not the "apostles' doctrine and practice," and have not had it, the church is not with them, and has not been. And when he cries so pitiably for information about the existence of the church "when Alexander Campbell was born," we try to wipe his weeping eyes by telling him, it was with the people who had the "apostles' doctrine and practice," and that "a succession that does not succeed to the apostles' doctrine and practice is useless." We give this "all-day sucker" to our babe in the woods to quiet him and to keep "Br'er Wolf" from catching him! But still he cries, and will not be comforted, because the line of "apostolic doctrine and practice " misses the Baptist synagogue, the birthplace and present home of "our plea."

This brings us to his statement in his last reply (?) which he does not affirm, though he ought to: "Baptists may receive enough of the doctrine of Christ from the New Testament (despite their error) to produce genuine faith and repentance." Yes, in one

sense they may. We have known many to do this. And the way they did it, was by hearing the word of God and believing it, thus learning the way of the Lord perfectly and being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. But he did not mean this, but meant that they have enough truth to save them and are saved when they are baptized under that teaching that leads them to believe that they are saved by faith alone, and are commanded to submit to baptism as a non-essential ordinance, because they have been saved! He was too scared to affirm such stuff as this, but now throws it in us so much wadding to pad out his contract with the Advocate. But just here we will take up his own whip again, which he used upon Mr. Ray, and hit him a few more keen cuts with it. "If we had not a word of Scripture to prove the apostasy of the church, and it were admitted that the Baptists) were a part of that church, the proof could be furnished without trouble. And this we have done time and again. Do they not today wear an unscriptural name, have a human creed, use the anxious seat, relate experiences, confess feelings instead of faith, teach a direct operation of the Spirit, deny that the gospel is the power unto salvation, teach that faith come? by praying and not by hearing, and many other things contrary to the apostolic doctrine and practice?" Yes, they do all of this, and seeing they do so, Brother Lipscomb charges that "they have more faith in visions, dreams, and imagination", than in the word of God, and that they "drive God out of the work," and that their

"conversion is wholly of men." Still, after Brother Burnett and Brother Lipscomb have said all these things about the Baptists, and have said they (Burnett and Lipscomb) are a unit on the question now under discussion, they have called on me to discuss a proposition which virtually only makes me deny that these people are in Christ, and Lipscomb pays Burnett a stipulated price to fight me for believing the same thing they teach! Are they not a consistent (?) pair? Laying aside all malice and all guile, we appeal to all candid disciples to know if they can have any confidence in the sincerity of such inconsistent and self-stultified teachers? We are merely affirming in this discussion that people shall now, before they are baptized, believe the doctrine taught by the apostles and believed by those whom they taught, before they were baptized. And in doing this, we are simply denying that persons are in Christ, whom Brothers Burnett and Lipscomb have said "wear an unscriptural name, have a human creed, use the anxious seat, relate experiences, confess feelings instead of faith, teach a direct operation of the Spirit, deny that the gospel is the power unto salvation, teach that faith comes by praying and not by hearing, and many other things contrary to the apostolic doctrine and practice, thus driving God out of their work and are working by a system that is wholly of men." And these two paragons of inconsistency and self-stultification are denying our denial that, people who do such things as they so boldly say the Baptists do, are in the kingdom of God!



But, the half has not yet been told, but will be before we are through . Now, let our opponent meet our arguments, in an effort to show that the proof texts we have from time to time adduced to support our proposition, do not teach as we contend they do. If he will not do this nor try to, the reader will decide that we have already proven the proposition, and we will spend the remainder of our time using the whips of Burnett and Lipscomb upon their own inconsistent theological carcasses. Reader, we are not mad with these brethren, whom we have convicted of such palpable and undeniable inconsistency and self-stultification. But, as we expect this discussion to be the last opportunity we shell ever have to bring them up face to face with their very apparent double-minded teaching and inconsistent procedure, fallen into through their great anxiety to defend that which is with them a time-honored tenet and practice (though man is its author), we do so, hoping to lead them to see themselves as they really are, that they may repent of this their wickedness and pray God, if perhaps this presumptuous imagination and stubbornness of their hearts may be forgiven them. "When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumbling-block before him, he shall die: because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin, and his righteousness which he hath done shall not be remembered; but his blood will I require at thine hand." (Ezek. 3:20.) When men turn from the way ordained of God to a human way that makes

God's commandment of non e effect, a way which they say is wholly of men and out of which God has been driven, their course is very unrighteous and iniquitous. Hence, as we have ample time and space to warn these men in this debate, without at al l interfering with our main line of argument, we feel it our duty, both to them and to ourselves, to do so, that they may see themselves in their true standing before God, and repent if they will, and if they will not, that their blood may not be required at our hands.

## BURNETT'S THIRD REPLY.

The author of the, foregoing wicked ebullition must have been about in the condition of the man mentioned in Job, 32d chapter:

"I am full of matter, the spirit within me constraineth me. Behold, my belly is as wine which hath no vent; it is ready to burst like new bottles. I will speak, that I may be refreshed: I will open my lips and answer."

It is quite evident to all unbiased readers that brother McGary realizes that he has lost his proposition. He has abandoned the field of argument, and resorted to vituperation and abuse. That's his old style. When he is whipped from the arena of controversy, he loads up his fusee with slang and billingsgate. Some of his best friends have told me that he cannot debate without abuse. But I know he can— till he is whipped! He promised me faithfully that he would not fall into his old ways in this debate— that he would "surprise the brethren." He kept his promise just two speeches! When he saw that every argument that he could bring was knocked from under him, and his blessed old hobby was gone forever, the "old Adam" arose within him, and he fell from grace and into his old rut of vilification. He shot every bullet he had in his first speech, and he has not offered a new argument since. In his second speech he loaded up the same old powder and shot it a second time, for he had nothing else. And when I showed (a second time) that not a

text he used furnished any proof for his proposition, he flew into a rage and went rampaging around worse than a blind dog in a yellow jackets' nest. See his beautiful Christian language: "Stiff-necked and hard-headed associates, " "unfairness and cowardice," "hireling!" Is it any wonder that a sweet-spirited saint like this should conclude that a Baptist has not been born again! But , beloved, I am not going to let you escape that way. I am onto your tricks, and I am after your heretical doctrine, and I am going to pursue the business of this discussion, though it raise more demons within you than possessed the body of the Magdalen, and your wicked tongue emits more billingsgate than the "Army in Flanders!"

Our poor fallen brother commences his speech with the false statement that I was so "rattled" that I misdirected my second speech to Midway, Miss., instead of to Midway, Texas; when his own clerk (Brother Jackson) wrote me a card and instructed me to so address it. I examined the card carefully, several times, to see that I had it correct. And I have a letter from Brother Jackson stating that the mistake was perhaps his own, as he may have had Mississippi on his mind when he wrote the address. I did not know there was such a place on earth as Midway, Miss., till I received Jackson's card instructing me to send the speech to that address. No, beloved, the "rattle" was at your end of the line. I do not blame Brother Jackson. He made the mistake, but he was in bad shape. When he saw his precious idol was rattled all t o pieces by

my second speech, his head was in such a whirl that he did not know Midway, Miss., from Midway, Texas. You know I told you once that if you would raise the lock and key from the columns of the "Flimsy Foundation, " and let me in, we would have such a rattling of the dry bones as would make Jackson's head swim. Jackson's head is now in the swim! But my speech might as well have been addressed to the ends of the earth, as for any attention Brother McGary paid to its contents. He did not notice a single argument in it. He must have answered it while it was in Mississippi! The rules of debate require a disputant to notice the arguments of an opponent. I know Brother McGary cannot do anything with them, but he ought to make an effort. the points I made on the confession and the faith—that one is equal to the other, and that there can be no more in one than the other—stand like the Pillars of Hercules before my opponent. And when it was shown that he has brought in a new faith, a new confession, a new gospel, a new definition of the gospel, a new obedience of the gospel, a new church not yet a hundred years old, a catechism and coroner's inquest, and a theory that falsifies prophecy, he ought to make some defense. It would be better to debate the question, than to fill his space with boasts of his awful performances with black-snake whips and other nonsensical bombast. But he thinks it better to run around and cry that David Lipscomb has hired me to take a thrashing from A. McGary rather than take it himself, and that I am doing it for the money that is in

it! What a mighty thrasher this wonderful Wild Bill of the West must be, that David Lipscomb stands in mortal terror of him! He can flog more men, lay more backs bare, stick more men through, and fetch more floods of gore (which nobody's eyes can see but his own), than any fighter on earth! The strange thing about, this thrashing is, that he cannot be induced to thrash me the second time! I offered to let him thrash me every work in the year, in the columns of his paper, but he said he was too tired! It took ten years to strain his nerves up to the proper tension to undertake this job, and it will take twenty years to prepare him for the second effort! It is not probable that David Lipscomb is much alarmed. My conviction is that David has had some experience with polecats, and while he has no fears of their teeth and claws, he is a little shy of their stink bag! But David had nothing to do with getting up this discussion, and did not write one word of the proposition. The Gospel Advocate Publishing Company simply accepted a boastful challenge from A. McGary (made to T. R. Burnett and not to David Lipscomb), and asked me to write the speeches. But he seems to think it quite awful that the Advocate Company should pay me fifty dollars to debate with him. Well, it may be a rather extravagant price, seeing how small a job it is! But if I succeed in making a decent man out of A.

McGary, by the little dressing I shall administer to him in this discussion, it will be money well spent. To rid the country of such a windy braggart, and rid the

churches of Christ of such a pestiferous nuisance as the rebaptism hobby, will be worth a thousand dollars! If the Gospel Advocate folks wish to do a little missionary work in that direction, all good people will use up and bid them Godspeed.

The reader will observe that Brother McGary shoots his same old powder the third time in his last speech. I have answered all those texts two times already, and shown that they furnish no proof for his proposition. Why keep repeating that the sinner must be "taught of God," and must "know the truth," and "learn of the Father," and yet refuse to meet me on the question, How much truth must the sinner know to be made free? How much must he learn of the Father before he can come to Christ? Besides, his proposition contains the word "belief," and not the word "know," yet he persists in discussing a thing not in his proposition. What faith is required to make baptism valid? This is what he ought to be debating. The Bible says faith in Christ as the Son of God. (Acts 8:37.) But Brother McGary will not go by the Bible. He wishes to stretch the line so as to include a design of baptism as a part of the faith, yet he cannot find a text of scripture to sustain him. Why does he not come up and meet me on the case of Philip and the eunuch? He is as shy of that case as he would be of a graveyard full of ghosts! As to his question about a person "madly rejecting" Peter's doctrine, on Pentecost, and obeying its opposite, I have already answered him fully. There is no such person. The Baptists we receive do not madly reject Peter's

doctrine, but receive it all except one item, which they misunderstand, and when they learn that item they accept it also. The very fact that they correct that part of their teaching which they find to be wrong, is proof that Brother McGary's charge against them is false and slanderous. His unfair way of putting the case shows that he has a dishonest doctrine to support.

