

**BURNETT-WEAVER
DEBATE**

VOLUME ONE



*Action and Subjects of
Baptism*

[PRICE FIFTY CENTS

FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE
AUSTIN, TEXAS



VOLUME ONE

BURNETT-WEAVER

DEBATE

PRICE FIFTY CENTS

1. PROPOSITION: *The Scriptures teach that the sprinkling or pouring of clean water upon a proper subject, in the name of the Holy Trinity, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism.* Weaver affirms, Burnet denies.

2. PROPOSITION: *Infant baptism is authorized by the word of God.* Weaver affirms, Burnett denies.

Firm Foundation Publishing House
AUSTIN, TEXAS

Burnett-Weaver Debate

PROPOSITION: *"The Scriptures teach that the sprinkling or pouring of clean water upon a proper subject, in the name of the Holy Trinity, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism." Weaver affirms, Burnett denies.*

MR. WEAVER'S FIRST SPEECH.

We mean by the Scriptures in the proposition the people's Bible, or the James version. We mean by sprinkling or pouring, affusion. The clean water is pure water. By the Trinity we mean the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. By proper subject is meant a scriptural subject. By proper administrator is meant a man called of God to perform the work.

Our first work shall be to find the word and its scriptural use and meaning. We read in Mat. 3:11: "I indeed baptize you with water, unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Here we find the word in dispute. Now let us try to find its use and meaning. Acts 1.4-5: "And being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me; for John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." In the first text we find "I baptize you with water" and "he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." So we

find two baptisms in the text, and all are agreed that the mode of these baptisms is the same. In our second text we find that Christ said "John truly baptized with water," and promises that they should "be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." So if we can find without doubt the mode of one, then that settles the mode of the other. We will go to the Scriptures in search of the mode. I read Acts 10:44-45: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." This is part of the record Luke made of Peter's sermon, and if the record can be relied on, the baptism of the Holy Ghost was by pouring. So, if the word don't or didn't mean pour, the record is to be blamed. Let us hear Peter himself, and see if Luke did report him correctly. Acts 11:15-16 "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." This confirms Luke's record, for Peter said the Holy Ghost fell on them, and then when he had witnessed this great fact, he said: "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." So, the mode of John's baptism and that of the Holy Ghost must have been alike, for when he saw the one it reminded him of the other. If John had been immersing the people, this falling on or pouring on of the Holy Ghost would not have reminded him of John's baptism. Hear Paul, 1 Cor. 12:13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." Now we have found that John the Baptist, Christ, Luke, Peter and Paul called the pouring out of

the Spirit on the people a baptism. A fine group of scholarly ministers, all called and sent of God to preach his gospel. So if the word don't or didn't mean pour, then they were mistaken. I believe I prefer to take them to others we might find. So I feel that I have made out a clear case, if our Bible can be relied on. I am willing to stand or fall by it. We are sometimes asked if we are not immersed into the Spirit? I will let the Book tell us. Isa. 31:15: "Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest." So the mode of Spirit baptism is pouring, without doubt, if we believe our Bible; and if the mode of water baptism is the same as that of the Spirit, then the mode is forever settled with those of us who believe the word of God as it is given to us.

We next note John's baptism. We are of the opinion that John's was not Christian baptism, from the following reasons: 1. In that it was before Christ's day. Isa. 40:3: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." We are told that John was the forerunner of Christ. Then, if this text be true, Christ must be God, for John had to make a straight path for our God. So John and his baptism were before Christ, and therefore could not be Christian baptism. It could not have been Christian baptism in that it was not perfect. Acts 18:24-26: "And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and, taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue; whom, when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." If it had been Christian baptism, this could not have been said

of it, and this baptism of John would have been enough for him to have known in the way of water baptism. But he knew no other, hence the need of instructing him on the subject. It could not have been Christian baptism, in that it bore John's name. It is ever referred to as the baptism of John, or as John's baptism. Acts 19:2-3: "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism." It could not have been Christian baptism in that it was unto repentance. Acts 19:4: "Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." Christian baptism could not point to Christ as yet to come. It was put into the church after Christ came and after his resurrection. John's being before Christ pointed to Christ as yet to come. It could not have been Christian baptism, in that John's disciples were baptized in the name of Christ under Paul's administration, and if John's had been Christian baptism they could not have been consistently re-baptized. Acts 19:5: "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." It could not have been Christian baptism, in that it was for the remission of sins. Luke 3:3: "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Whereas, the Scriptures teach that "whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." It could not have been Christian baptism, in that it had not the ceremony of Christian baptism. Mat. 28:19: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." John's disciples said, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Surely if they had been previously

baptized in the name of the Trinity, they would have heard of him. The truth is, John's baptism was to make Christ manifest. John 1:29-34: "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me. And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." Christian baptism is not to make Christ manifest, but is a symbol of heart purity.

MR. BURNETT'S FIRST REPLY.

Mr. Weaver wastes a good deal of valuable space in proving that John's baptism was not Christian baptism. That question has no connection with the proposition before us. It may be that he is trying to draw us away from the Jordan river, where John baptized, knowing that "Jordan is a hard road to travel" by a Methodist preacher. Or, it may be his intention (later on) to try to prove that John was a Jewish priest, and that his baptism was under the law. We shall wait and see. While John's baptism was not (strictly speaking) Christian baptism, the *act* was the same, for the same word is used to express it.

There is only one argument made in Mr. Weaver's speech, and that is on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. As this is the only point in the speech, we shall notice it fully. John said he baptized with water, and that Christ would baptize with the Holy Spirit. Mat, 3. And since the Spirit was poured upon

or fell upon the people, it is claimed that the pouring or falling was the baptizing act. This argument has not the force that it appears to have. In the first place, the word "pour" is not derived from the same Greek word from which we obtain "baptize." The word pour is from *cheo*, and not *baptizo*. This looks suspicious. Neither the Savior nor any apostle ever used *cheo* in speaking of baptism. This looks more suspicious. If the pouring (Acts 2:17) was the baptizing act, the same that John performed at the Jordan (Mat. 3:11), why did not Luke use the same word that John did? Ah, beloved, there is a reason. John used *baptizo* and Luke used *cheo*. These words do not express the same action. All the lexicons in the world define *baptizo* to dip or immerse. No lexicon in the world gives *cheo* that definition. And no lexicon defines one of these words by the other. They do not mean the same thing. In Acts 11:15 Peter says: "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning," and Mr. Weaver thinks the falling on was the baptizing act. If the act here was the same that John performed at the Jordan, the word used should be the same. Did Peter use *baptizo* to express the act of falling on? By no means! The word he used is *epiipto*. Does that word ever mean to baptize? It does not. We have before us the concordance of the Greek Testament, and have noted every occurrence of the word, and it is not used a single time in connection with baptism.

The error of Mr. Weaver, and all the affusion school, is in mistaking the descent of the Spirit for the baptism of the Spirit. The words "poured upon" and "fell upon" express the act of bringing the Spirit to the persons baptized. The apostles were baptized in the Spirit after the Spirit was poured out from heaven. When they were "all filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:4) is the time when they were baptized with the Spirit. The Spirit's influence overwhelmed their spirits, like the water

overwhelms the body of a man when he is immersed in water, and for that reason it was called a baptism. We can (and will) give the highest pedobaptist authority in the world for this opinion. Now note: The Spirit was poured, but the Spirit was not baptized; the apostles were baptized, but the apostles were not poured. Hence, the pouring was not the baptizing. When the people were baptized by John in Jordan, it was necessary to bring the candidates and the element together. The element was in the Jordan river; the people were in Jerusalem and the country round about. The going to the river was no part of the baptism, but necessary to it. It brought the people and the element together. On the day of Pentecost, the element was in heaven, and the apostles in the city of Jerusalem. The apostles were not taken to the element, but the element was brought to them. Hence, the pouring out of the Spirit was no more the baptism in that case than the going to the Jordan was the baptism in the other case.

The word pour and the word baptize are not the same class of verbs. Baptize is an active-transitive verb; pour is an active-intransitive verb, when applied to persons. You can not translate an active-transitive verb out of Greek into an active-intransitive verb in English. The word *baptizo* will not therefore be translated by pour or sprinkle while the world stands. Our affusion friends have strangely overlooked this point in all the books they have printed on baptism. The difference in the nature of these verbs shows that the pouring of the Spirit was not the baptizing act. To pour means to "turn out in a stream." Hence, you can not pour a man, unless you can turn him out in a stream. You can baptize a man; therefore to baptize and to pour are two different acts. To pour or sprinkle, you manipulate the element; to baptize, you manipulate the person.

We said we could give the highest pedobaptist authority for

our position on the baptism of the Spirit. Here is what Neander (Lutheran), the great church historian, says on the subject:

"In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original institution and import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same."—Church History, vol. I., p. 422.

Mr. Lechler, another Lutheran, says:

"The gift of the Spirit is here termed a baptism, and is thus characterized as one of most abundant fullness, and as a submersion in a purifying and life-giving element."

Mr. Cook (Episcopalian), in his Bible Commentary, says:

"The Holy Spirit is here represented as a life-giving stream. . . . 'In' expresses the immersion of the convert's entire being in the influence."

The Christian Encyclopedia says:

"Baptism in the Holy Ghost, that overwhelming abundance of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, which the Savior, after his ascension, poured upon his disciples. The basis of this beautiful metaphor is found in the literal signification of baptism, which is to cover one completely with any kind of element, particularly water."

Archbishop Tillotson (Episcopalian), in his Works, says:

"It filled all the house. This is that which, verse 5 of first chapter, our Savior calls baptizing the apostles with the Holy Ghost, so that they who sat in the house were, as it were, immersed in the Holy Ghost, as they who were baptized with water were overwhelmed and covered all over with water, which is the proper notion of baptism."

Dr. Robinson (Presbyterian), in his Greek Lexicon, says:

"To baptize in the Holy Ghost and in fire, to overwhelm,

richly furnish with all spiritual gifts, or overwhelm with fire unquenchable."

Mr. Leigh (Presbyterian) says:

"Baptized—that is, drown you all over, dip you into the ocean of his grace."

We have now met and overthrown the strongest argument that the affusion world can produce. On our part we wish to put a few difficulties in the path of Mr. Weaver. If Christian baptism can be performed by pouring or sprinkling, and that is what the Savior wished the apostles to do when he sent them forth to teach and baptize the nations, why did he not put into the commission a word that meant to pour or sprinkle? There was right there before his eyes, in the language he spoke, a word that meant to pour, *cheo*; and there was right there before his eyes a word that meant to sprinkle, *rantizo*. Why did he pass by these two words, which all the lexicons say mean to pour and sprinkle, and use a word which all the lexicons say means to dip or immerse? Did he wish to deceive the apostles? Did he wish to deceive the religious world for nineteen hundred years? Was our Lord such an arrant deceiver that he used a word that has misled every Greek scholar on the face of the globe that has attempted to make a lexicon of the Greek language? If he wished baptism to be performed as your proposition teaches, why did he not state it that way? If pouring or sprinkling is the baptism of the Bible, why will Mr. Weaver go down into the water and dip a person, and say, "By the authority of Jesus Christ I baptize you?" When these difficulties are met, we have others.

MR. WEAVER'S SECOND SPEECH.

Our friend said I had wasted valuable space in proving John's baptism not Christian baptism. "That question has no connec-

tion with the proposition before us." True, and it should never be brought into this controversy. Yet our friends go to Jordan for mode, they say, and that is why I go there to prove John did not immerse according to our biblical record.

A word about the baptism of the Holy Ghost. "The pouring was not the baptizing act." Our friend asks why Luke and John did not use the same words? I will say that Luke used a word which meant to pour, and John used a word which meant to pour, and they were talking about the same thing.