Brother McGary tries to patch up the blunder he made on the surrender of the question, but he makes a tenfold worse blunder than ever. In his boastful way he asserted that I would not affirm my teaching. I showed that the charge was utterly false, by quoting the proposition that I submitted to him, which he embraced the very point of doctrine on this subject held by my brethren. To maintain a bold front, he asserted he would affirm the proposition himself, and quoted it, leaving out a part. I then gave the whole of it, showing that Brother McGary had virtually surrendered his doctrine. The proposition he said he believed and would affirm reads as follows: "All persons who at the time of their baptism believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and repent of their sins, and are baptized to obey God, receive valid baptism, although they do not at the time understand that baptism is for remission of sins." The reader can see that this proposition embraces the exact class of Baptists received by us without rebaptism. Brother McGary said he believed the proposition, hence surrendered the proposition he is now debating, which says, "A belief that baptism is for remission of sins is essential to its validity." But



not having the manhood to come out and acknowledge defeat, and stop the debate, he now asserts that Baptists do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God!! Did you ever? Now, reader, what do you think of a man that will print as wild a statement, as that, when he knows that every person who reads this book will know that the statement is totally and utterly false? Brother McGary knows that every Baptist in Texas believes as fully as he does that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and every reader of this book knows the same! Now, here is the state of the dilemma he is in: I had the word of A. McGary that he believed all Baptists who believed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and were baptized to obey God, received valid baptism; and I had the word of Baptist preachers and editors all over the United States (see my second speech) stating that all Baptists believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and are baptized to obey God. Hence, putting the two statements together, I prove that Brother McGary believes all the Baptists in the United States have received valid baptism!! That is a clear surrender of the whole rebaptism doctrine, and all the kicking and bucking he can do till doomsday cannot extricate him from the muddle! To assert that Baptists do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is only to add falsehood to blunder. The Baptists say they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; Brother McGary says they do not. Now which will you believe? The Scriptures say, "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man that is in him?"

Brother McGary says he knoweth the things of a Baptist better than the spirit of a Baptist that is in him, thereby setting himself against the Scriptures! Bid any mortal man ever make as man y blunders as A. McGary? He never opens his mouth that he does not put his foot in it! No wonder Jackson was so rattled that he did not know Texas from Mississippi, when he saw that his chief's head had become a regular rattletrap!!

Nature abhors a vacuum, and my poor fallen Brother McGary is like nature. That is why he does not like to consider the period of time about the birth of Alexander Campbell, when there was an ecclesiastical vacuum! There was no church then, according to his doctrine. The old pioneer fathers that started the Reformation were Baptists, and, according to McGary, were nothing more than the "devil's goat pen." He traces his line from Austin back to the goat pen, and there it strikes the vacuum, and it gives him the theological fidgets for me to talk about the vacuum! As the poet says:

"You trace your line back to the pen, And when you get there, then—O then! You needs must flock with Baptist sheep, Or with old Satan's goats must keep! "

He has to flock with one or the other, and he can hardly tell which to take. To solace his poor lonely heart in this sad condition, he has found a little item in the "Ray-Burnett Debate," which somewhat fills his aching void. That book is the product of my early years in the kingdom of God—some sixteen years ago

—yet when honestly read and understood, it gives no comfort to the foolish rebaptism theory. Where I am quoted as saying, "Succession proves nothing unless it succeeds to the apostles' doctrine and practice," I meant that it proved nothing for Mr. Ray's proposition, viz., that "the Missionary Baptist Church is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church." If he proved succession, and yet did not prove identity in doctrine and practice, he lost his proposition. I meant also the "apostles' doctrine and practice" as an entire system, and did not mean to convey the idea that the Baptists did not have enough of apostolic truth to produce the new birth and translate them into the kingdom of Christ. Many times in that book I state that they are God's people in Babylon, and the very sentence preceding one of the reckless quotations of my reckless brother states, "They did not cease to be God's chosen people while in Babylon." So you see the little item that he cackles himself nearly to death over does not amount to a penny after all.

Now I wish to ask what Brother McGary says of those old Baptists of Campbell's day? He says they were not the church, and not any part of it, because they did not understand one of the designs of baptism. Then they were the devil's goats, and in the devil's kingdom. Yet McGary belongs to the church they set up! Can the stream rise higher than the fountain? Could the devil's children originate the church of Jesus Christ? Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? When those old Baptists were in the devil's

kingdom, were they inspired by the Spirit of God? No, for sinners do not possess the Spirit of God. What spirit guided them then? The spirit that works in the children of disobedience. And did the devil's children, inspired by the spirit of the devil, originate and establish the church of Christ? Most certainly they did, if McGary's doctrine be true!! This, gentle reader, is the monstrous doctrine you have to swallow, if you swallow McGary's absurd rebaptism theory! You see he cuts off the limb he stands on, and no wonder he gets a terrible fall! He will not (and cannot) admit that those old Baptists were Christians, and that creates a vacuum, an awful "bloody chasm," into which the whole rebaptism party is engulfed forever!

'Twas your new hob—" faith in design "— That broke the church succession line, And in your wild sectarian spasm You've made an awful bloody chasm! And in that gulf, forever doomed, The hobby crowd is now entombed, No more to sing in loud laudation The glories of the Firm Foundation!

Brother McGary's line of succession reaches from Austin, Texas, to New Lisbon, O. (A. D. 1827), and there it strikes the old "goat pen," or the "bloody chasm," and can go no further. Set to music, it runs thus:

How long's your line? Threescore and ten? And there it strikes the old goat pen! Where you must either shake or break! And that's what makes the hobby quake! You can't go round, you won't go through, And

now you don't know what to do! The goats were out,  
and put you in! And that's the place where you begin!!

Brother McGary should repent in sackcloth and  
ashes, for saying the church of the living God had its  
origin in the devil's goat pen!

## M'GARY'S FOURTH ARGUMENT.

My brother thinks I am like the man referred to in the 32d of Job. Yes, I am in one respect. He was disgusted at his opponents because "they found no answer" to him; and I am disgusted with mine because he cannot put up any answer to my argument, but tries to write poetry in reply, thus convincing the reader that

"He is as much a poet, As a sheep is a go-et."

But we must praise him for his effort to counteract the "stink bag of the polecat," by uncorking his bottle of delightful cologne and uncapping his alabaster box of spikenard, thus ravishing our souls with such an entrancing flood of sweetness as is in the following very mellow expressions: "Blind dog in a yellow jackets' nest; raise more demons within you than possessed the body of the magdalen; windy braggart, Wild Bill of the West; and stink bag of a polecat," etc. Reader, do you not see what caused this profuse flow of sweet-smelling savor and soul-stirring rhyme to gush out of this fount of sweetness and melody? If you do not, we will inform you that we drew it out by tapping the Ray-Burnett debate; and showing that T. R. Burnett is not a consistent, but a very inconsistent teacher. We also showed that his right bower (D. Lipscomb) in this game of theological eucher, is as inconsistent, and unfair in playing their flame, as is our present opponent—they are playing a game of "progressive eucher," instead of dealing fairly with the Scriptures, on this question.

We did say, and repeat that, such men are "stiff-necked and hard-headed." Who can say they are not, after seeing how they deny the Scriptures and stultify themselves, by crossing their own teaching? We do not say this because we love them less, but the truth more. He says some of our best friends have told him that I cannot debate without abuse. Yes, my "best friend," Tom Burnett, has said this; but he and these other "friends" know we are often forced into debates with some very hard cases, who strive to pervert God's word and contradict themselves. And I intend that the unprejudiced reader shall see in this discussion that, it is stubbornness, and not sincerity, that causes these men to persist in their opposition to the truth of God for which we are contending.

Brother Burnett denies that Brother Lipscomb had anything to do with getting up this discussion. But in denying this he follows his old habit of making reckless statements about well-established facts. I can produce a copy of the Advocate in which Brother Lipscomb framed the proposition I am affirming, and therein proposed this discussion, He says, I think it "quite awful for the Advocate to pay him fifty dollars for this debate" with me. I confess that it is none of my business what they pay him. He is the one who informed me that they were to hire him to do the work: But while it is none of my business what they pay him, I do think they are paying an "awful" price for such a poor job!

But let us go back to the glaring, irreconcilable work of these posing paragons of consistency and sincerity. He says, I can't be induced to "give him a second thrashing." No, because I intend to do it so thoroughly this time that there will not be enough left of him nor his right bower, to constitute a target for the future! Reader, did you notice how he tried to play the baby act, in reply to what I quoted from him, as found in the Ray-Burnett discussion? In his second reply he accused me of misquoting him from the Ray-Burnett book. But when I repented the quotation, it seems he consulted the book, and saw that he made a false charge against me. And now he says: "That book is the product of my early years in the kingdom of God—some sixteen years ago." Well, if he made that mistake (?) when he was a mere kid, why has he not corrected it since he has become a full-grown goat? The reason he has not is, because he is too hard-headed to correct his mistake (?). He has been selling the book all these "sixteen years," and is still peddling it! Why does he not stop selling it and cease blowing about its merits as being "one of the liveliest debates in America," if it contains mistakes? All! I will tell you why! It is because his attention had never been called to this very palpable inconsistency and double dealing on this question, till I laid it before him in this discussion! He says I promised to "astonish the brethren" in this discussion. Well, if I did, I have fulfilled the promise; for I "astonished" one of the "brethren" when I made that quotation from the Ray-Burnett—I astonished



Brother Tom so badly that he at first pronounced it a misquotation!