Our friend said: "All the lexicons in the world define 'baptizo' to dip or immerse." I will ask my friend to tell us of a lexicon that defines "baptizo" to dip only, in the exclusive sense. I will ask my friend to give us a lexicon prior to the days of Christ on earth, that defines "baptizo" to dip as a religious ordinance. I will ask my friend if it is not a historical fact that the exclusive idea of "baptizo," meaning to dip or immerse only, is not a modern idea, or in other words, does he read of it in any authentic history prior to 1641? Our friend informs us that "poured upon" and "fell upon" express the act of bringing the Spirit to the persons baptized, and that the apostles were baptized in the Spirit after the Spirit was poured out from heaven. That is his idea, but when we remember that the Holy Ghost is a person, that idea fades away. Also, instead of the apostles being in the Holy Ghost, the record tells us that the Holy Ghost was in them. John 14:17; "Shall be in you." When the sacred influence of the Spirit fell on or was poured on a person by Christ, he is said by our Bible to be baptized by the Holy Spirit. So, when clean water, by a proper administrator, falls on or is poured on a proper person, he is baptized with water.

Our friend asks why Christ used "baptizo" instead of "cheo" or "rantizo," if he wanted to pour or sprinkle? I will say our Lord used a word that is broad, and did not use an exclusive

term. If he had wanted to use a word to mean dip only, he would have used *embapto*, but he did not. So we conclude that Christ did not wish to teach the doctrine of immersion only, or sprinkling only, or pouring only. Christ used the word "baptizo" in its original sense, to wash, cleanse or purify, and that may be done by immersion or by affusion, prior to 1641 mainly by affusion.

We find from John 1:33 that John had authority to baptize, for he said that he had been sent to baptize with water. In Isaiah, 44th chapter, we have John's work pointed out. Of course, it is the work of God, and he does part of that work through John. Verse 3: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." This text tells us of three baptisms, yet one mode. God sent John to deal with the thirsty people, and he was to bring them into covenant with God by baptism. So when John poured water on the thirsty people they were baptized, and when God pours water from the clouds upon the dry ground it is baptized, or when water falls from the clouds or is poured out on the dry ground it is baptized. Also, when God pours his Spirit on a person asking for it, he is baptized with the Holy Spirit. Zacharias said of his son John: "And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins." So John's baptism was for the remission of sins, and to the people of God.

We next note Christ's baptism. We do not believe that he was baptized for a pattern, because we learn from the Scriptures that the people were baptized before he was. See Matthew, third chapter. "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were

baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him." I read Luke 3:2]: "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened." If Christ had been baptized as a pattern to the people, he would have been baptized first, as a pattern must go before. A farmer, wishing to make a plow stock by a certain pattern, must have the pattern before him in order to lay off his work by it. "We think he was baptized for a nobler purpose. We learn that purpose from Jer. 33:17-21, 25-26. I read: "For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. And the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah saying, Thus saith the Lord, If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign over his house, and with the Levites my ministers." I will say, if Jesus Christ is not on the throne of David now, they do want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, which is the throne of David. And if Jesus Christ is not a priest of the Levites, then they want a man, for there is no legal priest of that line today in the flesh. The man who can break God's covenant of the day and night, can break his covenant with David and Levi. For it is certain, if we believe the word of God, that the covenant with David and the Levite priests, God's ministers, will stand as long as day and night continue in this earth. I read verses 25-26: "Thus saith the Lord, If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinance¹-of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed

to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them." This text locates Christ as king on David's throne, which is the house of Israel, and on the Levite priesthood, at least until day and night end. This Levite priesthood was an everlasting priesthood. 1 Chron. 15:2: "Then David said, None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites, for them hath the Lord chosen to carry the ark of God, and to minister unto him forever." An everlasting priesthood must have a succession of priests, or an everlasting priest. Levi's tribe furnished its priests down to John, then John put Christ into it by baptism, God anointing him. Now we learn from Scripture, Christ fulfilled every point of the law for making a priest. Num. 4:3: "From thirty years old and upward even until fifty years old, all that enter into the host, to do the work of the tabernacle of the congregation." See Christ's age. Luke 3:23: "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age."

MR. BURNETT'S SECOND REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says the reason he tries to prove that John's baptism was not Christian baptism is, immersionists go there for the "mode." Well, Mr. W. and all other people agree that the two baptisms were the same in action. The word used is the same. And as John baptized "in the river," and where there was "much water," and the Savior "went up straightway out of the water," and the word used means to dip or immerse, it is a pretty good place to go to learn the "mode."

We asked if the pouring of the Spirit was the baptizing act, and the same act John performed, why was not the same word used? Mr. Weaver says Luke used a word that meant to pour, and John used a word that meant to dip. This is a mistake. The word Luke used (*cheo*) always means to pour, and the

word John used never means to pour, (according to the lexicons), but always to dip or immerse Why is this? His explanation does not explain! It is strange that a word that always means to pour, and a word that never means to pour, should be used to express the same action!

He asks us to produce a lexicon that gives dip or immerse as the exclusive meaning of *baptizo*. They all give dip or immerse or overwhelm (or some such kindred word) as its meaning, and they all exclude the words pour and sprinkle by leaving them out. That is exclusive enough to destroy his proposition. It is not an exclusive definition that Mr. Weaver needs, but an inclusive one—one that includes his words pour and sprinkle! Eh? Do you not know that if this word meant to pour or sprinkle, some of the fifty Greek lexicons we have in use would give it that definition? Suppose we should say it means to chop wood, and build a religious theory upon it, would not some scholar ask us to produce a lexicon that gives that definition? Mr. W. asks for a lexicon prior to the days of Christ that defines the word to dip as a religious ordinance. There were no lexicons prior to the days of Christ, and the word was not used in a religious sense (as we use it) before his day But the lexicons of later date give the meaning that Greek speaking people put upon the word in all ages—before Christ and after Christ and during the days of Christ—and it always had the same meaning See Robinson, Thayer, or any standard lexicon They give its use in Plato, Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo, New Testament, Josephus, etc If Mr. W. knew anything about Greek, he would not ask such a foolish question He thinks the dip only idea a modern notion, not prior to 1641, and wishes to know if we have read of it in any authentic history before that date All the reputable historians in the world say that the apostolic practice was exclusive immersion See Neander, Mosheim, Bossuet, Stackhouse, Schaff—all members of sprink-

ling churches. These historians doubtless read all authentic history prior to 1641. Mr. Weaver is the first man in the world to discover that dip is a new meaning of *baptizo*. All affusion champions admit that this was its original meaning, but claim that the Savior put a new meaning on the word. Mr. W. used to take that position. He has reversed all the champions, and has reversed himself! If the horse can not pull the load by putting him before the cart, he thinks perhaps he can pull it by putting him behind the cart! The horse can not pull this load, no matter where he puts him. The word does not mean to pour or sprinkle, either before or after Christ, in either classic or Hellenistic Greek, and no lexicon so defines it. Let us have the book.

We asked Mr. Weaver why Christ did not use *cheo* or *rantizo*, if he wished to express pour or sprinkle. He says Christ used a broad word. Yes, but it was not broad enough to take in pour and sprinkle! He says if Christ had wished to use a word that meant to dip exclusively, he would have used *embapto*. Yes, that word means to dip, and there are several more that mean to dip, but none so exclusively as *baptizo*. Why, Groves and other lexicons give one definition of *embapto* to sprinkle, but no lexicon gives sprinkle as a definition of *baptizo*! So, Mr. Weaver has put his foot in it! He does not know what he is talking about, and that is why he makes such blunders.

He says we have John's work pointed out in Isa. 44: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty," etc. A very little attention to the passage will show that he is in error. It commences: "Hear now, O Jacob my servant, (not John the Baptist,) and Israel whom I have chosen." It is simply a prophecy about a day of prosperity to Israel, and has no more reference to John the Baptist than to the man in the moon! If it has reference to John's baptism, the wrong word is used again. The word "pour" is *cheo* and not *baptizo*. Could John fulfill

a "cheo" prophecy with a "baptizo" action? It is strange that Mr. Weaver can not find a single text that has the right word in it! He is unfortunate.

He says that, instead of the apostles being in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit was in the apostles. Yes, it was in their bodies, for they were "filled" with it, and their spirits (within their bodies) were overwhelmed with the spiritual influence. See?

He thinks John washed Christ to make him a Levitical priest. A very little attention to the teaching of the Scriptures will show what a great mistake that is. Christ did not belong to the tribe of Levi, and could not have been a Levitical priest without a violation of the law. Hear what Paul says: "For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar; for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood; and it is yet far more evident, for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Heb. 7. And now listen at this: "And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest, for those priests were made without an oath but this with an oath." Verse 20. Was the oath made at the baptism of John, while the law stood? Hear Paul on that point: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which was *since the law*, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forever more." Heb. 8:4. Mr. Weaver is wrong, or Paul does not tell the truth. Both can not be right, for they flatly contradict. Mr. Weaver says he was a Levitical priest. Paul says he did not belong to the tribe of Levi. Mr. Weaver says he "fulfilled every point of the law for making a priest." Paul says he was not made priest by the law of a carnal commandment. Mr. Weaver says he was of the similitude of Aaron and Levi. Paul says he was

"after the similitude of Melchisedec," and not "called after the order of Aaron." Now, beloved, you can follow Mr. Weaver, or you can come with us and follow Paul. The covenant that God made with David and Levi was as inviolate (on his part) as his covenant concerning day and night, but the Levites broke it and forfeited their rights in the covenant.

MR. WEAVER'S THIRD SPEECH.

My friend says, "The word John used never means to pour." I will introduce Mr. Fairfield, (Letters on Baptism,) p. 12 to 14. I will ask you, Mr. F., if you were ever a Baptist? "Yes, you know, perhaps, that I have been a Baptist for more than a quarter of a century, and no man was more certain of being right. I had not a doubt on the subject." Will you tell us what made the change in your mind on the subject? "Yes. Some years ago I was requested by a Baptist publishing house to prepare a book in defense of Baptist views." And you accepted the call believing you were able to do the work? "Yes, I accepted this appointment with the fullest assurance that an argument could be made in that compass that nobody could fairly answer." I wish to ask how you went about the work? "In order to do it, I determined to go over the whole ground from the beginning; so that when the work was finished the honest and intelligent reader of my book would be constrained to admit that it was unassailable." I will ask if you were a full-fledged immersionist? "I fully believed that immersion was the only water baptism, and that it could be made so to appear to every candid inquirer." I will ask if you accomplished the required work? "No, my disappointment you can imagine, when I tell you that as I prosecuted my study of the subject I found tower after tower of my Baptist fort tumbling down! Most laboriously did I strive to repair them; month

after month for more than two years did I labor to maintain my old ground, but to no avail." I will ask what seemed to be in your way? "There were too many hard and solid facts against me. Having studied the subject through and through on both sides, I was convinced of my error. Immersion was not the only baptism." I will ask what you found "baptizo" to mean in the New Testament? "I found that the word 'baptizo' did not mean 'immerse' in the New Testament. I saw it clearly. I could not have been an honest man, and continue to profess to believe what I did not believe." Now, reader, all we ask is an honest investigation of this question.

Our friend says, "All reputable historians in the world say that the apostolic practice was exclusive immersion." Then he mentions a number belonging to sprinkling churches. I will say this much here now. If that statement be true—if these men believed the apostolic practice was exclusive immersion, and then would not themselves practice it, or belonged to churches that sprinkled—they were not worthy for any one to follow. So, as for me, he can have all such witnesses. I don't believe there is a pedobaptist in the world that believes the apostles practiced exclusive immersion.

My friend says also that Mr. Weaver is the first man in the world to discover that dip is a new meaning of baptizo. I will refer my friend to English Baptist Reformation, by G. A. Lofton, D. D., p. 245. "In none of the confessions of Smith, nor in the confession of 1611, is the word baptizo rendered to dip, for the reason that the 1609-11 Anabaptists did not practice immersion." I will advise my friend to "read up." I will ask him to see p. 217. "Yea, at this day they have a new crochet come into their heads, that all that have not been plunged nor dipt under water are not truly baptized, and these also they re-baptize; and this their error ariseth from ignorance of the Greek word baptizo, which signineth no more than wash-

ing or ablution, as Hesychus, Stephanus, Scapula, Budeus, great masters of the Greek tongue, make good by many instances and allegations out of many authors."

Now let us see how the Levites were ordained priests. Ex. 29:4-7: "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water." So the first step in making a priest was washing with water, or baptism, then the anointing followed. Verse 7: "Then shalt thou take the anointing oil and pour it upon his head, and anoint him." The washing typified water baptism; the anointing with oil typified the baptism of the Holy Ghost, a giving of power. How was the washing performed? Num. 8:5-7: "And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them, and thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, Sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean." Now we find that the washing, or baptism, which the law demanded was not an immersion. So we conclude, if Christ fulfilled this demand of the law, he was not, or could not have been, immersed, but sprinkled, that is baptized.

Oil for anointing the priest. Ex. 30:22-23: "Moreover, the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Take thou also unto thee principal spices, of pure myrrh five hundred shekels, and of sweet cinnamon half as much, even two hundred and fifty shekels, and of sweet calamus two hundred and fifty shekels, and of cassia five hundred shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, and of oil olives a hin. And thou shalt make it an oil of holy ointment, an ointment compound after the art of the apothecary: it shall be a holy anointing oil. And thou shalt anoint the tabernacle of the congregation therewith, and the ark of the testimony, and the table and his vessels, and the candlestick and his vessels, and the altar of incense, and the altar of burnt

offering with all his vessels, and the laver and his foot. And thou shalt sanctify them, that they may be most holy: whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy. And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and consecrate them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office. And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel saying, This shall be a holy anointing oil unto me throughout your generations. Upon man's flesh shall it not be poured, neither shall ye make any other like it, after the composition of it. It is holy, and it shall be holy unto you. Whosoever compoundeth any like it, or whosoever putteth any of it upon a stranger, shall even be cut off from his people." This anointing oil was a type of the Holy Ghost. So we find in the making of a Levite priest, first they were to be washed, cleansed, or baptized with water; secondly, this anointing oil was to be poured on them, to anoint them to minister unto God. We note in the case of Christ a similarity—a washing first by John the Baptist, a Levite priest, then the anointing with the Holy Ghost by the eternal Father, and this anointing was by pouring out of the Spirit on him. We find the oil poured on them; we have found the washing was by sprinkling; hence we safely conclude that Christ was sprinkled. Mat. 3:16: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him." So we see in this text the baptism of water and the anointing of oil, and this is in perfect harmony with the law for ordaining a Levite priest. The anointing of Aaron was by Moses; Christ's washing or baptism was by John, his anointing was of God. Acts 10:38: "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, for God was with him." This priesthood had a human and also a divine side. The human side typified by the Levitical priesthood; the divine side typified by the priesthood of Melchisedec, which as

touching the priesthood was without father or mother, or beginning of days or end of time. Yet when we understand this priesthood, we can understand both sides of it. See Lev. 16t3i chapter. Read all of the chapter. I read v. 5-6; "And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin offering, and one ram for a burnt offering; and Aaron shall offer his bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and make atonement for himself, and for his house." There were to be offered two goats for Israel's sins, one for Aaron and his house. Read v. 7 downward: "And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall east lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering; but the goat on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make atonement with him, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness, and Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself and for his house, and shall kill the bullock of the sin offering which is for himself. And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil."

MR. BURNETT'S THIRD REPLY.

In reply to our statement, that "the word John used never means to pour," Mr. Weaver does not bring a standard lexicon and show that we are in error, (as he should,) but introduces a theologian named Fairfield, who changed from dip to sprinkle. There are a few isolated cases in the world like Fairfield, *but* we have thousands on the other side—*men who*, after thor-

ough investigation, have changed from affusion to immersion. Mr. Weaver will admit that we can "overwhelm" him with a majority of a hundred to his one. Did you ever hear of Dr. Judson, the celebrated missionary? By investigation he changed his views, and, rather than teach the heathen pedobaptist errors, he gave up his position under the affusion party that sent him across the ocean. If that argument proves anything, we have won the question by a large majority.

He says if the historians we quoted (who say the apostolic practice was immersion) so thought, and still held to sprinkling churches, they were unworthy of credit. They are the most reputable historians on earth, and are accepted by all churches as reliable on matters of fact. As they did not consider baptism essential to salvation, they did not think it necessary to change churches. A man who will testify honestly to a matter of fact, when the fact conflicts with his religious views, is entitled to more weight as a witness than a man who will suppress a fact to save his theory. By Mr. "Weaver's logic, we can impeach the integrity of John Wesley. He said in his Notes on the New Testament that God did not ordinarily bestow pardon except through baptism. Is that Methodist doctrine? Did John Wesley change churches? Mr. Weaver, can you give us one reputable historian that says the apostles sprinkled or poured? Can you give us one standard Greek lexicon that says *baptizo* ever meant to sprinkle or pour? The historians and lexicographers, although they belonged to sprinkling churches, are all on our side, and must be impeached.

He quotes Lofton, a Whitsittite Baptist, to prove that dip is a new meaning of *baptizo*. Whitsitt and Lofton have been ridiculed out of countenance by all scholarly Baptists. (See Dr. Christian's book.) But they never tried to do as foolish a thing as Mr. Weaver credits to their account. They tried to prove that the Anabaptists of England "restored" immersion

in that country in 1641, and that the Baptist chain broke in two at that date. But they both believed that the apostles practiced exclusive immersion. See? Mr. Weaver himself does not think immersion was a new thing in 1611, as he pretends. The rubric of the Church of England contained exclusive immersion at that date, (except in case of sickness,) and a good while after that date John Wesley was indicted by the grand jury in Georgia because he would not sprinkle Mrs. Parker's child, contrary to the rubric! Why, the first Methodist Discipline he wrote contained exclusive immersion! As usual, Mr. Weaver has got the cart before the horse, and is badly tangled up. He tries to make the new thing the old thing, and the old thing the new thing, and his speech is such a mixed up thing that he will never get the thing straightened! Dr. Ditzler (Methodist) in his book on baptism, says the immersion influence was so strong in England in 1611 (when the King James version was made) that it colored that translation greatly.

Mr. Weaver asserts (contrary to Paul's statement) that Jesus was a Levitical priest, and asserts (contrary to Paul's statement) that John washed him to make him a priest. Then he goes to Num. 8:5-7 to prove that the Levites had the "water of purifying" sprinkled upon them. Paul says Jesus was not *i* priest "after the order of Aaron"—not a Levitical priest. Mr. Weaver says he was. Paul says he was not made a priest "by the law of a carnal commandment"—by a washing and anointing. Mr. Weaver says he was. These two flat contradictions are enough to condemn his argument to everlasting ruin. But we can admit that Christ was a Levitical priest, and made such by the Levitical law, and then it can not be shown that John sprinkled water on him at the Jordan. The Levitical priests were washed in water (Ex. 29:4), and had the "water of purifying" sprinkled upon them (Num. 8:7), but this was not one and the same transaction. Mr. Weaver confounds the two, and

gets himself in another tangle. Does he not know that the "water of purifying" was not water at all, but the ashes of the red heifer mixed with water? In Num. 19 we learn how it was made. Its application was never called a washing. Did John the Baptist have ashes mixed with the Jordan water when he washed the Savior? Did Jesus "shave all his flesh and wash his clothes?" If he did not, he violated the law. Mr. Weaver says he "filled every point of the law." Matthew says when Jesus was baptized he "went up straightway out of the water." Did the Levitical priests go up straightway out of the ashes of the red heifer, when they had been sprinkled with it? And what is the word rendered sprinkle in their case? Is it *baptizo*? Ah, beloved, Mr. Weaver never finds a text that contains the right word! In this text it is *raino*, and not *baptizo*, and in his text in Isa. 44 it is *cheo* and not *baptizo*. Why did not Matthew use the word *raino* when he described the baptism of Jesus, as Moses did when he described the sprinkling of the Levitical priests? Mr. W. says it was the same act performed upon the priests. It is strange that he can not find *cheo* and *raino* in any text that mentions baptism, and can not find *baptizo* in any text that mentions pouring and sprinkling!

But Mr. Weaver has got himself in a worse tangle than ever. In his other speech he said John poured the water on Jesus, because the Spirit was poured on the apostles on the day of Pentecost. Now he says John sprinkled the Savior, because the Levitical priests were sprinkled! If the priests were sprinkled, and John sprinkled Jesus, then the Holy Spirit must have been sprinkled on the apostles on the day of Pentecost! Can Mr. Weaver find a text that says the Holy Ghost was ever sprinkled on anybody? If the pouring of the Spirit was the baptizing act, and John performed the same act when he baptized the Savior, then the sprinkling of the priests could not have been the same act. Perhaps Moses poured the ashes on the Levites!

Or perhaps they were buried in the ashes! Paul says we are buried in baptism, and rise in baptism (Col. 2), and Matthew says Jesus "went up straightway out of the water." So the priests must have been buried in the ashes, and then had a resurrection from the ashes, and then come up straightway out of the ashes! And Moses must have been sprinkling in that place "because there was much ashes there!" Mr. "Weaver is getting his figures of speech and his baptismal words much scattered. He finds *cheo* on the day of Pentecost and in Isa. 44, and *raino* in the case of the Levites, and *baptizo* at the Jordan! In the language of a celebrated congressman, it is about time for him to inquire, "Where are we at?" He says the descent of the Spirit upon the Savior, like a dove, was the anointing of the Spirit, or the baptism of the Spirit. Another mistake. Was the dove poured upon him? Was it sprinkled upon him? Like the pouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the descent of the Spirit like a dove was not the anointing or baptizing, but the act which brought the Spirit down from heaven to where the Savior was.

In the Bible baptism there was water, much water, going to the water, going down into the water, a burial, a resurrection, a coming up out of the water. There was also a birth of water. In Methodist baptism, for which our opponent contends, there is not much water, no going to the water, no going down into the water, no burial, no resurrection, no coming up out of the water, no birth of water. We ask Mr. Weaver to tell us if he ever heard of anything that was born of a thing smaller than itself? How then can a man be born of a spoonful of water? He may also tell us how there can be a resurrection without a burial, and how there can be a burial without a covering up out of sight? Then he may tell us whether he ever saw a person buried and raised in baptism when the water was poured or sprinkled on the person? If he can not answer these questions, his proposition must fail.

MR. WEAVER'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Our friend said that these Pedo historians said that the apostles practiced exclusive immersion. Now he brings them to "immersion." He takes care to tell you what they say, but gives no quotation from them. Our friend can't find one pedo-baptist on this earth in good standing in his church that will say he believes that Christ commanded and the apostles practiced exclusive immersion. He says, "Whitsitt and Lofton have been ridiculed out of countenance by all scholarly Baptists." Just the reverse is the truth. All scholarly Baptists who have gone and examined as did "Whitsitt and Lofton are with them, and they are yet alive and can speak for themselves. He says "the first Methodist Discipline contained exclusive immersion." A little proof would make that more reasonable. Our friend says, "Paul says Jesus was not a priest after the order of Aaron, not a Levitical priest. Mr. Weaver says he was. Paul says he was not made a priest 'by the law of carnal commandment,' by a washing and anointing. Mr. Weaver says he was." I will state, my friends, that it is easier to state things than it is to refute a scriptural argument. Mr. Weaver did not say what my friend charges him with; it was Mr. Jeremiah who said it, and he is as good authority as Paul. You take the statements of Jeremiah and Paul and compare them carefully, and you will find no conflict. I grant you that our friend's interpretation of Paul contradicts Jeremiah, hence his interpretation of Paul is wrong. As to our friend's burial and much water statement, I will attend to that when I get to it. You will remember, as we have found from the Bible, that Christ's priesthood had a divine and human side. "And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not. And he shall take of the blood of

the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward, and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times. Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat. And he shall make atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins, and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself and for his household, and for the congregation of Israel. And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement for it, and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited, and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness. And Aaron shall come into the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall put off the linen garments which he put on when he went into the holy place, and shall leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh with

water in the holy place, and put on his garments, and come forth, and offer his burnt offering, and the burnt offering of the people, and make an atonement for himself and the people." As stated, we learn from this scripture that Christ had both a human and divine nature. The goat upon which the lot fell to die represents the human or crucified Christ. The blood of this goat was to be sprinkled over the mercy seat, and it was to be taken by the priest within the veil, and this blood was to atone for the holy place, the altar, and for the people. The goat upon which the lot fell for the live, or scapegoat had to be brought to Aaron or the High Priest and he was to lay his hands on the head of the goat and confess over it all the sins of the people, and he was to be sent by a fit man into an uninhabited place, or wilderness, bearing away the sins of the people, hereby representing the risen, living or divine Christ. So it took two goats to make plain to us the lesson in the text on the priesthood.