But he is so hard-headed that he will not "confess he made a mistake even in his "early years," when he delivered himself of this catcher! In one breath he intimates that it was a mistake of his "early years," but in the very next breath he holds to it and contends that it was no mistake at all! Listen at him, and watch me sprawl him again with his own teaching, He says: "Where I am quoted as saying, succession proves nothing unless it succeeds to the apostles' doctrine and practice, I meant that it proved nothing for Mr. Ray's proposition, viz., 'that the Missionary Baptist Church is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church.' If he proved succession, and yet did not prove identity in doctrine and practice, he lost his proposition. I meant also the apostles' doctrine and practice as an entire system, and did not mean to convey the idea that the Baptists did not have enough of apostolic truth to produce the new birth and translate them into the kingdom of Christ." But now listen at what he says the Baptist system does, and then see if you think he grants them "enough of apostolic truth to produce the new birth and translate them into the kingdom of Christ:" "Do they not to-day wear an unscriptural name, have a human creed, use the anxious seat, relate experiences, confess feelings instead of faith, teach a direct operation of the Spirit, deny that the gospel is the power unto salvation, teach that faith comes by praying and not by hearing, and

many other things contrary to the apostolic doctrine and practice? "How much of "the apostolic truth" does he leave them when he makes this charge against them! He leaves them nothing but a goose pond! Water, Esau, water alone! Will he dare tell us that a system that holds to an unscriptural name, a mourner's bench, a human creed, relates experiences, confesses feelings instead of faith, holds to the doctrine of direct operation of the Spirit, denies that the gospel is the power unto salvation, teaches that faith comes by praying instead of by hearing, and many of far things contrary to the apostolic doctrine and practice, still has enough of "apostolic truth to produce the new birth and translate them into the kingdom of Christ?"

Brother Burnett says all of these things against the Baptists, and Brother Lipscomb says their system "drives God out of the work, and is wholly of men." Yet Brother Lipscomb is paying Brother Burnett "fifty dollars" to sophisticate at me, in an effort to sustain their teaching that Baptists, "who drive God out of the work," are in the kingdom of Christ! Are they not a worthy pair of defenders of "the faith once delivered to the saints?" Where is the man or woman who really loves the truth of God better than he or she does these "hard-headed" friends, who can blame me for charging them with double dealing and insincerity on this question? If they will repent of this bold, presumptuous wickedness, and stand by the truths they have been teaching so many years, we will agree to accord unto them due honor and respect. But until

they do this, we intend to "rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith," or until every candid lover of God's truth shall see that they are unworthy teachers and presumptuous sinners, and are in truth h  
veritable, pretenders! Brother Lipscomb has become so exceedingly mad at . us for catching him in his own contradictory teachings that he has furnished a "Supplement" to the Gospel Advocate, for the sole purpose of having me slandered by those under his influence, and has hired Brother Burnett to suffocate me with sweetness (?) and rhyme (?). But I will forgive him and all of his evil aids, when they repent of their double-dealing tactics with the gospel of Jesus Christ. In Brother Lipscomb's "Commentary on Acts of the Apostles" we find a few statements we wish to copy into this debate, as Brother Burnett in this is doing the job for Brother Lipscomb and the rest of the Advocate Company, for revenue. In commenting upon Acts 2:38, Brother Lipscomb quotes approvingly from several Baptist scholars! One of these says: "Remission of sins' is the end to be aimed at in the actions expressed by the predicates, 'repent' and 'be baptized.'" In thus quoting approvingly what this Baptist author said, Brother Lipscomb makes the language his own. Then, if "remission of sins" is the "end to be aimed at" in repenting and being baptized, when one is baptized with any other "aim," he is baptized with an "aim " contrary to the God-ordained "aim." Hence, as Baptists are baptized with a different "aim" from the one "aim" God has ordained, he

convicts himself again of glaring inconsistency and insincerity, whenever he contends that Baptist baptism is valid. Nothing could be more palpable than this. It is just as much so as saying, "Baptist conversion drives God out of the work, and is wholly of men." Brother Lipscomb says both, and Brother Burnett says he and Brother Lipscomb are a unit on the question. One of these brethren, then, is just as "deep in the mud as the other is in the mire;" and they are both as much so as "the sow that was washed" when she went back to her "wallowing in the mire.". When we quote the things these brethren have taught in defense of gospel truth, and contrast them with the sophistry they are continually vomiting out against us because we want them to stand by the truths they have uttered, and by "the faith once delivered to the saints," it makes them so sick that they vomit all over the reader, as Brother Burnett did in his last speech. But a proverb in the Bible says: "The dog is turned to his own vomit." We are sorry to have to make our brother so sick, but a doctor ought to be willing to take his own medicine when he needs treatment. So we expect to administer several more very bitter doses to Brother Burnett, which he prescribed to his patient, Ray, in the "early years" of his practice!

Again, Brother Lipscomb, in his "Commentary on Acts," (pp. 165, 160), in commenting on Acts 18:8, says: "Here is another example of a whole household that believed in the Lord and were baptized, but it is specifically said that he believed with all his house.

The manner in which the believing and baptizing are here told shows what were taught as conditions of salvation. The results show that it was precisely the same as was taught by Peter on Pentecost and at Samaria and at the house of Cornelius and in all other cases of conversion. The order was uniform." Now we are contending for that "uniform order" of teaching, and he contends, and employs Brother Burnett to contend, that an "order" which is not apostolic, but which he himself says is "wholly of men, and drives God out of the work," brings people into Christ as effectually as the "uniform" apostolic "order." How can we believe he is sincere in such contradictory teaching? If any one can show us how to become that charitable (?) we will try to do so; but we do not know how to do it without help, any more than we would know how to be charitable (?) enough to believe and say a witness in the court, room was sincere, if he should swear in one breath that a certain thing occurred at midnight, and in the next breath should swear it took place at noontide!

But, now, we will pay our respects to the only semblance of an argument Brother Burnett has thus far made. Then we will conclude this by pushing our first and wholly unanswered argument at him again, He complains at us for "shooting the same powder" at him so often. In this complaint he is like B, who challenges A to select his own weapon and meet him in the ring for a fight to the finish. A selects a hickory club and enters the ring, and finds B with a broom

straw in his hand. Well, at it they go, and A hits him on the jaw with his hickory club, and down he brings him, the first stroke. Then B tries to rise to his feet, but is sprawled out with a second lick. The third time B tries to gain his feet, but A hits him another lick with his club and measures the ground with him, and B turns upon his back, and piteously and helplessly cries out: "Please throw away that hickory club and try another. I am tired of it. " But A says: "If you have got enough, say so, and I will let you up; but I can down you so easily with this club, that I would not exchange it for any other stick in all the land." And this is what is the matter with Brother Burnett. He has been daring me into the ring and blowing so much, and his backers have been crowing so lustily, that I don't intend to accommodate him or them with the privilege of choosing my weapons, or proof texts. But I intend to lay it on him with this one that downs him and hurts him so badly! He says I have not "the manhood to come out and acknowledge defeat and stop the debate." He is very anxious for me to "stop the debate," but I shall not do it, but intend to wear his sophistry to a frazzle while I am at the business. He must make up his mind to put up with the "fifty dollars," for that is all he shall have out of this debate! He may try to soothe me with his poetry (?) and his sweet-smelling savors (?), but I don't intend to become charmed by his sweetnesses nor show him any quarters whatever. If he can make an y reputation as a poet while I am at it, he is welcome to it. I am sorry for

him, made on the confession and the faith—that one is equal to the other, and that there can be no more in one than the other—stand like the Pillars of Hercules before ray opponent!" Well, when I run up against things as hard to move as the "Pillars of Hercules," I call in my side partner and have him to help me. He is a regular Samson at such work as this. Do you ask who this side partner is? It is Tommy Burnett. All I have to do when I have a job like this, is to call him in and command him to put his shoulder to the "pillars" and push them down, and they "come down cofilumix!" So, come here, Tommy, this very minute, and overturn these "Pillars of Hercules!" Now listen at them tumble! He says: "The eunuch said, 'What doth hinder mo to be baptized?' Philip said, 'If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest!' The eunuch answered, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' That faith qualified him. Why do we ask that confession when we baptize a person? Is it a confession of faith? If Brother McGary's doctrine is true, we need a new confession. The old confession does not contain his new faith." Brother Tom, do the Baptists make this confession? Listen at his answer: "They confess feelings instead of faith." ("Ray-Burnett," page 9.) So, down come the "Pillars of Hercules," and bury our side partner a mile deep under their mighty, tumbled ruins! And "the dead which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life." So, "Sampson died with the Philistines!" But now to the living. We ask: Why did the eunuch demand baptism when he

came to a certain water? Because Philip had preached "unto him Jesus," and Jesus had said: "He that believeth [the gospel] and is baptized shall be saved." So, as the eunuch desired salvation and had been "taught" and had "learned of the Father," as Jesus I might of the Father and as Philip preached Jesus, he understood and believed that he would be saved through obedience, and not before, as his Baptist clients who "confess feelings instead of faith" believe! But our "dead duck" (or goose) says: "If Brother McGary's doctrine is true, we need a new confession. The old confession does not contain his new faith, He will have to add a codicil to the old confession, and make it read, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that baptism is for the remission of sins!' The confession must be as long as the faith." This sounds extremely silly. It reflects upon the apostolic doctrine and practice with the very same force that it "reflects upon "Brother McGary's doctrine," as "Brother McGary" preaches the same doctrine of remission of sine that the apostles preached, and demands the very same confession the apostles demanded. He baptizes those who "gladly receive" the apostolic doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins and make the same confessions people made under apostolic preaching, which Brother Burnett calls the "old confession." "Brother McGary" does not shake or squeeze any in who have been baptized upon a denial of the apostolic doctrine and upon a "confusion of feelings," as Brother Burnett charges against the Baptists! So, it turns out



that if Brother Burnett's doctrine is correct, he is the one who will "have to add a codicil to the old confession, and make it read, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,'" or that "God for Christ's sake has pardoned my sins." You know, "the confession must be as long as the faith!" and Brother Burnett's "faith" is just that "long," if he is not gaming and joking in insincerity! He says I made a surrender when I said I would affirm what he proposed to affirm. But the candid reader can see that I did no such thing, but that I meant that no man who denies that baptism is for the remission of sins, has genuine faith in Christ; and I repeat this with all the emphasis of my soul! A man cannot have genuine faith in Christ while he is strongly denying the word of God, which teaches that baptism is for the remission of sins. But, now, leaving our Samson helpless under his "Pillars of Hercules," which he threw down upon himself, we will reproduce our argument, which in such a "pillar of fire" against his theory that he has not dared to approach it, and would not try to overthrow it, if he could possibly extricate himself from his strong prison house, into which he fell by his slippery steps.