We learn after this anointing of Christ into this ministry of priesthood he began the work committed to him. Matthew 4:17: "From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'" Why did he not preach before this? It was because he had not been clothed with authority to preach. I read Gen. 49:10: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Shiloh, the Messiah, or anointed, or ordained Christ. See Matthew 21:12-14, 23-25: "And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers, and the seats of them that sold doves, and said unto them, "It is written, my house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves, and the blind and lame came to him in the temple and he healed them." These Jews were never disturbed in this way before; when Christ was about twelve

years of age he went into the temple, but not as the Shiloh; he only asked and answered questions to their astonishment. The prophet said the sceptre nor a law giver should not depart until Christ, or Shiloh come. So he has come and their authority is challenged and they put out and Christ takes charge. And we see the people coming to him. The prophet said and unto him shall the gathering of the people be, so they come; the blind and lame came to him in the temple. He begins the work of a priest, he heals them in the temple. Surely he is the Christ, and he is clothed with authority and begins this gracious work in the temple. These priests who had never been disturbed in this way before were astonished, and began to question his authority and to demand of him who gave him his authority. I read, v. 23-25: "And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, by what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority, and Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven, or of men?" He had taken possession of the temple and was healing and teaching; doing the legitimate work of the priest, and when they demanded of him his authority he simply asked them of the baptism of John as to whether it was of God or men. So he had them put to confusion. So they said among themselves. "If we shall say, from heaven, he will say unto us, why did you riot then believe him? But if we shall say, of men; we fear the people, for all hold John as a prophet.' Hence their answer, "We cannot tell." They knew that John was their legal priest and that he had the authority from heaven to baptize him. And Christ gives them to understand what they knew, that his authority was from John as their legal priest and from God. If they had not been fully convinced of the

fact, they would never have vacated that temple. So this reveals the purpose of Christ's baptism, not as a pattern, but a clothing of him with power from John their priest and from God, who anointed him with power after his baptism. This also reveals the mode. If John had have immersed Christ while their law emphatically said sprinkle, they would have stoned him to death as a violator of their law, and they would have refused to give up the temple to Christ for they would have had just grounds to brand him as an impostor, so this is a plain case. Christ not only took possession of the temple while on earth, but he put his ministry in possession of it. He called it his house, v. 13. He said unto them, "It is written, my house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." A serious and plain accusation against them.

MR. BURNETT'S FOURTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says we made a statement about the historians, but did not give their language. Here are their words. Mosheim, Lutheran (was he in good standing?), says of baptism during the first century:

"The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font."—*Ecclesiastical History*, p. 28.

The celebrated Neander, a Lutheran (was he in good standing?), says:

"In respect to the form of baptism, it was, in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit. It was only with the sick, when the exigency required it, that any exception was made."—*Church*

History, pp. 422, 423.

Stackhouse, Episcopalian, says:

"Several authors have shown, that we read nowhere in scripture of any one being baptized but by immersion, and from the acts of councils, and ancient rituals, have proved that this manner of immersion continued (as much as possible) to be used for thirteen hundred years after Christ.—*History*, p. 291.

Philip Schaff, Presbyterian, a member of Revision Committee (was he in good standing), says:

"The usual form of baptism was immersion. This is inferred from the original meaning of the Greek *baptizen* and *baptismos*; from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan; from the apostles' comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage of the Red sea, with the escape of the ark from the flood, with a cleansing and refreshing bath, and with burial and resurrection; finally, from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the east to this day."—*History Christian Church*, p. 468.

Dr. Wall, Episcopalian, who wrote the most celebrated book on infant baptism in the world, says:

"The general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant or grown man or woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that, as one can but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so also we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Anti-Pedobaptists merely for their use of dipping, . . . when it was in all probability the way by which our blessed Savior, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians, did receive their baptism.—*History*, p. 570.

Bossuet, the celebrated Catholic historian, says:

"It is a fact most certainly avowed in the Reformation, al-

though at present some will cavil at it, that baptism was instituted by immersing the whole body into water; that Jesus Christ received it so, and caused it to be so given by his apostles; that the Scriptures know no other baptism than this; that antiquity so understood and practiced it; that the word itself implies it, baptism being the same word as to dip; this fact, I say, is unanimously acknowledged by all the divines of the Reformation, nay, by the Reformers themselves, and those even who best understood the Greek language and the ancient customs as well of the Jews as Christians; by Luther, by Melancthon, by Calvin, by Casaubon, by Grotius, by all the rest. . . . Nay, Luther has observed that the German word signifying baptism was derived from thence, and this sacrament named Tauf, from profundity or depth, because the baptized were deeply plunged into water."—*History*, pp. 370, 371.

Mr. Weaver will have a big time turning all these big men out of their respective churches. They are the highest authorities in the world, as historians. They believed baptism by sprinkling was valid, though the original form was dipping. They thought the church had the right to change it. Mr. Weaver knows as little about history as he knows about Greek, and about the Jewish priesthood. We now inform him that every reputable Encyclopedia in the world says the apostolic baptism was immersion. The Americana, Blaikie's, Brando's, Brittanica, Chambers', Concise, Edinburg, English, Globe, International, London, Manifold, Metropolitan, Penny, Perthen-sis, Popular, Schaff-Herzog, and Zell's. The men who wrote these Encyclopedias were the finest historians in the world. If he calls the statement in question, we will do as we did with the historians—give their words. Mr. Weaver doubts the statement that the original Methodist Discipline contained exclusive immersion. It is a historical fact, nevertheless, though we have not the book at hand. But Mr. Weaver knows that the

rubric of the English church at that date contained exclusive immersion, except in case of sickness, and that John Wesley was indicted in Georgia because he would not sprinkle Mrs. Parker's child contrary to said rubric. That is a historical fact, for it is recorded in Mr. Wesley's Journal. The historians are all against our friend; the encyclopedias are all against him; the lexicons are all against him; and when he comes to the scriptures that treat of baptism, we will show that they are all against him. Thus far he has not touched the subject he set out to debate, except the one text about the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Tic persists in discussing matters that have no relation to the action of baptism, and in staying in that part of the Bible where baptism is not mentioned. He runs all over the Old Testament to find the words sprinkle and pour (though they have nothing to do with baptism), and when we assure him that the word used is not the word that John and Christ used for baptism (in either English or Greek), he pays no attention to it. He says he will attend to the Jordan, the "much water," the "burial," etc., when the time comes. In that case, we might as well let our pen lie idle till he gets ready to discuss the action of baptism.

Mr. Weaver persists in saying Christ was a Levitical priest, in direct contradiction of the express statement of Paul. He says it was Mr. Jeremiah, and not Mr. Weaver, that said it. Beg pardon; Mr. Jeremiah said not a word on the subject. God said through Jeremiah that, till day and night fail, his covenant with Levi should not fail (on his part), but it failed on the part of the Jews, and was abolished. Paul says (Heb. 7:12) that the priesthood was "changed." Mr. Weaver says it was not. This is Contradiction No. 1. Paul says Christ was not a Levitical priest. Mr. Weaver says he was. This is Contradiction No. 2. Paul says he was not a priest after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchizedec. Mr. Weaver says

he was after the order of Aaron. This is Contradiction No. 3. Paul says he was not made priest by "the law of a carnal commandment"—by washing. Mr. Weaver says he was. This is Contradiction No. 4. Paul says the oath that made him priest was "since the law." (Heb. 7:28.) Mr. Weaver says he was made priest under the law, and served under the law. This is Contradiction No. 5. Paul says he was a minister of the "true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." Mr. Weaver says he was a priest of the tabernacle which man pitched and not the Lord. This is Contradiction No. 6. And there are others. Mr. Weaver contradicts Paul six times, in order to make a point on the sprinkling of the Aaronic priests by Moses, when he ought to know that Moses did not sprinkle water on those priests, but the ashes of a red heifer. Moses washed the priests at the door of the tabernacle, but this was not the sprinkling of the "water of purifying" (ashes) that Mr. Weaver refers to, but another transaction. He washed them all over, too, for they changed clothes afterwards, and put on the priestly garments. Maimonides, the celebrated Jewish rabbi, says this washing was a complete immersion. It was for the purpose of cleansing them, that they might put on the holy garments, and as the priestly robes covered every part of the body, every part of the body was washed. To fit the Methodist mode, Moses should have sprinkled a few drops of water on the priest's head, and put a little skull-cap or top-knot on the place wetted! The words used were, "wash them with water," but the word "with" is the Greek word *en* and means *in*. It is translated "in" two thousand and forty-two times in the New Testament, and only one hundred and twenty-seven times "with." So we have a majority of sixteen to one that Moses washed the priests in water.

Mr. Weaver thinks they would have stoned John if he had immersed the Savior, Ought a Methodist preacher to be stoned

when he immerses persons in baptism, as Mr. Weaver did in North Sulphur creek, once upon a time?

MR. WEAVER'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Our friend gives us some quotations from the historians, which he says is "the highest authorities in the world, as historians." I will ask, are these historians with him or with us on this subject? Hear him: "They believed baptism by sprinkling was valid, though the original form was dipping." Then the highest historical authorities are with us. Then his statement in his second reply, that all the reputable historians in the world say the apostolic practice was exclusive immersion must be a mistake. As to the "contradictions between Mr. Weaver and Paul" I will say if the reader will read Mr. Jeremiah and Paul, he will find that Mr. B.'s interpretation of Paul contradicts Jeremiah. Mr. Armitage, speaking of the baptism of Christ, says, "His character and office had both been predicted, nay, he had foretold the glory of Christ—had seen him in his beauty, had lived contemporary with him, was his blood relative, and had inducted him into his Messianic office." So Armitage, an eminent Baptist historian, seems to be with us on Christ's baptism being to induct Christ into his priestly office. Just what I have proven to you in the former articles. So that matter is plainly settled, when admitted by so great a Baptist minister as Mr. Armitage. I can't see how any one can read and believe the Scriptures on the subject and conclude otherwise.