Jesus says: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard; and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." (John 6:44, 45.) How, coming unto Christ is the very question we are discussing. The final or last

step one takes in coming to Christ is when he steps down into the water to be "baptized into Christ." When he is baptized scripturally, he thus enters into Christ. Our opponent will not deny this. He then, as no man can come to Christ until he hears and learns of the Father, no man can come to the "one baptism" which puts him into Christ, till he hears and learns of the Father. So, to hear and learn of the Father, is to hear and learn of Jesus Christ, and to hear and learn of the apostles of Christ is to hear and learn of Jesus Christ. Therefore, to hear and learn of the apostles is to "hear and learn of the Father." Because Jesus Christ said: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them [the apostles] into the world." Again, he said: "I have given unto them [the apostles:] the words which thou [Father] gavest me." (See John 17:8-18.) Again, he said to his apostles: "Take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what you shall speak. For it is not you that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." Now, then, it is impossible for any unbiased mind to deny that, when the apostles of Jesus Christ began on the day of Pentecost to speak and teach sinners, it was "the spirit of the Father speaking" and teaching through them. To preach Jesus was to teach of the Father. Jesus had told them to begin this teaching at Jerusalem, after they were indued with power from on high. He had told them to preach "repentance and remission of sins." They did so, as we find recorded in Acts 2:38. Here they preached the doctrine for which I

am contending in this debate. There, and then, and forever afterward?, the apostles preached to sinners to enable them to "hear and learn of the Father." Just what they preached is just what God had ordained that sinners should "hear and learn," in order that they might "come to Christ" by being baptized into him. I say that persons cannot come to Christ now till they do thus hear and learn of the Father. I say so because Christ said it. Now why does he not meet this? It proves my proposition as, effectually as God's ever-abiding truth can prove anything! I want no more nor stronger proof, because proof could not be stronger or more thoroughly answer any demand! Those who gladly received the teaching of the Father, delivered through the apostles of Christ, were those who had "heard and learned" it. Hence these, and no others, were baptized by the apostles. Therefore, none save those who now "hear and learn" this same heaven-and-earth-bound system of truth can be baptized by the authority of Jesus Christ! I repeat that my proposition is proven beyond all doubt, and it triumphantly defies all the sophistry of my opponent. He asks: "How much truth shall the sinner know before he can be baptized?" I answer: Just as much as the apostles taught sinners before they baptized them!

I challenge Brother Burnett, and all of his associate perverters of truth—Lipscomb, Harding et al. —to meet this argument. And the challenge will go unmet till the sounding of the last trump! But in our next and last argument we promise to make it still clearer.

## **BURNETT'S FOURTH REPLY.**

It is unpleasant to debate with a man who will not discuss his proposition, and will not answer your arguments, and who continually misrepresents the positions of his opponent, and who is so mad that he is literally beside himself. Every reader of this book knows that Brother McGary set out to affirm the proposition that, "A belief that baptism is for remission of sins is essential to its validity," but he has persistently affirmed another proposition. He has not produced a text that has the word "belief" in it, and hence has not done anything for his proposition. The texts he has produced, containing the words "teach" and "learn" and "know," have been shown to prove nothing for his doctrine, since not one of them says that a sinner must know and know that baptism is for remission of sins before he can be baptized. Remission of sins is God's design of baptism (he being the remitter), and a sinner may therefore be baptized without knowing God's design of the ordinance. Abraham "went out" of his country, "not knowing whither he went," and without knowing all of God's design in the command, yet he obeyed and received the promise. To say that sinners must know this design of baptism, because the apostles taught it to persons before baptism, is to say that the sinner must know everything the apostles preached to unbaptized people. But on the day of Pentecost Peter preached the promise of the "gift of the Holy Ghost," and Brother McGary does not know what that promise means, for

he differs from the best Bible scholars in the land as to the meaning of the "gift." Yet the reception of that gift is one of the designs of baptism. Is Brother McGary therefore still without valid baptism? Peter also preached, "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Yet the apostle himself did not understand the meaning of that language until it was miraculously taught him at Joppa and at the house of Cornelius. So you see it is a mistake that the sinner must understand as much as the apostles taught before baptism. As this is the only point my opponent has made in the entire discussion, I have noticed it fully, though it does not deserve so much attention. I have followed him around in his wild meanderings, not because the rules of debate require it, but in order that he shall not save a pretended point in this whole discussion. As he grows wilder, he grows madder, and as he grows madder, he grows wilder ; and if his friends do not take charge of him, he will do something desperate before the debate is completed! I am tempted to tell him to soak his head in a mud puddle, and drink heavy draughts of Mrs. Soothlow's Winsling Syrup!

My poor fallen brother is so reckless in his assertions, that I commenced to number his astonishing fabrications, but they grew so multitudinous that I stopped counting. For instance, he said that I misdirected my second speech to Midway, Miss. That is Fib No. 1. He said I refused to debate

with him , unless he would lead. That is Fib No. 2. He said I would not affirm m y teaching and practice. That is Fib No. 3. He said David Lipscomb hired me to do this debating in his place. That is Fib No. 4. He said David Lipscomb "fixed up" the proposition. That is Fib No. 5. He said I agreed with Brother Lipscomb that the Baptist doctrine drives God out, when I had never expressed an opinion on the subject. That is Fib No. 6. He said I charged him with "misquoting" my book, when I said he misrepresented it. That is Fib No. 7. He said the Baptists do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. That is Fib No. 8 1 All these, and many more, in one speech! Is it any wonder that a man of such linguistic turpitude should conclude that a Baptist has not been'born again! And would not a pious, honest-hearted Baptist be greatly benefitted by a second washing at the hands of this Austin saint! If I were Brother McGary, and the grace of God were incompetent to regenerate my mouth, I would take it to a blacksmith shop and have it upset!

He says I answer his argument with poetry, and he thinks I am As much a poet As a sheep is a goat.

Well, he is neither a poet nor a debater. He gives us two lines, and he stole that from a book! But he said over at Dallas that Brother Burnett was a splendid poet A change has come over the spirit of his dream. No wonder he does not like that goatish poetry. It has butted his whole rebaptism crew into the "bloody chasm," at the birth of Alex. Campbell, when there was no church, and has piled on top of them the

prophetic statements of old Daniel, until they never can get out again! He says David Lipscomb has hired me to suffocate him with rhyme. Well, he is about suffocated! From the short gasps he is making, his breath is about gone! But why don't he answer the poetry? If his church line is longer than threescore and ten years, why doesn't he show it? If the devil's goats did not set up the church that he belongs to, why doesn't he show it? If his church did not commence at New Lisbon, O., instead of a t Jerusalem, why does he not tell us about it? His brethren are holding their breath in direful suspense, waiting for their champion to run a. line of succession from Austin, Texas, to Jerusalem without passing through that Baptist goat pen, and if he will only run the line he will be the "chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely!" But he will not touch it! I will stake the whole question on the points made in that poetry. He says a doctor ought to take his own medicine. Why doesn't Dr. McGary take his own medicine on church destruction? His doctrine says the church was dead when Alex . Campbell was born, and Brother Jehu Chism (one of his lieutenants). says he is ready to stand by the doctrine. But Dr. McGary will not do it. He knows the moment he swallows that dose, he will be eternally salivated! But he might as well take it, for I am going to hold his nose and put it down him! I dare him to accept the logic of his doctrine, and say with Brother Chism that the church was dead! And I dare him to say the church was not dead, and try to show its location!

He will do neither. He is as dumb as a stump in the presence of that bold challenge. Like the man that did not have on the wedding garment, he is "speechless!" He would rather talk about blacksnake whips, and hickory clubs, than meet the square issues of this debate. I have heard of the Irish shellalah, and how the Pat Murphys and Mike Malloys and Mickey McGarys could wield it, but this wild Irishman of Austin might as well be armed with a broom straw! Can anybody see any execution he has done? Be jabbers, he is not sthrong, but he's nawsty!

He says I helped him overturn the "Pillars of Hercules," when I said Baptists "confess feelings instead of faith." Let us see. When a Baptist says he "feels that God for Christ's sake has pardoned his sins," does he not in that statement show that he has faith in God and in Christ, and that he believes that it is by the merits of Christ that sins are pardoned? If so, does it not embrace a confession of faith in Christ? And since all Baptists affirm that they do have faith in Christ (see my second speech), and are baptized to obey God, and since Brother McGary says he will affirm that all such Baptists receive valid baptism, I prove that Brother McGary will accept all such Baptists despite the crookedness of their confession! But he says the eunuch must have believed that baptism was for remission of sins, because Philip certainly taught that doctrine. Admit it, and yet it does not touch the point I made on the confession. If Philip taught that Jesus was the Son of God, and that baptism



was for remission of sins, and both were constituent parts of the faith that qualifies for baptism, why was one put into the confession and the other left out? Why was the eunuch not required to confess both parts of the faith? Why does Brother McGary, and all Christian preachers, ask a confession of faith in Christ, and not a confession that baptism is for remission of sins, when a person demands baptism? All, the reason is, that faith in Christ is essential, and faith in a design of baptism is not. Brother McGary's own practice contradicts his doctrine. The confession contains the faith, but it does not contain the belief that baptism is for remission of sins, hence that is not a part of the faith. If it is as essential to believe that baptism is for remission, as to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, it is just as essential to have it in the confession. Hence that codicil that some of his brethren have added to the old confession! So you see the "Pillars of Hercules" are still standing Brother McGary went fooling around the Pillars, and some particles of rubbish fell off upon his little head and so addled him that he thought the entire superstructure had come down with a crash, and that Samson was in the wreck! Tut, tut, tut!!!

He seems to be exceedingly mad against David Lipscomb. It appears that David has been printing a certain Supplement, in which Brother McGary cuts a large figure. My understanding of the Supplement is, that it had nothing to do with doctrinal delinquency, but with moral and financial crookedness. It has no business in this discussion, and it is unfortunate that

the brother has lugged it in. My advice is that he drop it at once, and attend to the matters pertinent to this debate. As to Brother Lipscomb's statement that Baptist doctrine drives God out, it is equally foreign to the issue before us. All honest and fair-minded readers know that Brother Lipscomb had reference to the Baptist "theory" of conversion, and did not mean to convey the idea that Baptists are not in reality converted by God. He believes that faith is produced in their hearts by the word of God (despite their cumbersome theory), and that faith leads to baptism in obedience to God's command, and Brother McGary says all such Baptists are validly baptized. Every reader of this book can understand Brother Lipscomb's language, except A. McGary, and he has a call just now to put a false construction upon the words, and misrepresent and strike the man that is not here to defend himself. But he says that Brother Lipscomb said in his "Commentary" that remission is the end to be aimed at in baptism. Yes, but as there are several designs of baptism, or several ends to be aimed at, if a sinner aims at any scriptural design of baptism and reaches it, he will reach all the ends of baptism, and receive all the promises that belong to the ordinance. Did Brother McGary aim at all the ends of baptism when he was baptized? I am prepared to show that there are two designs of baptism which he does not understand at the present day!

I have charged that Brother McGary has a new form of doctrine, and new obedience of the form, but he will

not meet me on this point. Paul says the doctrine or gospel is the death and burial and resurrection of Christ. Obedience to that is to die to sin, be buried in baptism, and rise to a new life. The Baptists that we receive die to sin, are buried in baptism, and rise to a new life. Hence, they obey the form of doctrine, and are made free from sin. They also have the new birth, or are born again. What is the new birth? It is to believe in Christ and he baptized "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." Baptists say they believe that Jesus is the Christ (see my second speech), hence they are begotten of God. Baptism is the birth, and we know they are baptized, hence they are born. A child that is both begotten and born is certainly in the family. Brother McGary says all Baptists who believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and are baptized to obey God, receive valid baptism. Hence, I prove by Brother McGary that Baptists are born again, and are in God's family!

It is well that I held that debate with Dr. Ray, and that Brother McGary has a copy of it. If it were not for that book, and what Brother Lipscomb said about the Baptist doctrine driving God out, my valorous opponent would be entirely out of soap. He could not fill up his part of this book. So you need not think hard of him, gentle reader; it is the best he can do. But he is grievously mistaken when he says I plead the baby act about that debate, and ought to correct it. There is nothing to correct, and nothing in conflict with what I hold to-day, although the book was made sixteen years

ago. He has not found a word in that volume that intimates that such Baptists as we receive to fellowship are not in the kingdom of God. He asks how much of the "apostles' truth" do I leave them, after recounting their errors? I will tell him. I leave them faith in Christ as the Son of God, repentance of sin, and baptism to obey God; and as Brother McGary says all such Baptists have valid baptism, I leave notice: Why do you set up one design of baptism (and that God's design), and say that a sinner must understand that design before he can be baptized, but may misunderstand other designs of baptism and yet receive valid baptism? I have already demonstrated that there is one important design of baptism that Brother McGary does not understand to-day, viz., being baptized into Christ. He said Alex. Campbell was baptized into Christ, but not into the church of Christ, when every Bible scholar knows that to be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into his body or church. So, if Brother McGary's doctrine be true, he is yet unbaptized, for he does not understand that design of baptism, although he has been dipped two or three times! But I affirm that if sinners are moved to baptism by any one scriptural motive, they are scripturally baptized, and receive all that belongs to the ordinance; and I deny that the validity of baptism depends upon the knowledge of all the designs, or upon faith in God's design. Brother McGary was in a tight place, and had to deny that Campbell was baptized into the church. How could he be baptized into the church,

when there was no church? Brother Jehu Chism says he was baptized into the "economy" of Christ—whatever that is! It was fortunate for old Brother Campbell that there was an "economy" at hand for him to get into, for according to these wild exegetes there was no church on earth at that time. Brother McGary says that Campbell traveled in "a straight gospel line till he got there" (into the church), "after he left the Baptists." But he does not inform us what steps he made in traveling that straight gospel line—"till he got there!" They were not the steps of faith and repentance and baptism, for he made those steps before he left the Baptists. Perhaps he did not step at all, but only swam across that "bloody chasm," from the "goat pen" to New Lisbon, where Wm. Amend was the "chief corner stone," and they "shook him in " after he got there! Say, Brother McGary, lay aside your black-snake whips and hickory clubs and bombastic lingo, and let us have a little debate along here. No doubt your long-faced followers are growing exceedingly anxious for you to bridge that "bloody chasm," so that they can walk along the highway that leadeth toward Jerusalem a little further than New Lisbon, Ohio! O Pentecost! "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence!" Besides, there is a bad-smelling goat pen, the smoke of which ascendeth upward forever and ever!! Brother McGary has been "suffocated with rhyme," and smothered to death with the odors from the

"devil's goat pen," out of which his church originated, and he and all his deluded followers are now entombed in the "bloody chasm" that lieth just east of Brush Run, Pa.! So nil we have to do is to write a funeral ode, and prepare an epitaph.

Here's Jackson, Jones, and Charlie Nichol, And Weeping Joe, in the sad pickle, And Durst and Strode and Tant and Chism, Who pushed along the mighty schism, And Wm. Gibbs (who lost his hell). And other names I know full well; McGary, Swinney, McIntire (Who struck the match that made the fire), And Warlick, Holt, and Jack McCarty, All mighty chiefs of our great party, Of flaming zeal and enthusiasm— All buried in the bloody chasm! While Burnett views the landscape o'er, And holds the truth as held before, But drops a tear in their behalf, And pens this solemn epitaph.

### ***EPITAPH.***

Here lies the last of poor old Hob, He undertook too big a job, He tried to kick the Baptists out, And that's what brought his end about! For then he could no further go Than Campbell's day, and could not show A church or people in the line That understood the "one design." The question true he could not meet, Though many times it did repeat, At noon and night and early morn, "Where was the church when C. was born?" Not one of all the hobby preachers, The squallers, shriekers, screamers, screechers, The whackers, clackers, howlers, hooters, The pugilistic spikes

and'sputers, The ranters, canters and cavorters, The  
pounders, sounders and exhorters, Could be induced to  
toll or say Where was the church in Campbell's day!  
So here is where the Hob went down, And broke his  
back and lost his crown, Fell in the chasm deep and  
wide, And now lies buried'neath the tide! Here let his  
carcass rest in peace, And all the churches have release  
From schism, strife and agitation, That lead to dearth  
and desolation! Ho, every Adam's son and daughter,  
Who makes an idol of the water, Come back into the  
good old way That leads to heaven and endless day.

I ask Brother McGary where was the church when  
Alex. Campbell was born? He says it was with those  
people who had the "apostolic doctrine?" Where were  
those people who had the "apostolic doctrine?" He  
says they were with the church! But where were the  
people and the church? All, he will not name the  
location! He reminds me of the old negro, when his  
master asked him where the hoe was. "It is wid de  
rake." "Where is the rake?" "It is wid de hoe." "Well,  
where is the hoe and the rake?" "Dey is togedder, sah!"  
I ask Brother McGary to name one member of the  
church of Christ on earth a hundred years ago! I ask  
him to put his finger down on any location in the  
world, and say, "The church was in this place when  
Alex. Campbell was born." If the church was not with  
the immersed believers one hundred years ago, it  
certainly was not with the sprinkled bodies, such as the  
Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and [Methodist?].  
Where was it, then? Daniel says: "In the days of these

kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all those kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." (Dan. 2:44.) Did Daniel tell the truth? In the seventh chapter he says: "His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Did Daniel tell a falsehood? In Luke 1:33, the angel said to Mary: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." The rebaptism theory says the kingdom came to an end, and was destroyed, when a certain design of baptism was lost! If you accept the rebaptism theory, you have to reject the statements of Daniel and the angel, and say that they prophesied falsely! Which will you follow? All, beloved, the schismatics of Texas, who are sowing discord among brethren with a nonsensical theory that flatly contradicts the plain prophetic statements of the Scriptures, should repent in sackcloth and ashes! They should weep and howl over their great sin of charging that the angel that appeared to Mary was a blatant liar, and that old Daniel was a fake prophet that wrote a book full of falsehoods! The advocates of Brother McGary's theory sometimes try to "whip the devil around the stump," and save both the prophecy and their doctrine, by saying that the seed of the kingdom (the word of God) remained, and that the kingdom existed in embryo in the seed, and was not destroyed. That might do if it filled the Bible



statement. Did Daniel say, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, the seed of which shall never be destroyed?" No, beloved, he did not say that, and it will not do to palm off such an untruthful utterance as the prophecy of Daniel. It was the kingdom itself, and not the seed, that Daniel said should never be destroyed. But suppose the kingdom was destroyed, as your doctrine requires you to affirm, but the seed remained? How came the seed to be planted, and another crop of Christians to grow up on earth? The devil's goats at old Brush Run (the Baptists of Campbell's day) put in the seed and made the crop, and you are a part of the devil's crop! Is not that a nice predicament? The God of heaven was dependent upon the devil and his children to establish the church of Christ on earth! About this time I imagine some rebaptist scribe is beginning to scratch his head, and repeat Hymn No. 3 in the rebaptist hymn book:

"Here's a new thing beneath the sun! The devil's goats at old Brush Run Put in the seed and made a crop Of Christian saints! But here I'll stop! For when we sing Amazing Grace, And our succession line would trace, Sure as the world, if my head's level, Our church comes direct from the devil!"

As black a picture as the foregoing facts and arguments draw around the rebaptism theory, my astonishing friend at Austin cannot frame words bitter enough to express his hatred for David Lipscomb and T. R. Burnett because they will not lay aside every vestige of common sense and Bible knowledge they

ever had, and mount his blind hobby and ride it  
recklessly over the peaceful churches of Jesus Christ!  
Wonderful man! Astonishing effrontery!

## M'GARY'S FIFTH ARGUMENT.

It is enough to provoke a regular horselaugh for Brother Burnett to speak about a man misrepresenting the positions of his opponent! Does he not know that every candid reader will know that he did just this thing when he said I said, "Alexander Campbell was baptized into Christ, but not into the church of Christ?" He knows I never said such a thing in my life! But time and space would fail me if I should undertake to notice all of his misrepresentations.

He persists in saying I have affirmed a different proposition from the one I started out to affirm. He says I have not produced a text that has the word "belief" in it! Have I not produced, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" And then, when I produce such texts as, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31, 32), what right has he to complain? Could they "know the truth" without believing the truth?

I can see that he is intending to take the position in his last speech that baptism is not included in the gospel. But I want the reader to remember that Paul

says we are saved by the gospel, and that we are saved by the "washing of regeneration." (See Titus 3:5.) Peter also says: "Baptism doth also now save us." (1Pet. 3:21.) Hence the man who tries to make an apostle teach that baptism is not a part of the gospel, tries to make an apostle contradict himself. Such an

effort amounts to a deceitful handling of the word of God. Remember this, reader, when he tries to narrow the "gospel" down to the three facts of Christ's death, burial, and resumption.