The new dispensation was opened in the temple. Acts 3: 1-11: "Now Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour.' V. 11: "And as the lame man which was healed held Peter and John, all the people ran together unto them, in the porch that is called

Solomon's, greatly wondering." So if there was a new church organized, it had the old material. What was this porch "called Solomon's greatly wondering," doing in the new church? Then we learn from Acts, 5th chapter, that the apostles were still in possession of the temple, and the apostles were doing many signs and wonders among the people, in the way of healing and teaching, and they had believers added to the Lord. We find in this chapter a legal test as to who should control the temple. The authorities, including the high priest, rose up and arrested the apostles and put them in prison. So they take charge of the temple. But God sent an angel who released the apostles from prison and put them back into the temple to preach the gospel, or to teach the people. Now, the test came when the high priest came, and they that were with him, and they called the council and all the senate of Israel together, and they sent to the prison to have the apostles brought before them, but they did not find them in prison, yet the prison doors were fastened. So these officers were afraid to do violence to the apostles, so they charged them not to teach in the name of Christ any more. Their answer to them was: "We ought to obey God rather than man." So when they entered a city, if there was a synagogue or temple, they entered it in Christ's name and preached the gospel. So Christ began his work as a priest on earth, in the temple of God, and when he went forth from the earth he put his ministers in possession of the temple to do his work. See Heb. 2:16-18: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore, in all things it behooved him to be like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in the things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, for in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." He took on him the seed of Abraham and was made like

unto his brethren of Abraham's family were made priests by having the water of purifying sprinkled on them, and then having the holy" oil poured on them to anoint them, then they made reconciliation for their sins and also for the sins of the people. And we have seen first, Christ was baptized, that is set apart for the priest's office, by John, then was anointed of God by the pouring of the Holy Spirit on him, and now he is making reconciliation for the sins of the people. He was recognized as our priest after his ordination. Heb. 3:1: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and high priest of our profession, Christ Jesus." I will ask: Was not Christ a minister of the new church? Romans 15:8: "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." As we have found, God had promised that David should never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. So Christ is king on this throne, and will be to all eternity, to fulfill this promise. Also, we have found that the priests, the Levites, should never want a man before God to make offerings to atone for the people's sins. So, we find Christ is our priest forever, to make reconciliation for our sins. So we have found out the purpose for which Christ was baptized. So, we praise God for Christ as our high priest, and rejoice in the fact that if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ, our Lord.

We will next examine the "into and out of" argument. I will read Joshua 3:8-15: "And thou shalt command the priests that bear the ark of the covenant, saying, 'when ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan.'" When they were at the brink of the water of Jordan, that is, at the edge of the water of Jordan, they were in Jordan, for it is said, "ye shall stand still in Jordan." They were in Jordan, yet not under the water of Jordan, but at the water's

brink, or edge. V. 15: "And as they that bare the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bare the ark were dipped in the brim of the water" (for Jordan overflowed all his banks at the time of harvest). We find only the feet of the priests were in the water, and only the edge of the water. They were in Jordan, and as we learn from chapter 4:16, they came up out of Jordan and did not go under the water. So we may go down into and come up out of and yet not go under the water. Take a case in I. Kings, 18 and 26: "And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it and they called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, saying, O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice nor any that answered. And they leaped upon the altar which was made, saying, O Baal, hear us." In the margin we read or "answer us." Hence we learn that "hear" and "answer" are only two meanings of that word, so we conclude the word don't mean hear alone, but has other meanings or at least one other. We read: "But there was no voice, nor any that answered;" the margin has it, "or heard." We read. "And they leaped upon the altar which was made." Now a person might say if he believes that a word can have but one meaning, that they leaped emphatically upon the altar; and yet another who has learned that a word may have more than one meaning may truthfully say that these people did not necessarily touch the altar, much less to leap upon it. We read they leaped upon the altar; the margin has it, "or leaped up and down at the altar." I refer you, my friends, to these facts in order to broaden your minds on into and out of. See Matthew 5 and 1: "And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain." I would ask did he go under, or on top of the mountain? Luke 6 and 12: "He went out into a mountain to pray." Did he go under the mountain to pray, or on it? I had rather believe that he went up on it, for verse 17 says, "he came down with

them." Luke 9 and 28: "Went up into a mountain to pray." Verse 37: "The next day, when they were come down from the hill." So hill and mountain are used synonymously. Luke 9 and 4-6. Zaccheus wanted to see Jesus, but being a small man "he ran before, and climbed up into a sycamore tree to see him." When Jesus got to the place, he looked up, and saw him, and told him to come down, for he was to go to his house with him. Into a sycamore tree—into means under—he went under the tree. Then how could he come down? A person who would contend for the going into and coming out of the water, to prove immersion, to be consistent, would contend that a city that lieth in the midst of a river would be immersed, of necessity, and how could a city be under water and its inhabitants live, unless they were of the nature of fish? If "in Jordan" proves immersion, what does "in the wilderness" prove? Mark 1:4: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." The text declares to us, emphatically, that John did baptize in the wilderness.

MR. BURNETT'S FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says the historians are not against him, because, while they all say that immersion was the apostolic baptism, they (some of them) admit that sprinkling was valid in case of sickness. Is that what Mr. Weaver holds? He says the historians are with him. They say dipping was the apostolic mode, though the church could change it (without any authority from Christ), and the ordinance still be valid! If there is any consolation in that, he is welcome to it!

He says Mr. Armitage, a Baptist, says that John inducted Christ into his Messianic office. Well, "Messianic office" does not mean priest's office, It includes more. Mr. Armitage did

not say that John washed Christ to make him a priest, and besides he said John dipped Christ. So your own witness contradicts you.

He says the new church (if there was any new church) was organized in the temple, and was composed of the material of the old church. Was any member of that old church allowed a place in the new church, without coming in through the rite of initiation? The Methodist creed says baptism is the initiatory rite into the church of Christ, and all the members of the old church had to be baptized into the new. The three thousand on Pentecost, Paul, Crispus, and all the first converts were Jews. How could they be baptized into an institution they were already in? Eh? Were there any holding-over members? Who were they? Mr. Weaver is wrong on this, as he is on everything else, but we are not discussing that subject. He is "too previous." He thinks Peter and John "had possession" of the temple because they went there at the hour of prayer. Why then were they arrested? If the writer of this (who was once a Methodist) should attend a Methodist meeting, Mr. Weaver would say he was a member and "had possession" of the church!

He still asserts that Christ was a Levitical priest, in the face of the fact that he contradicts six statements of Paul in the assertion. Why does he not try to rectify those contradictions? He quotes that Levi should "never want a man" to make offering before Cod. But Christ was not a Levi man, and his quotation proves nothing. Did Christ ever make an offering on a Levitical altar? You know he did not. Paul says: "If he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing there are priests," etc. All this nonsense about Christ being a Levitical priest has been brought in, in order to obtain the word sprinkle, which occurs in the ordination of Jewish priests. But it was not water, but ashes, that was sprinkled on the Levitical priests,

while their bodies were washed in water. Why does not Mr. Weaver try to meet our argument here? Is he "called and sent" not to notice the arguments of his opponent? He beats the world as an example of *how not to do it!* If he has nothing to offer, of course he should not attempt to offer anything.

He at last comes to the question, and gives us some philosophy on "into" and "out of." It takes an expert Methodist to put people "into the water" and "out of the water" without getting them wet. But Mr. Weaver is expert when it comes to doing a thing and not doing it, at the same time. He says the priests stood still in Jordan, when they were only at the brink of the water, and they came up out of Jordan, and had not been in the water at all. We think that no one has ever claimed that "in Jordan" means in the water. But the Savior was not only "in Jordan" and "in the river of Jordan," but he was in the water, for he came up "straightway out of the water" after his baptism. Philip and the eunuch "went down both into the water." They not only went into the creek or river (within the banks) but they went into the water. Suppose it had been said of the priests that they stood still in Jordan, in the river, in the water, and that they were buried in the water and born of water, would it not have made out the case? And suppose that their passage had been expressed by a word that all the lexicons say means to dip or immerse in water, would Mr. W. affirm that they never touched the water? As Jesus went up into a mountain," and not under it, and Zaccheus climbed up into a sycamore tree, and did not go into the inside of it, Mr. W. concludes that "into" does not mean "into." Jesus went within a space of territory called the mountain, as we say a man comes "into Texas" when he comes within a space or territory called Texas. When "they that do his commandments" enter in through the gates "into the city," Mr. Weaver must not (if he is one of them) conclude that he is not

in the city (but on top of it), and go to crawling under the houses! He would make himself a laughing stock for the angels! They would say: "That is some poor Methodist that has never learned what 'into' means!" Zaccheus went within a space called a tree. The branches and leaves of the tree extended around and beyond the space occupied by him. The city in the river was on an island. The word "into" in the Scriptures takes people into everything in God's universe. Into city, into country, into house, into barn, into oven, into bottles, into mouth, into heart, into head, into fire, into grace, into kingdom, into heaven, into hell, into lake of fire, into life eternal, into everlasting punishment! We modestly affirm that it ought to take a Methodist into the water, when Christ says go there! Suppose these two disputants were lawyers, and the readers of this debate were a jury, how easy it would be for us to win the case on circumstantial evidence! We would call the inspired witnesses, and have them testify. First let Matthew come into court. Matthew, you saw John baptize, and know how it was done; tell the jury about it, Matthew. Matthew: "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan." Say, Matthew, speak louder; Mr. Weaver is hard of hearing. Did you say "in Jordan" or "at Jordan?" Matthew: "IN JORDAN!" Tell about the baptism of the Savior. Matthew: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." Speak louder, Matthew, Mr. Weaver does not hear you. Matthew: "OUT OF THE WATER?" Now, Mark, you come into court, and tell all you know about the baptism in or at Jordan. Mark: "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan." Speak louder, Mark; Mr. W. is quite deaf, and some of the jury are a little dull of hearing. Did you say "at the river?" Mark: "IN THE RIVER OF JORDAN!" Now, John

you come into court. Do you know anything about John's baptizing? If so, tell the jury. John: "And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." Speak louder, John, Mr. Weaver can't hear you. Did you say he was baptizing there because there was much water, or camping there because there was much water for the people's stock? John: "BAPTIZING . . . BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER!" Now, Luke, you come into court. They say you wrote the book of Acts of Apostles, and told about how Philip baptized the eunuch. Tell the jury and Mr. Weaver about it, as Mr. W. is a very poor reader and can't make good sense out of some of the things you wrote. Luke: "And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water." Hold on, Luke. Did you say they came to an elephant's track, or a certain crawfish-hole? Luke: "A CERTAIN WATER!" Ah! Then what occurred? Luke: "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him; and when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." Stop, Luke. Did you say they went down *near by* the water? Speak loud, Mr. Weaver can't bear you. Luke: "WENT DOWN BOTH INTO THE WATER!" Paul, you come into court. You must have seen a great many persons baptized. Tell the jury what took place in baptism. Paul: "We were buried with him by baptism." What else took place? Paul: "Wherein also ye are risen with him." Stop, Paul. Did you say sprinkle and pour? Speak loud; Mr. Weaver is hard of hearing. Paul: "BURIED—RISEN!" John Wesley, come into court. You are not an inspired man, but you are pretty good authority with some people. Tell the jury and your son, Rev. Jos. C. Weaver, what Paul means by "buried" and "risen." Wesley: "Alludes to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Did you say by sprinkling? Speak louder; Mr. Weaver is deaf. Wesley: "BY IMMERSION!"

MR. WEAVER'S SIXTH SPEECH.

Our friend says that the historians say that "dipping was the apostolic mode." There is where I demand proof. If these historians, being as he claims them to be, Pedoes, and if they believed dipping to be the apostolic mode and would not practice it, I for one would not take them as evidence on any question.

I will state that our friend has to go to many texts, both in John's and Christian baptism to get his case in court, even circumstantially. Let's examine one point, and we will note others when we get to them. Christ "in Jordan," "in the river of Jordan," in the water, for he came up "straightway out of the water." I read from an immersion version: "And having been immersed, Jesus went up immediately from the water." So much for the "up out of."

I would ask what is a wilderness? Ex. 15:22: "So Moses brought Israel from the Red sea, and they went out into the wilderness of Shur, and they went three days in the wilderness, and found no water." It was a dry place. Num. 20:1-5: "Then came the children of Israel, even the whole congregation, into the desert of Zin, in the first month, and the people abode in Kadesh, and Miriam died there, and was buried there. And there was no water for the congregation, and they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and the people chode with Moses, and spake, saying, Would to God we had died when our brethren died before the Lord. And why have ye brought up the congregation of the Lord into this wilderness, that we and our cattle should die here? And wherefore have ye made us to come up out of Egypt to bring us unto this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines,

or of pomegranates, neither is there any water to drink." I read Deut. 8:15: "Who led thee through that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions and drought, where there was no water? "Who brought thee forth water out of the rock of flint?" We find no water in the wilderness, so we conclude that it is a poor place for an immersionist. Yet the record tells us that "John did baptize in the wilderness." Some are curious, then, to know how they could have been sprinkled, if there were no water there. We will let our Bible explain it to us. St. John 2:1-6: "And the mother of Jesus was there, and both Jesus was called and his disciples, to the marriage. And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus said unto him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come. His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it. And there were set there six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece." We learn from this text that the Jews carried water with them for purifying purposes when they went into a desert place. So they had it on this occasion. V. 6: "After the manner of the purifying of the Jews." It was a custom with all the Jews, except they washed their hands oft, ate not. "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not." The law for washing, or purifying, we have found to be sprinkling. Ex. 29:4: "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle and wash them with water." How was this washing to be done? *We* have seen from Num. 8:7, to cleanse them, the water of purifying was sprinkled on them. Also from Heb. 9:19. Moses took blood and water, according to the law, and sprinkled the book and all the people. And from Num. 19:13, we learn that unless the unclean person had the water of separation sprinkled on him, he was to be cut off from

his people. Then, besides this, with the amount of water they had, they could not have immersed themselves in order to wash, or purify themselves. V. 6: "Six waterpots of stone, containing two or three firkins apiece." A firkin is from six to nine gallons; we will allow nine. The water-pots contained two or three firkins. We will allow three. Then we have six waterpots holding three firkins apiece. That would give us eighteen firkins. With nine gallons to the firkin, we would have one hundred and sixty-two gallons for all the Jews to purify themselves in, that is, *immerse* themselves in. Then, as there was no baptistery there, they would have to put them in one end at a time, into a stone pot holding a few gallons of water, and besides, according to their law, the first unclean one that went in would have made the whole thing unclean, and not fit for use. So immersion, for this cleansing and purifying purpose, is out of the question. And yet, this water was there for the purifying of the Jews, and not to drink.

We are told that John baptized in Enon because there was much water there. John, 3:23: "And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized." If the much water was for baptizing, and if the baptizing could not be done except where there is much water, then how could he have baptized in the wilderness, and in Bethabara? So, if baptizing in Enon because there was much water there proves immersion, what does baptizing in Bethabara prove? John 1:28: "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." So John baptized in Bethabara beyond the Jordan, not in Jordan this time. John 10:40: "Therefore they sought again to take him; but he escaped out of their hand, and went away again beyond Jordan, *into the place* where John at first baptized, and there he abode." Into the place. If John baptized in water in a tank or river, Jesus abode in the tank or

river, for he went away beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized, and *there* he abode.

Now, my friends, suppose I am anxious to know just how John did baptize, could I not learn it from the Bible^{1]} Would God leave as important a subject as that without explanation in his word? I think not. Then let us go to the word of God for our information. And first I will call your attention to prophecy. What is it? I will say in reply it is God speaking to us through his prophet. So if we reject the prophecy, we reject the word of God, for none can prophesy but God. God put the words in the prophet's mouth. Read Isa. 49:1-2: "Listen, O isles, unto me, and hearken ye people from afar; the Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name; and he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a polished shaft; in his quiver hath he hid me." The Lord can make any true man a prophet. A true prophet claims no power, except he gets it from God, to prophesy. Read Jer. 1:4-7: "Then the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou earnest out of the womb I sanctified thee; and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. Then said I, Ah, Lord God, behold I can not speak, for I am a child. But the Lord said unto me, Say not I am a child, for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak." So we learn from this text that the prophet was not to speak his own words, but the words of God. Read Ezek. 3:17: "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore hear the word of my mouth; and give them warning from me." Read 2 Kings 6:8-12: "Then the king of Syria warred against Israel, and took counsel with his servants, saying, In such a place shall be my camp. And the man of God sent unto the king of Israel, saying, Be-

ware that thou pass not such a place, for thither the Syrians are come down. And the king of Israel sent to the place which the man of God told him and warned him of, and saved himself there, not once nor twice; therefore the heart of the king of Syria was sore troubled for this thing; and he called his servants, and said unto them, Will ye not show me which of us is for the king of Israel? And one of the servants said, None, my Lord, O king, but Elisha the prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber." If God had not put these words in Elisha's mouth, he could not have known them to have spoken them. Then it is God alone that can tell what shall come to pass in the future. Read Isa. 42:8-9: "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images. Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them." God says, "I tell you of them." Read Dan. 2:19: "Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision. Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven." V. 20: "Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever, for wisdom and might are his."

MR. BURNETT'S SIXTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says that if the historians were pedoes, and yet said the apostolic practice was dipping, he would not accept their testimony on any subject. Yes, but he has to accept their testimony, for there is none other on the subject. All the historians in the world are a unit as to the apostolic practice. The reason they accepted sprinkling as valid, they thought the church had the right to change it. Mr. Weaver repudiates the

historians, because they are all against him. And he repudiates the lexicons for a like reason. All the Catholic and Episcopal and Lutheran and Presbyterian historians, and all the scholars in those churches, admitted that the apostolic practice was dipping. Martin- Luther, the founder of the Lutheran church, and John Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian church, both said the apostles dipped their converts. John Wesley said that Paul in Bom. 6 had reference to "the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." The historians of the Bible, Matthew and Mark and Luke and John, say the act was dipping, for they used a word that always means to dip. John the Baptist said he dipped the Savior, for he used the same Greek word. All Greek lexicons define the word *baptizo* to dip or immerse, and not one defines it to sprinkle or pour. The historians, lexicons, scholars, church-founders, and Matthew and Mark and Luke and John and Paul and John the Baptist are all against Mr. Weaver.

He says we had to go to many texts and many places to establish our doctrine even circumstantially. We did not go to the many texts because a single text did not prove it, but to show what an abundance of proof we had. All the texts are against Mr. Weaver. If he will produce one text (which speaks of baptism), and it teaches sprinkling, we will give up the question. He careers around through the prophecies, trying to find something that will confuse your minds, because he has nothing in the New Testament that will sustain him. He says that God ought to have made the subject of baptism plain, and if a man is anxious to know just how John baptized he can learn it from the Bible. Then what does he do? He sails off into the prophecies and finds a text that has no reference to John nor baptism!

We have told him more than once that sprinkling of the "water of purifying" upon the Levites did not typify baptism,

and the baptismal word is not used there. Nor did Moses use the baptismal word when he "sprinkled both the book and all the people." Then what have these transactions to do with baptism? Nothing! In one case blood was sprinkled, in the other the ashes of the red heifer mixed with water. John did not use ashes or blood when he baptized the Savior, and a different word is used to express the action he performed. The Savior also used a different word when he gave the command to baptize the nations. Why does not Mr. Weaver pay some attention to this point? He still confounds the sprinkling of "the water of purifying" on the Levites with the washing of the priests "with water" at the door of the tabernacle, when they were two distinct transactions. At the door of the tabernacle water was used, and Maimonides, the great Hebrew scholar, says the whole body was immersed. As the holy garments were put upon the whole body, the whole body was washed. Mr. Weaver thinks a little space on the head was moistened, and the holy garments consisted of a little skull cap just large enough to cover the space that was moistened! True, the words "with water" are used there, but all scholars know that the word *en* means *in*, and it is so rendered 2042 times in the New Testament, while it is rendered *with* only 127 times. So we have a majority of 1915 in favor of "in water," in the New Testament alone! Mr. Weaver is not a democrat;—will not let the majority rule—even where it is sixteen to one!

Our friend is wonderfully amusing at times, and would make folks laugh, if he were not in such dead earnest! He makes a masterly effort to prove (what?) that a wilderness is a place where there is no water! He leads us forth (with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm) into the "wilderness of Shur," and on through the "desert of Zin"—where there was not water enough to sprinkle a baby—forgetting that John the Baptist did not baptize in the wilderness of Shur nor the desert of

Zin, but in the wilderness of Judea, which wilderness was a "well watered country!" Ah, beloved, you ought to study geography and the Bible, as well as a little Greek and history. The Jordan river ran through the wilderness of Judea! Webster, in his definition of wilderness, calls the ocean a wilderness! He quotes a poet as saying, "The watery wilderness yields no supplies." Yet Mr. Weaver can not find enough water in a *wilderness to sprinkle a baby!* Tut! tut! *We know there was an abundance of water where John baptized, for he baptized "in the river Jordan," and "in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there," and the Savior went up "straight-way out of the water."* He is so fearful that we will find some water in that country, that he tries to make us believe (he "six waterpots" at Cana were carried there from some distant place! His geographical knowledge is again at fault. Travelers tell us there was a great fountain at Cana, and Smith's Bible Dictionary says the waterpots were filled from that fountain. Mr. Weaver thinks the Jews could not have purified their bodies in those waterpots. But the Jews purified cups and pots and many other things, as well as bodies, and Maimonides says there was in every Jewish house a bath tub large enough to immerse a man's body in, and he further says that all washings of the body mentioned in the law were entire submersions.

And now comes another one of Mr. Weaver's jokes. He says if the "much water" at Enon proves dipping, the baptism at Bethabara must have been sprinkling, for Jesus "abode" where John "first baptized." If he will consult Matt. 3:5 and Mark 1:5, he will learn that John first baptized "in the river of Jordan." Bethabara means "house of the ford," and the Savior could very well abide in the place where the first baptisms took place, and still not abide in the water of a tank or river. *The writer recently baptized a preacher in Titus county, Texas, and*

in announcing the place of baptism he said: "We will baptize in Swananoa creek, at the usual place. Let as many as can assemble there." The people assembled in the place where we usually baptized, and yet did not abide in the water. Mr. Weaver thinks that because the Savior "went *into* the place," he must have gone into the river or tank. How does he know "into" means "into" there? Perhaps it means only near by, and the Savior abode near by where John baptized! How can "into" in that text put the Savior into the river or tank, and not put him into the river or tank in the other text? Mark says he was baptized *eis ton Iordanen*, that is, *into the Jordan*. The baptizing act put him into the Jordan. It takes an expert Methodist to make a word say a thing and not say it at the same time! But he says Bethabara was "beyond Jordan, not in Jordan this time." It was the "house of the ford," and as it was the place where John "first baptized" we know it was in Jordan, for Matthew and Mark both say John first baptized "in the river of Jordan." See Matt. 3:5, Mark 1:5. Jordan is a hard road for a Methodist to travel, and we do not wonder that Mr. Weaver tries to get beyond it and away from it! The house of the ford was simply on the thither side of the stream, in the place where John baptized. Mr. Weaver should learn that the words "in the place" may mean in a locality.

He thinks that, as the Savior came up "from the water" (according to one version), he was perhaps not in the water. Poor dodge. All immersed persons come up from the water, as well as out of it. Philip and the eunuch came up "out of the water," according to all versions. What will he do with this case? How could a person be "buried in baptism" without being in the water? And how could there be a resurrection in baptism (Col. 2:12) without a burial? If Mr. Weaver will show how there can be a burial and resurrection by sprinkling and pouring, we will give up the question.

MR. WEAVER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

Our friend says, "All the historians in the world," and all the scholars of the Catholic, Episcopal, Lutheran and Presbyterian churches admitted that the apostolic practice was dipping. This is a land of wholesale representation of the matter. I would like to have some proof of it before I believe it. Reader, suppose you ask a Presbyterian in person, and see if he admits any such statement to be true. Then worse, our friend says Matthew, Mark, Luke and John say the act was dipping. "Where is the proof? I would that our friend could give us more proof and less assertion.