But I repeat my argument on John 6:44, 45, which he has not, and cannot, possibly meet. He says I am "shooting my old powder" when I repeat this argument. It is worse than "powder" to his theory; it is more like gun cotton, for it blows his theory, and the little Baptist raft upon which he has tried to float it, sky-high, and leaves him nothing but blubbers on his sea of speculation.

When Jesus teaches that none can come to him except those who hear and learn of the Father (John 6:44, 45), he teaches that none can be baptized by his authority save those who have heard and learned of the Father. Those who come to Christ come through baptism, for they are "baptized into Christ." Hence, all that must be heard and learned of the Father in order to come to Christ, must be heard and learned of the Father in order to come, scripturally, to baptism. Now we repeat that this teaching of the Father does not come to man independent of means. The means through which it comes is Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the apostles. Jesus said: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." (John 7:10.) Again, he said: "I have given unto them [the apostles] the words which thou [Father] gavest me." And: "As thou [Father] hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them [the apostles] into the world." (John 17:18.) He had

promised his apostles that they should receive the Holy Spirit to guide them in their teaching, and he told them where to tarry for this promise. He told them to go and "teach all nations, baptizing them." (Matt. 28:19.)

When they did this they were teaching the word that God the Father gave to Christ, and that Christ gave to them. Now where is the man who has any reverence for God's word, who will deny that the very teaching they began to do at Jerusalem is the very same teaching of the Father that all must "hear and learn" in order to come to Christ, and therefore in order to scriptural baptism, which puts people into Christ? Such a man cannot be found in all the world among honest, candid believers of the Scriptures, So, if we can find what the apostles taught to sinners before they came to Christ or were baptized, we will, in finding it, find just what sinners must "hear and learn of the Father" before they can come to baptism by the Lord's authority. This we find in the instruction of Peter to the inquirers on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection. Brother Burnett could as easily beat down Gibraltar with a feather pillow as he could meet me on this proposition. If the apostles were teaching what God the Father gave to Christ and Christ gave to them, when they commanded sinners to "repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," then sinners must believe that baptism is for the remission of sins before they can be baptized by Christ's authority, and

my proposition is established without another word and beyond all question.

Now, as before stated, no one could tell from Matt. 28:19, which says, "Go... teach all nations, baptizing them," etc., what was to be taught nor what was taught; hence we need to examine Mark 16:15, 16, to see what was to be taught and what was taught. This passage says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Here we learn that something called "the gospel" is to be preached and is to be "believed," or is to be "heard and learned." But as there might be room for speculation and disagreement about the meaning of the term "gospel," we need additional light, which we get in Luke 24:40, 47, which, says: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day [this suffering and rising embraces the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ]: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Now then, we have seen from Mark 16:15, 16, that they were to "preach the gospel," and here we see they were to "preach repentance and remission of sins" in Christ's name. Then "repentance and remission of sins" was part of the gospel they were to preach, and did preach, and they were to "believe" it. So Peter did preach the suffering and resurrection of Christ, and repentance and remission of sins in Christ's name. And they believed it, or "gladly received his words and were

baptized." The people on the day of Pentecost, whom Peter baptized, heard and believed what my proposition says sinners must hear and believe in order to baptism. They heard and learned of the Father and then came to Christ through baptism. Their "coming to Christ" was the result of what they "learned." What they "learned" was the result of what they heard Peter preach. What Peter preached was what the Father gave to Christ and what Christ gave to the apostles, and what the Holy Spirit guided them to preach or teach.

It is pure speculation on the part of my opponent when he says that persons may come to Christ upon less information than the three thousand came on the day of Pentecost! My proposition is in perfect harmony with what came from God the Father to Christ, and from Christ and the Holy Spirit to the apostles. And I have examples, all through Acts of the Apostles, of sinners hearing and believing it, and my opponent has neither precept nor example for what he teaches on the question. But again, our Lord commanded that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name." Peter says: "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4:12.) Peter also says: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) Remember, Christ has said that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations [not one nation], beginning at Jerusalem." Therefore, just as Peter

preached it on Pentecost it must be preached among all nations, till Christ comes. Believing in the name of Christ is a scriptural requirement. Remission of sins is inseparably connected with the name of Christ, and must be preached and believed just as it is connected. In Acts 8:12, we learn that when they "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." My opponent argues that they need not believe "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ," to qualify them for baptism, but that they are qualified as soon as they believe Jesus is the Christ, even though they reject all other things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, Heb. 11:6 informs us that he that comes to God "must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of proportion, and am perfectly willing to abide the decision of all fair-minded, unbiased readers. Now we come to utter destruction for my opponent.

The reader will remember what he called the "Pillars of Hercules," which I made him push down with his own hands. But he says the "pillars" are still standing and that he is untouched. We did not expect him to admit that he was hurt, but we will show the reader that he is ruined without remedy. If a man should knock Tom Burnett down and pound his hard head to a pulp and kick him all over a ten-acre field, he would crawl off and vow he had not been touched! But we will see if he is out from under his sprawled pillars.



He said that when the eunuch confessed that he believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, it qualified him for baptism. This is what he called his "Pillars of Hercules." But when I asked him if the Baptists made this qualifying confession, and made him answer the question from his debate with Mr. Ray, as found on page 9, where he says they "confess feelings instead of faith," he saw that his "Pillars of Hercules" were built of broken broom straws! But he came back with this question to me: "When a Baptist says he feels that God for Christ's sake has pardoned his sins, does he not in that statement show that he has faith in God and in Christ?" Now, he knows he has trapped himself and is tangled up in the meshes of his own sophistry, but he asks me this question with the very slim hope that I will open a way of escape for him; but I shall not, but shall make him pull the trigger of his own deadfall with his own tricky hand, by handing the question back to him to answer from the Ray-Burnett debate: Do Baptists confess, their faith in God and in Christ by that confession of their feelings? Listen at his answer: "No, sir. In this country they relate a dream, a vision, or tell how they feel, or how they did feel when they fancied that God by a direct operation of his Spirit washed away their sins. This is the kind of 'experience' that Christian people tell Baptists is not in accordance with New Testament teaching. In apostolic day, sinners confessed their faith in Christ, not their dreams or feelings, and were baptized on this confession. There is no account that

any one ever confessed his love, as a qualification for baptism, as Dr. Ray says Baptists now do. Will the gentleman please give us an example of this kind? In ancient times baptism itself was the confession of love. The Baptists have their experience in the wrong place also. Paul assigns it to the Christian life. He says: 'Tribulation worketh experience.' In this the Baptists have departed from the apostolic model." ("Ray-Burnett Debate," pp. 27, 28.) Is he not a glib witness against himself? He has treated us to a little work of supererogation. We don't need half he has given us to convict him. He has already stated on page 9, "Ray-Burnett Debate," that the Baptists confess "feelings instead of faith"—remember, instead, instead, INSTEAD of faith! Now, is not this hired champion debater of the Advocate family in the middle of a bad fix—in a strait betwixt two contradictory statements of his own mouth? To use his own chaste expression, has he not opened his mouth and put his foot in it? But the end of his inconsistencies is not yet. Lest he should again say the "Pillars of Hercules" are still standing and that he has not been touched, we will hear him speak some more from the Ray-Burnett debate, which he calls the "liveliest debate in America." We intend to help him prove that it is "lively," entirely too lively for him under the stress of present environments.

On page 109, "Ray-Burnett Debate," he says: "Baptists differ from us as they differ from the New Testament. They have an unscriptural name, creed,

language, organization, government, and communion; confess feelings instead of faith [*Italics mine*], have displaced baptism from its position in the Christian system and put the mourning bench therein, preach a direct operation of the Spirit not through the truth as the power that converts, deny the doctrine of salvation through faith, and belong to a church that is unknown to the New Testament. We differ from them on all these points." Yet he is arguing in this debate with me that there is really no essential difference between all of the differences! I wonder if he thinks it is possible for him to escape conviction of the charge of insincerity I have made against him? He certainly will not escape this conviction in the sight of one unbiased reader! Listen at him taunt Mr. Ray and the Baptists generally: "When Peter commanded the Pentecostians to be baptized for the remission of sins, it must be understood that he did not mean what he said—that there was no remission promised—but that the apostle was only talking in a figure. Is not this a ridiculous perversion of Peter's language? If Peter meant what he said, when he commanded baptism for the remission of sins, he taught the doctrine of devils! but if he did not mean what he said and there was no remission of sins, then he taught Baptist doctrine. Mr. Ray's ridiculous perversions are doubtless from the devil." ("Ray-Burnett Debate," page 109.) "Tut, tut, tut!" But listen again at this attorney hired to prove that the Baptists are in the kingdom of Christ: "They do not rise with Christ in baptism, for they claim that they

rise before they are baptized." (Page 113.) Is he not a bright specimen of consistency and sincerity? Again, he says: "Christ places salvation after baptism, and says, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Baptists invert this order, and say, 'He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized.' They do not teach the doctrine of Christ, but call it Campbellism." (Page 108.) "Would not a pious-hearted Baptist be greatly benefitted" by shaking hands with this broken-necked theological acrobat of Dallas!

On page 105, "Ray-Burnett," he says: "They refuse to wear the name of Christ, will not call their church after him, denounce his commission as Romanism and the doctrine of devils, and take the thief on the cross as their model of conversion. This is the way they expel Christ from their kingdom."

He thinks the "thief on the cross" is a good "model of conversion," or pretends to think so, when he debates this question with me! And their expelling Christ from their kingdom makes no difference, if they will only be ducked and let him shake them!

He says they expel Christ from their kingdom, and Brother Lipscomb says they "drive God out of the work," yet Brother Lipscomb hires him to argue that they have become Christians and children of God, by believing and obeying a doctrine that "expels Christ" and "drives God out!!!" Brother Burnett says I attack Brother Lipscomb because he is not "here to defend himself." But I attack him because his "hired" man is "here" and paid fifty dollars to defend their position.

But Brother Lipscomb was "here" once, with every means of defense save the ability and possibility of defense. To m Burnett will not be "here" next time, not as long as the Ray

Burnett debate is as "lively" as it now is! He says I ought to take my mouth to "a blacksmith shop and have it upset." I have taken my argument to his shop and find that he cannot "upset" it, but upset his own "Pillars of Hercules " trying to.

He call ls on me to answer the points in his poetry (?) which he call s "goatish poetry." This is a slander on both spiritual and literal "goats." And I think too much of the good old foxhounds I used to own to call it doggerel, or even puppy-rel. Hence, I shall call it the ravings of Blind Tom, or Tom foolery.

He sa ys: "I ask Brother McGary where was the church when Alex . Campbell was born? He says it was with those people who had the apostolic doctrine.

'Where were those people who had the apostolic doctrine?' He says they were with the church! But where were the people and the church? All, he will not name the location! He reminds me of the old negro, when his master asked him where the hoe was.

'It is wid de rake.' Where is the rake?' 'It is wid de hoe.' Well, where is the hoe and the rake?' 'Dey is togedder, sah.'" Now, when it comes to "niggerin'" I am sure the reader will say Brother Burnett can beat me out of sight! I will try him. On page 15 of "Ray-Burnett Debate" he says: "Succession prove s nothing

unless it succeeds to the apostles' doctrine and practice." This amounts to the same thing I said to him when he asked me where the church was when Alex. Campbell was born. But he tries to "nigger" out of it when I get after him, about as follows: Where was the church when Alex. Campbell was born, Brother Burnett? "It was with the Baptists." Where were the Baptists? "They were with the church." Well, where were the Baptists and the church? "They were together, say, with Alex. Campbell in the middle and at both ends of it " But where

was "the apostles' doctrine and practice" at that time? "Dar won't none deny, say, but just water to save. (Dan. 2:44.)"

That boatman who found a dead negro and a dead catfish on the sand bar, the negro fastened to one end of the line and the catfish at the other, could not tell after all his "thinkin' and figgerin'", whether the nigger a-fishing had gone, or the fish had gone a-niggerin'." But Brother Burnett's case does not perplex me that way. I know just how it is: he has gone to "niggerin'" in one case; and in the other he plays both nigger and catfish, for he is dead at both ends of the line! He says "succession proves nothing unless it succeeds to the apostles' doctrine and practice." Then he denies that the Baptists ever had this doctrine and practice! Then he says if we deny that the Baptists are in the kingdom, that denial makes Daniel out to be a false prophet! He says the Baptists "do not rise with Christ in baptism," yet he teaches that they are scripturally baptized! Says

the Baptists "expel Christ from their kingdom," yet they are in the kingdom of Christ! Says the Baptists "do not teach the doctrine of Christ, but call it Campbellism," yet contends that their baptism is the "one baptism" ordained of God, and that when they baptize persons upon their doctrine, which is not Christ's, they are born of water and of the Spirit! He says: "When Baptists baptize there must be a church present and an experience related and a vote taken! But Mr. Bay says Baptists plant in the picture of Christ's death. They do not. They spoil the picture." ("Ray-Burnett'," page 72.)

We ask him the same pertinent question he asked Mr. Ray: "Why does the man talk in this silly style, if he is not clean, stark crazy?" He certainly does write like a crazy man. He has sophisticated and

perverted and somersaulted till he has lost his debating powers and has become so weak and contradictory that he cannot even interest us. Listen at one of his "points." "Remission of sins is God's design of baptism (he being the remitter), and a sinner may therefore be baptized without knowing God's design of the ordinance." IS that not logical and conclusive? Because it is God's design and God is the remitter man need not understand it! This sounds like, if it were man's design people would have to understand it. Then he brings the ease of Abraham going in obedience to God's call, "not knowing whither he went." Abraham did not know because God, did not tell him, but God does tell the sinner what baptism is for. He says I don't

know one of the designs of baptism, that I don't know what the gift of the Spirit is. But I do know that it is a promise that follows baptism and does not precede it. If God had told us what the gift of the Spirit is, as plainly as he has told what baptism is for, I know I would understand what it is as well as I now understand that it was to follow baptism. In Brother Burnett's last speech he says the Baptists "die to sin, are buried in baptism and rise to a new life." But on page 113 , "Ray-Burnett Debate," he says: "They do not rise with Christ in baptism. " Here we leave our theological scapegrace transfixed upon the rugged cross of his own making, with his "Pillars of Hercules" piled upon him, trying to nigger out of the most conglomerate mess of inconsistency, self-contradiction, and evident insincerity that ever emanated from any man. These things have stripped him, whipped him, hummed him, and condemned him. Our heart's desire and prayer to God is that he may become sincere enough to repent.

#### BURNETT'S FIFTH REPLY.

The reader now has all that Brother McGary can say for his unscriptural doctrine in five long speeches. He retained my last speech five long weeks , and when at last he sends forth his reply, what does it contain. Apart from his usual brag and bombast, and the numerous quotations from the "Ray-Burnett Debate," there is nothing in it. If he had not had a copy of my little hook to quote from and pervert, he never could



have gotten through this debate. He ran out of soap the second speech, and has not made a new point since, He has shot that same old powder till it will not make a flash in the pan. Instead of sinking. my "Baptist craft" (as he calls it), all of his shots have fallen short . Like the Spanish gunners, his aim has been bad. Not one of his texts has reached his proposition, for not one of them contains the word "belief" as applied to a design of baptism. Besides, mine is not a Baptist craft, but the Old Ship of Zion that was launched from Jerusalem more than eighteen hundred years ago. McGary & Co. say the old ship was lost in the dark ages, and they fitted out a little new craft and launched it instead of the old ship, but it sailed only a short distance till it struck a rock called the "goat pen," and there it was wrecked. At last accounts it was lying bottom upwards in the "bloody chasm" off Brush Run point! It was a Romish and Baptist craft, too, for it sailed under water colors (faith in water), and the bosses of the ship held a "coroner' s inquest" upon every passenger that tried to sail with them!

My opponent has made but one point in the whole debate, and although I have refuted that point more than one time already, I will refute it again in this last speech. He affirms that as the apostles taught bap

tism for remission of sins, a person cannot come to Christ without knowin g and believing that doctrine. But that logic will require us to hold that a person must know all that the apostles taught before he can be baptized. It has boon shown that the apostles taught

things that Brother McGary does not yet understand, and if his logic be true, he is himself without valid baptism, and there has never been a baptized person on earth! Does Brother McGary know that his converts know all that the apostles taught? How can he know, unless he asks them? Why does he ask about their faith in Christ, and not about their faith in the other things preached by the apostles, especially the design of baptism? All, beloved, your own practice contradicts your false theory! You will have to stop preaching "faith in design," or add that codicil to the confession! The only case in the New Testament where the question was brought to an actual test, as to what faith is necessary to baptism, settles the matter against my opponent. See Acts 8:37. Brother McGary says I ought to have a codicil, too, containing the "Baptist experience," Not at all. I do not teach that the "experience" is necessary to baptism, or leads to baptism, therefore have no use for the codicil. But he teaches that faith in a design of baptism is essential to baptism, therefore he must have it in the confession. To know that our converts understand all that the apostles taught, we must state it to them item by item and expound it by order unto them, and see that they answer every item correctly. What preacher does this? I array the practice of every preacher in Christendom against the false logic of my opponent. the proposition that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God" is the central sun of the whole system of divine truth, and when a person accepts the central idea, he accepts the whole system,

but he does not have to understand every jot and tittle of it before he can be baptized. To learn how much knowledge (and faith) are prerequisite to baptism, we must be guided by the divine record. That record draws the line at faith in Christ as the Son of God (Acts 8:37), and not at "a belief that baptism is for remission of sins." Brother McGary goes beyond the record, and goes where there is no scriptural proof to sustain him. His arrogant pretense that he is in harmony with the preaching and practice of the apostolic age is the merest bosh, He is out of harmony with the only case in Acts of Apostles where the question was brought to an actual test. He thinks the eunuch had faith in the design of baptism. But that does not help the matter at all. If faith in Christ and faith in a design of baptism were both essential to valid baptism, why was one put in the confession and the other left out? This is one of the "Pillars of Hercules," which Brother McGary thought he had thrown down, but the intelligent reader can see that it has not been shaken. He simply butted his brains out against it.

How did he meet my argument on the confession—that the confession must contain the faith, and if all the faith is not in the confession, it is not a confession of faith? He did not meet it at all. He simply gave a quotation from my book, to show that Baptists "confess feelings instead of faith." I meant by that statement that Baptists do not confess simple faith. Their confession embraces faith, but it embraces more than faith, and is not simply a confession of faith. Baptists

all have faith in Christ (see my second speech), and are baptized to obey God, and as Brother McGary says all such persons receive valid baptism, I prove by McGary that Baptists are all right despite their crooked confession! No, my dear, the "Pillars of Hercules" are still standing.

It is rather painful to take the last crumb of comfort away from the poor suffering brother, but I am forced to do it in this instance, He has nothing left but the quotations from my book, and now they must go. If he would stop his wild raving and high bucking long enough to take a calm look at the matter, he would see that in that discussion I was criticising the Baptist "theory," which no man can obey. For instance, the theory says repentance precedes faith, but we know a sinner cannot repent until he has faith. Shall we be so reckless as to say that no Baptist ever did repent, because his "theory" places repentance before faith? All my statements about Baptist errors are about the errors of their "theory," and not about their actual obedience to God's commandments. And since their errors do not produce baptism, they do not invalidate the baptism that is produced by faith in Christ. This point my opponent has never tried to meet. He is as shy of it as he would be of a ghost in a graveyard. It is another Pillar of Hercules, against which all the rebaptism champions on earth might butt out their brains, but never shake it from its solid base. Look at it right carefully, for it is the key to the whole situation. THE BAPTISM of BAPTISTS IS NOT PRODUCED

BY THE ERRORS OF THE BAPTIST THEORY,  
BUT BY THE FAITH WHICH BAPTISTS HAVE IN  
JESUS CHRIST, despite their theory, hence the errors  
of the theory do not invalidate their baptism! Do you  
hear that? I will sound it in his deaf ears till the dullest  
reader that peruses this volume shall wake up and  
learn its import. Now, that argument disposes of all the  
quotations that he has read from my book, and leaves  
him nothing to quibble about. Faith in Christ produces  
baptism, and all Baptists have faith in Christ, and are  
baptized to obey him, and Brother McGary says he  
will affirm that all such persons receive valid baptism.