If John "first baptized in the river of Jordan," then the Savior "went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized, and there he abode." John 10:40. He went into the place where John first baptized. If that was the river, he went into the river to live; if it was a baptistery in the house, he went into it; as he went into the place John baptized. It is our friends who are in a strait here. Sometimes they want it to mean into, and sometimes they want it to mean near by. In this place they want it to mean near by.

I will now finish the quotation from Daniel, 2nd chapter. I read 22nd verse: "He revealeth the deep and secret things; he knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him." Daniel claimed no power or wisdom to reveal of himself; it was all of God. Isa. 46:9-10: "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." None can do this but God. It is God who prophesies through his prophets, and he it is that brings it

to pass. Rev. 19:10: "I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, See thou do it not. I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus; worship God; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." It is necessary now for us to know how God fulfills his prophecies. For this needed light read Gal. 4:4: "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." He fulfills at the time, not a day before or a day late, but at the time. Now let the prophet tell us of John and of his work. Read Isa. 40:1-4: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably of Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." This text points to John as the forerunner of Christ, to prepare the way of the Lord. Now, as to his work more fully. Read Isa. 44:1-4: "Yet now hear, O Jacob, my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen. Thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee: Fear not, O Jacob, my servant, and thou Jerusalem, whom I have chosen. For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground, I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring, and they shall spring up as among the grass, and as willows by the water courses." John was sent to the thirsty, to prepare them for the Lord. Read Isa. 55:1: "Ho,

every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." So if we can rely on the prophecy, which is the word of God, John was to pour water on the thirsty, and God was to pour his Spirit on their seed. So that settles forever the mode of John's baptism.

The informed Jews expected Christ to baptize when he came. Read Isa. 52:13-15: "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men; so shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him; for that which hath not been told shall they see, and that which they had not heard shall they consider." Now, when John began to baptize the people they took him to be the Christ. Read John 1:19: "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? That we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" One thing is certain, if John had been immersing the people, they could not have taken him to be the Christ, who should sprinkle the nations. Hence, we safely conclude that John's baptism could not have been immersion. Christ was to sprinkle, or baptize, the nations, and to fulfill this prophecy he called his ministry

and ordained and sent them out to do this work in his name. Read Matt. 12:5: "These twelve Jesus sent forth." V. 7, "And as ye go, preach." Read Matt. 28:19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Christ has his ministers now in all nations, sprinkling, or baptizing, the people in his name, thereby fulfilling his prophecy. So Christ is sprinkling (or baptizing) many nations through his ministry. Read John 4:1: "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, and his disciples." Jesus baptized through his disciples. This is a plain statement of facts, and reveals the mode of John's baptism unmistakably to those who desire to know the truth of it.

We note the baptism of Pentecost. Read Acts 2:41: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." It is hard for one to believe that the apostles could have immersed this many persons in the time they had to do the work, even if they had plenty of water in which to immerse. And if there was plenty of water for the purpose, why did John go from Jerusalem to Jordan to get water for immersing purposes'?

We have another hard case in Acts 4:4: "Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed; and the number of men was about five thousand." Nothing said of baptism here, but they believed and our immersion friends can't add believers without immersing them. So it devolves on them to prove that they were immersed. One could easily see how the apostles could have baptized them as Moses did, for "he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people." Adopt

the mode in this figure and everything is plain and possible, otherwise it is a difficult job to explain.

We next note the jailer's baptism. Acts 16:33: "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." He took them. They were in the inner prison. V. 24. So when they went out of it they were in the prison. There the work of preaching, etc., was done. After the work was done, he brought them into his house, and set meat before them, etc. We know that Paul did not take him out of the enclosure, for that would have violated the rigid law and forfeited the jailer's life. Besides. Paul would not go out without the proper officers to take him out. If they had gone out of that enclosure without the proper authorities taking them out, the jailer's life would have been taken. See a similar case in Acts 12:19: "And when Herod had sought for him, and found him not, he examined the keepers, and commanded that they should be put to death." In as much- as we have no news of the jailer's being put to death, we safely conclude they did not go out of the prison. Besides, there was no necessity to take them out for baptism, for it could have been performed scripturally in the prison. Paul had only to step to the jailer's water bucket and take his gourd and pour water on the jailer and his wife and babies, and then take him and all his house into the ark

MR. BURNETT'S SEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver thinks our statement, that all the Catholic and Episcopal and Lutheran and Presbyterian historians said the apostolic practice was dipping, was too broad, and he wants the proof. We gave the proof, for we gave their own statements. (See fourth speech.) We gave Bossuet, the celebrated Catholic, Stackhouse (Episcopal), Mosheim and Neander (Lutherans),

and Philip Schaff, the celebrated Presbyterian. Why does not Mr. Weaver give us one prominent historian (of any church) on his side of the question? Why can he not give us one Greek lexicon that says the word *baptizo* means to pour or sprinkle? Ah, beloved, he knows the reason why! They are all against him! But he thinks that if you will inquire of some Presbyterian in person (who can not perhaps spell "crucifix"), he will dispute what the historians say! Yes, it is likely that Mr. Weaver himself would dispute the historians and lexicons, for he has already done so. But, worse and worse, he says we said Matthew and Mark and Luke and John said the act was dipping, and he asks, "Where is the proof?" The proof is, that they used a word that means to dip, and is so defined by all the lexicons. Mr. Weaver still thinks that if John first baptized in the river Jordan, the Savior went into the river and "abode." Well, the Bible says he did first baptize in the "river of Jordan" (see Matt. 3:6, Mark 1:5), and in the water. Mark 1:10. But when the Savior "went into the place," he simply went into the locality, for place means locality. See Webster's dictionary. No, we do not say it means into in one text, and near by in another. It always means into. And the Savior did go "into the place," but Mr. W. is in error as to what the word "place" means. He ought to study the dictionary, as well as tin¹ historians and lexicons. But Mr. Weaver has not explained how "into the place" can mean into the place, and "into the water" not mean into the water, in Acts 8:38. Let him try his hand on it.

He quotes Isa. 40, where it speaks of John the Baptist as the forerunner of Christ, and then jumps over to Isa. 44 (where it has no reference to John), and finds "pour water!" It takes an exegetical gymnast to perform such a feat as that! But Mr. Weaver has to make long jumps to get his proof and his proposition together; for they are very far apart. Isa. 40 speaks

of John the Baptist, but has no "pour water" in it. Isa. 44 has "pour water" in it, but no John the Baptist! That is bad, very bad—for Mr. Weaver and his bad cause. Moreover, it is God, and not John the Baptist, that is to "pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground." Did John baptize any dry ground in the region round about the Jordan? It is simply a prophecy about a refreshing season in Israel, after a long drouth, and has no more reference to John the Baptist than to the man in the moon. But how could John fulfill a prophecy about "pouring water" by using a word that never means to pour? The word in Isaiah is not the word that expresses what John did in the Jordan, in either Greek or English. But just awhile ago Mr. Weaver said John sprinkled the Savior, because the Levites were sprinkled; now he has changed the mode to pour. He has a flexible baptism, that can be twisted to suit the occasion, and then he can not make it fit. If John poured water, to lit Isa. 44, and to lit the pouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, then he did not fit the sprinkling of the ashes on the Levites! Say, Mr. Weaver: Was the Holy Spirit ever sprinkled on anybody? You will not try to answer that, beloved, will you? But neither the pouring of Isaiah, nor the sprinkling of the ashes on the Levites, had any reference to baptism.

He next comes to Isa. 52, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," and again changes his mode of baptism! It is now sprinkling, and not pouring. He thinks it means that Christ, through his ministers, would sprinkle many nations in baptism, and when he commissioned them and sent them out they began to fulfill this prophecy. But the word used by Christ in the commission, when he said baptize the nations, is not the word used in Isa. 52, and there translated "sprinkle," and it is not the word used in any of Mr. Weaver's prophecies! Strange, that if Christ wished his ministers to sprinkle the

nations, in fulfillment of this prophecy, he should use a word that never means to sprinkle, but always to dip, when there were two or three Greek words right before his eyes that always mean to sprinkle! Did Christ know nothing about language, or is Mr. Weaver, in error in his application of this prophecy? Mr. Weaver is in error, most assuredly. The word sprinkle in Isa. 52:15 is from the Hebrew *nazah*, which Gesenius thus defines: "To leap, to spring, to exult, to leap for joy; when applied to liquids, to spirt, to spatter, to be sprinkled." Please note that the word only means to be sprinkled in the passive form, and then only when it applies to liquids; and as in Isa. 52:15 it refers to nations and not to liquids, this meaning will not apply. A distinguished scholar renders this verse: "So shall many nations exult on account of him." Dr. Barnes, the celebrated Presbyterian commentator, says: "It may be remarked that whichever of the above senses is assigned, it furnishes no argument for the practice of sprinkling in baptism."

Mr. Weaver thinks it doubtful if the apostles could have dipped three thousand in one day, even if they had sufficient water for the purpose. According to the best biblical information, there were at that date thirty-five acres of water in Jerusalem, in the various pools of the city. The pool of Bethesda had "five porches" of entrance, in which lay a "multitude of impotent folk" waiting for the moving of the waters. There was certainly no scarcity of water. Allowing ten hours for the baptizing, there would be only three hundred per hour, and three of the apostles could have baptized the whole number. The writer has baptized, without any undue haste, three persons per minute, which would make eighteen hundred in ten hours. He is confident he could easily baptize one thousand persons in ten hours. Two Baptist ministers dipped twenty-two hundred Telugus in one clay. John the Baptist did not

"go from Jerusalem to Jordan to get water for immersing purposes," for John the Baptist was never in Jerusalem, so far as we have any account.

As to the five thousand at the temple (Acts 4), it is not said they were baptized in a day. The statement is, "Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand." Mr. "Weaver will certainly admit that five thousand men could believe in a day. He thinks the apostles could have baptized them, if they had done as Moses did, when he "sprinkled both the book and all the people." But Moses did not baptize the book and the people, and the baptismal word is not used in that text. The word used is *raino*, and not *baptizo*, and *raino* is not the word Christ used when he gave the command to baptize. Our friend's figures and prophecies all have the wrong word! Is not that singular?

Mr. Weaver thinks the jailer's life would have been forfeited if he had taken Paul and Silas out of the prison. So it would, if he had set them at liberty. But a jailer may take prisoners from jail, and still hold them in custody, and suffer no harm. They often do this in Texas—even for baptizing purposes. And the Philippian jailer did take Paul and Silas out of the jail, for the historian, Luke, says he did. Read Acts 16:32: "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." Now they are in the jailer's house. What next? "And he TOOK THEM (where?) the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway; and when he had BROUGHT THEM INTO HIS HOUSE, he set meat before them." They were brought into his house after the baptizing, and they were in his house before the baptizing, for they spake the word "to all that were in his house." Hence, they were out of the house at the time of the baptizing! See? The bucket and gourd and the

babies are all in Mr. Weaver's imagination, and not in the Bible. But it is well for a man to have a fruitful imagination, when he has no Scripture to sustain him!

MR. WEAVER'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

Our friend asks why I can't give one Greek lexicon that gives sprinkle or pour. I will say in reply I am affirming that the Scriptures teach sprinkling or pouring as valid baptism, that is the plain reason why I don't go to the lexicons. If our friend will allow it, I will enter that field with him to his satisfaction when I get in all my scriptural arguments. I can't turn aside to do so now.

Our friend says "into" simply means locality. So, when John baptized in the wilderness, he simply baptized in that locality, and the river Jordan ran through that locality. So he baptized first in the river Jordan, that is giving *into* great latitude. Then why not say John baptized in Jordan, that is, in that locality, and when Philip and the eunuch went down into the water they simply went down into that locality? The Bible tells us that Jesus went away again beyond Jordan (not in) into the place where John at first baptized, and there he abode. So if he first baptized in Jordan, Jesus abode in Jordan; if in a tank, he abode in a tank. If we take the record, he abode in the place John baptized in, and that was beyond Jordan and not in Jordan.