I tried to induce him to meet my argument, that  
Baptists obey the "form of doctrine" (Rom. 6), and are  
made free from sin, but he would not come to the lest.  
Baptists die to sin, are buried in baptism, and rise to  
walk in newness of life. His only attempt at reply was  
to quote from my book the words: "They do not rise  
with Christ in baptism, for they claim that they rise  
before they are baptized." That is a criticism of their  
"theory" again, and has no bearing upon the fact that  
Baptists actually die to sin and are buried and raised up  
just like the rest of us. Did you notice the word "claim"  
in the quotation! He next quotes another scrap (out of  
its connection), where I say: "They expel Christ from  
their kingdom." This, too, is a criticism of the  
"theory," and not a statement of what Baptists do in  
actual practice. If the wonderful wild man of Austin  
were as willing to make an honest quotation as a  
dishonest one, and properly represent an author as to

misrepresent him, he would quote the words in which I say that the Baptists are spiritual Israelites and God's people in Babylon, despite their many errors. But he will not deal honestly with a n opponent. He has cackled himself nearly to death over my little book, and yet there is not a line in it that is not in strict harmony with the position I hold today. But it is the best he can do. It is that or nothing. He is like the poor fiddler. A saloon keeper put up the sign: "Don't shoot the fiddler—he is doing the best he can." You must not shoot the fiddler, reader—he is doing the best he can! You must not charge all the bad breaks and wild assertions and dirty billingsgate that mar the pages of this book to my poor fallen brother of Austin. You must set it down to the discredit of his wicked and dishonest doctrine. If he had a better doctrine, he would be a better man, and make a better debate!

I urged Brother McGary to meet me upon the argument that Baptists have the new birth, but he passed it by in silence, as he has done nearly every argument I have made in this debate. John says: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." Baptists believe that Jesus is the Christ, hence are begotten of God. Baptism is the birth, and we know they are baptized. Therefore they are both begotten and born, and are children of God. Why did he dodge this argument? The reader can guess why he did it. And there is another point that he has persistently ignored, though it has been sounded in his ears more than once. Why does he single out one

design of baptism, and say that sinners must understand that design before they can be baptized, yet may misunderstand other designs and yet receive valid baptism? Now, this argument, that deserved attention but received none, will go into the book unanswered. We say that persons who are led to baptism by an y scriptural motive receive valid baptism, and receive all the promises that pertain to the ordinance.

The wild brother contradicts Paul in his definition of the gospel (1Cor . 15), and tries to make Paul contradict himself, because he said we are saved by the gospel and also saved by the "washing of regeneration," which is baptism. Paul does not contradict himself. He declares the gospel in 1Cor. 15, but does not declare the design of baptism, hence the design is not the gospel. The three facts constitute the gospel which saves, but they save by leading to the washing of regeneration. The power that leads to salvation is the power that saves. If the three facts constitute the gospel, we can easily see how a man can obey the gospel (in form), by dying to sin, being buried in baptism, and being raised up to the new life. But if Brother McGary is correct (that all things preached by the apostles constitute the gospel), it is impossible believe" the things taught by the apostles, and also that persons may "reject the doctrine proclaimed by Peter on Pentecost," and yet receive valid baptism. But he knows that I hold no such position. A failure to understand a point of doctrine is not "unbelief," neither is it "rejection" of what the

apostle preached. Then he quotes one new text, viz., "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," and says Baptists do not believe this statement. That is on a par with his assertion that Baptists do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God! It needs no reply. A man that cannot put his pen to paper without misrepresenting the Baptists or his opponent, ought never to engage in debate. He next conjugates himself into one of his death-dealing, blood-curdling moods, and imagines he has beaten Burnett's head into a pulp and kicked him over a ten-acre field. I am sure that the intelligent reader has seen no "pulp," except the pulpy stuff that has come from his pulpy brain, and the only "kicks" that are visible are the dying kicks of the rebaptism champion of Austin! He has blustered around over a ten-acre field, beating the air, but he has not hit me a lick since this contest began! His statements are highly "figurative"—mostly wind. In fact, a "rushing mighty wind," would be a good description of my windy opponent! Take out the brag and bluster from his speeches, and there would be nothing left. He calls me Lipscomb's hired man, although Brother Lipscomb did not hire me, and had nothing to do with getting up the debate in any respect. If A. McGary had hired him a debater, it would have been much better for his side of the question. He says I will not be "here" next time. Just let him try me and see. Appoint the time when you will meet me in oral debate, or when you will open the columns of the Flimsy



Foundation, I will not charge you fifty cents for the next little job. I love to go to picnics!

He tries to answer me on Abraham's case, by saying that Abraham did not know God's design in sending him to Canaan because God did not reveal it to him, but God has revealed the design of baptism to the sinner. I instance d Abraham's case to show that a person can obey a command of God without knowing God's design in the command. If a sinner misunderstands God' s design in baptism, yet obeys the command, it is obedience, and he receives all the promises that pertain to the ordinance. If this be not true, then Brother McGary is gone, for he does not understand two designs of baptism. He does not know what is meant by being "baptized into Christ," and does not know what the "gift of the Holy Ghost" is, in Acts 2:38. He says he knows the gift comes after baptism, but that is a mistake. In his new theory of the Spirit, that the Spirit is in the word, he says the sinner receives the Spirit before baptism, hence he has the gift in the wrong place! If the mistake of the Baptist (that remission comes before baptism) invalidates his baptism, the mistake of A . McGary (that the gift of the Spirit comes before baptism) invalidates his baptism! He baited that hook to catch a Baptist, and got caught on it himself! See?

Brother McGary says I misrepresent him, when I say that he said Alex . Campbell was baptized into Christ, but not into the church of Christ. The poor brother is so rattled that he forgets what he has written.

The readers of the Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation will remember that he did say that very thing a few months ago, in his paper, and it was copied into the Gospe Advocate and into Baptist papers and commented upon.. When he said that A. Campbell was baptized into Christ, but not into the church of Christ, he was asked when Campbell got into the church? He replied that, "after he left the Baptists," he "traveled in a straight gospel line till he got there." Is it possible, dear deluded brother, that you have forgotten making that wild statement? We all know you made it, and here was the reason for the statement: How could Campbell be baptized into the church, when (according to your doctrine) there was no church? It was enough to provoke a horselaugh from a graveyard to see what a predicament you got old Brother Campbell into! And you have never extricated Campbell nor McGary from that sad dilemma! Your lieutenant , Brother Jehu Chism, came to the rescue, and tried to get you out, by showing that Campbell was not baptized into the body or church, but into the "economy" of Christ! You had better join Chism, and then quote Paul, "For by one Spirit, are we all baptized into one economy!" Eh?

He is exceedingly mad at my "goatish poetry," which butted him and his rebaptism crew into the "bloody chasm," and is now disposed to call i t "doggerel," or "puppy-rel." Well, he is the puppy that I am after! I rather think that it is bloodhound music, for when this likely "field hand" left the ol d gospel

plantation and struck for the swamps of sectarianism, it chased him down in short order—ran him around through the "bloody chasm" and across "vacuum" hollow and into the "goat pen" at Brush "Run, and there captured him!!

He says I got caught when I went fishing for the church at the birth of Alex. Campbell, for I said the kingdom was with the Baptists, yet the Baptists did not "succeed to the apostles' doctrine." By that statement I meant that they did not succeed to the apostles' doctrine as an entire system, but in the same book I said they had enough of the apostles' doctrine to produce the new birth, and hence were children of God, and born into his kingdom. Therefore the kingdom was still in existence. So I tell exactly where the church was when Alex. Campbell was baptized, and give the names of the persons who composed it. Alex. Campbell and Walter Scott and Jacob Creath and John Smith, and all the old Baptists who had believed on Christ and been baptized to obey God, were members of it. Brother McGary represents me as saying that there "wasn't any" apostolic doctrine there, but he knows better. Faith in Christ was there, and repentance was there, and baptism to obey God was there, and the new birth was there, and the kingdom was there. So I catch the fish that I go after, and am not drowned. Neither do I sing Amazing Grace to the devil for setting up the church of Christ! But how is it with my amazing friend of Austin? When he goes fishing for the church that should "never be

destroyed," he ties the line to his leg and (he leg of his hobby, and throws out the hook into the "bloody chasm," and lo, when the big cat is caught it is the Baptist Church or a pen full of the devil's goats!! In either case it sinks and drowns the fisherman. If it is the Baptist Church, it pulls him and his hobby into the river and drowns them, and if it is a pen full of the devil's goats, the big "sinker" on the line (Dan. 2:44) sinks him and his hobby in the "bloody chasm" forever! When the "coroner's inquest" sits on the case on the sand bar, the verdict will be more interesting than the one McGary and his lieutenants pass upon a poor Baptist who seeks fellowship in a church of Christ. It will read about as follows:

'Tis a wonderful thing—we never can show, With all of our thinkin' and figgerin', Whether this nigger did a-fishin' go, Or this fish went a-niggerin'!

Or it may read this way:'Tis a wonderful thing— McGary can't show, With all his twisting and varying, Whether McGary did a-goating go, Or the goats went McGarying!

McGary caught the goats, and the goats caught McGary, and he is drowned eternally! All the church he can find when Alex. Campbell was born is the Baptist Church, or the devil's goat pen. He can take his choice. If the Baptists were in the kingdom, his doctrine is false; if they were not, the Bible is false. In either case, McGary and his hobby are out of court. Like the Texas politician, he is "between the devil and the deep blue sea," and can't go either way! He is

between the Baptist Church and the devil's goat pen, and dare not take sides! I am sorry for him, and I know he is sorry that he ever went fishing for big cat, or undertook to defend the rebaptism hobby in debate!

It was my desire to discuss this question in a courteous and argumentative manner, but I have not been permitted to do so. I heartily wished my opponent to lay aside his customary rough language, and meet me upon the genuine issues between the two positions. I would like to have my arguments put to the test in fair and honorable controversy. Is faith in Christ as the Son of God the faith that qualifies for baptism?

Does the confession which we require of our converts contain the faith? Is death to sin, burial in baptism and resurrection to a new life "obedience to the form of doctrine" taught in Rom. 6? Did Daniel tell the truth when he said the kingdom of God should never be destroyed? Was the church of Christ, of which we are members, set up by a party of the devil's goats about the year 1827? Has one baptized believer a scriptural right to sit on another baptized believer and decide whether he has the right to fellowship in a congregation of Christians? All these points I mean to discuss as soon as I can find an opponent who will meet me upon them. Will the rebaptism party of Texas furnish such a man!