Our friend says it was God, and not John, that was to pour water on the thirsty. God did it- through John. See John 4:1-2. Here we learn that Christ baptized through his disciples. All the baptisms performed by our God are pouring in mode. Our friend says, "Strange that Christ used a word that never means to sprinkle, but always to dip, when speaking

of baptism," and he asks if Christ knew anything of the meaning of words? I will say Christ knew language, and for that reason he took a word that was not exclusive, but broad in meaning, signifying to wash in a general sense, but we will settle that when we come to the lexicons.

As to the Pentecost baptism and the jailer's baptism, I leave them to the reader. They will take care of themselves. It is hard for one to think immersion possible in either case.

Acts 18:7-11: "And he departed thence, and entered into a certain man's house named Justus, one that worshiped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue. And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee, to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them." Nothing said about Paul taking these out for baptism; and if he could have scripturally baptized these in the house, he could have baptized the jailer also. So we conclude he did not take the jailer out for baptism.

We next note Paul's baptism, Acts 9th chapter. We learn from verse 11 that Saul was in the house of Judas, praying. So God heard one sinner pray. Verse 15 teaches us that his repentance and prayer was so genuine that God chose him to bear his name before the Gentiles. We learn that God's conversation with Ananias was so satisfactory that he called him "Brother Saul," and told him that Jesus had sent him that he might receive sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. (A good case for baptism.) From verse 18 we learn that the seeming scales had fallen from his eyes and he received sight, "and arose and was baptized." Arose, that is, stood up, no going

to hunt water in this text. This work was done "immediately." Another hard case to get to water.

We next note the case of Cornelius, Acts 10th chapter. Verse 43 teaches us that remission of sins was by faith in his name. Verse 44 teaches us that while Peter was preaching that truth, the Holy Ghost fell on all who heard the word. (Another good case for water baptism.) So Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." So we learn that not only Cornelius but all these were baptized. No mention of baptistery, or going to hunt water for baptizing. This pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the people is called baptism; then would not the pouring on of clean water be baptism of water? If not, why not? There is uniformity of Christian baptism, and it must be remembered that it takes both water and Spirit to make Christian baptism, for Christ said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." What God joins together let no man put asunder. If being born of water is water baptism, then would not being born of the Spirit be Spirit baptism? If not, why not? We know the Spirit baptism is by pouring on, then, to be uniform, the water must and is poured on. The Spirit and water baptism were so much alike in mode, Peter said when he saw one it reminded him of the other. There is no uniformity in the immersion theory. Some dip three times, others one, some face down, others duck down, some with clothes on, others without, some deep, others not so deep, some in rivers or pools or ponds, others in baptisteries, some in muddy water, others in clear water, etc.

We next note the eunuch's baptism. Acts 8th chapter. We learn from verse 30 that he was reading the prophet Esaias. Philip asked if he understood what he read. He answered,

"How can I, except some man guide me." Hence the need for a person who knows the way to guide. He was reading Isaiah's prophecy, referring to Christ and his work, also his crucifixion. The prophet's plain, reference to Christ began in the 52d chapter, and at the 13th verse, "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high." He had read this prophecy to the 7th verse of the 53d chapter when Philip came to him. So Philip, having found Christ himself, had an experience, and could teach his friend. So he took his text or prophecy, and preached Christ unto him. So Philip took this hidden man that should deal so prudently, and that should sprinkle the nations, and that should be despised and rejected of men, and was to be a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and was to be wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, and finally to be crucified on the tree of the cross for our sins, and brought him before the eunuch as the Savior of the world, and especially of them that believe. And when the eunuch saw him by faith, he desired baptism in his name. He must have gotten the idea of baptism from the text, "He shall sprinkle many nations," for he was first to mention baptism. Philip did not mention it; he preached Christ for salvation. Our friends preach water these days, and generally beg persons to be baptized. Quite a change. Our friends base their conclusion for immersion in this text on the fact stated, "They went down both into the water," "come up out of the water." They seem to overlook the fact that both went down into the water. If the going down into the water proves that one went under, would it not prove that both went under, for both went down into? And if coming up out of the water proves that the eunuch came from under the water, would it not prove as much for Philip? If not, why not? Yet now and then we hear one say that this language is so plain that they could swear that

the eunuch was immersed. Let's try this language in a sentence not connected with water baptism, and see if one could safely swear to its mode of doing the thing. I say Smith and Jones were traveling through a certain country, and came to a certain city; and Smith commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the city, both Smith and Jones, and he killed Jones; and when they were come up out of the city, the sheriff caught away Smith, that Jones saw him no more. Now, could you know how Smith killed Jones, for a surety? You could not. You could not say with knife, pistol or gun, or club. There are many ways to kill. You would know the fact that he killed him, but the how you could not know, except by true evidence, and the language in the sentence does not furnish the evidence. But, as we have seen, the word of God tells how baptism is to be administered, and that is by sprinkling or pouring. So, if we believe the evidence, or record, we know how it was done. I am as well satisfied that Philip sprinkled or poured the water on that eunuch as if I had been there and witnessed the transaction, for I believe the record God has given us, and it makes it plain. Isa. 56:4-5: "Neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree; for thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant: Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters."

MR. BURNETT'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

Mr. Weaver says the reason he does not try to find a lexicon that defines *baptizo* to sprinkle is, he is affirming that "the Scriptures teach" sprinkling or pouring as valid baptism. He intimates that we are trying to decoy him away from the Scriptures. Not so. The Scriptures were written in Greek, and

when we go to a Greek lexicon to learn the meaning of a Bible word we are still in the Scriptures. To use a Bible word in an unscriptural sense is to get out of the Scriptures. And that is what Mr. Weaver has been doing ever since this debate commenced. He finds the word sprinkle or pour in the prophecies, where it has no reference to baptism, and presses it into service; and when we tell him the word the prophet used is not the word the Savior used for baptism, and point him to the lexicons for the meaning of the two different words, he says we are trying to lead him from the Scriptures!

, He says we said "into" means locality. A mistake. We said "place" means locality, and when Jesus went into the place where John baptized, he simply went into the locality. So all his flourish about Jesus abiding in a river or tank is Methodist moonshine. He disputes Webster's dictionary, just like he does the Greek lexicons. He says it was "beyond Jordan, not in Jordan," where John first baptized. He disputes Matthew and Mark in that statement. See Mat. 3:6, Mark 1:5. It was "beyond Jordan" in the sense it was on the thither side of the stream, but it was in the place or locality of the baptism. Place means locality, but water does not mean locality, and John baptized in the water. See Mat. 3:16.

He says God poured the water (of Isa. 44) through John. Yes, but God used the word *cheo*, and John used the word *baptizo*. How do you account for that? And John baptized people while God poured water on the dry ground! A different administrator, a different subject, a different word, and hence a different action. You might as well give it up, Mr. Weaver. You never can make it fit. You try to fulfill a "pour" prophecy in Isa. 44 by a dip word in John the Baptist, and a "sprinkle" prophecy in Isa. 52, by a dip word in the baptism of the eunuch! You change the mode of baptism to suit your contradictory prophecies! John administered

baptism by pouring, and the Savior commanded baptism by sprinkling, and both represent the: baptism of the Holy Ghost! But you have not yet told us when the Holy Ghost was ever sprinkled on anybody! And you forget that you just a little while ago told us that John sprinkled the Savior in fulfillment of the sprinkling of the ashes on the Levites! Ah, beloved, it is in a terrible mess! We have tried in vain to get Mr. Weaver to explain why not one of his sprinkle and pour prophecies contains the baptismal word. He is as shy of it as a horse is of a black stump.

We asked him why Christ used a word that always means to dip, if he wished us to sprinkle and pour? He says Christ used a broad word, a Word that is not exclusive! That is a mistake. The word Christ used is exclusive—it excludes sprinkle and pour from its definition, according to every lexicon in the United States.

Because Paul "entered into a certain man's house named Justus," Mr. W. thinks all the Corinthians were baptized in that house! And he thinks if all these people could have been baptized in a house, the jailer could also. It is not said that any of the Corinthians were baptized in a house, for there is not a word on the subject. As to the jailer, the record says he was out of the house when baptized, for when the baptism was over he "brought them into his house" and "set meat before them." Acts 16:34. Our friend ought to put off his Methodist spectacles and put on gospel glasses and read that passage more carefully.

He says Paul prayed before baptism (yes), and was called "brother Saul," (yes) and was filled with the Holy Ghost (no), and was hence a good case for baptism. Does Mr. Weaver Wait for his candidates to pray and be filled with the Holy Ghost before he baptizes them? What about the little babies, that are "conceived and born in sin," (See Meth. Discipline)

and the seekers he sometimes sprinkles? Are they full of the Holy Ghost? Saul was a brother Jew before baptism, but not a brother Christian. If he was, he was a Christian in his sins, for Ananias told him to be baptized and wash away his sins. Did Mr. Weaver ever tell a man to wash away his sins in baptism? Eh? He had better let that subject alone till we get to it, and attend to his sprinkling and pouring. He says there is nothing said about Paul going to the water. No, but a word is used that means to dip, and we know that was what was done. If it should be stated that a traveler ate his dinner on a prairie by the wayside, we would know there was food there, for the word "ate" indicates it. The same is true of the case of Cornelius, which needs no attention. It is not intimated that either Paul or Cornelius was baptized in the house. Paul was told to "arise," which shows that he went somewhere. He could have been sprinkled while kneeling.

Mr. Weaver says the Spirit falling on Cornelius reminded Peter of John's baptism. That is a mistake. It is not, stated that the mode of the Spirit's reception is what reminded Peter; The word used to express the falling on of the Spirit is *epiipto* while the word used to express what John did is *baptizo*. The falling on was therefore not the baptism. He says it takes both water and Spirit to constitute baptism, and "what God hath joined together let no man put asunder." He puts them asunder every time he baptizes a baby! Do little babies receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost? He thinks if born of water means water baptism, born of the Spirit means Spirit baptism. Very well. Did Mr. W. ever know anything that was born of a thing smaller than itself? How can a man be born of a spoonful of water? If Mr. Weaver will find one case, in all the universe of God, where a thing was born of a thing smaller than itself, we will give up the controversy! As his creed-says a man must be born of water to enter into the kingdom of God, and Metho-

dists are not born of water, as they have too small a quantity when they rantize, Mr. Weaver and his folks are outside the kingdom, according to their own creed! Bad! bad!! bad!!!

He says the eunuch was reading the passage, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," and he must have learned baptism from that text. The record does not say he read that passage, and the passage he did read is in another chapter. But if he did read that passage, Dr. Albert Barnes (the celebrated Presbyterian commentator) says it furnishes no ground for sprinkling in baptism. Mr. W. does not see how the eunuch learned baptism, if he did not learn it from that text. As the baptismal word is not contained in that text, it is clear that he did not learn baptism from it. Philip "preached unto him Jesus," and that means he preached the commands of Jesus. At the city of Samaria Philip "preached Christ unto them." and "they were baptized both men and women." Did they learn baptism from the prophecy of Isaiah? Our friend thinks we could not learn how Smith killed Jones, if it were recorded like the baptism of the eunuch. If the act of killing were defined by all the lexicons to be a specific performance, we would know how it was done. As Mr. Weaver has Jones coming out of the city after he was killed, we do not think he was killed at all! It is about as doubtful as Methodist baptism! The writer has dipped three hundred Methodists, who had had the doubtful act performed upon them. He says if the going down into the water means going under it, both Philip and the eunuch were baptized. We never heard any one say that the going down into the water was the baptizing act, but it was necessary to it. Going into the water was not necessary to sprinkling, but was to immersion. Nobody (but a Methodist preacher) would go down into the water to sprinkle water on a man! Yet every translation of the Scriptures in the world says Philip and the eunuch went down both into the water.

He says immersionists do not have uniformity. Some dip face downwards, some dip three times, some in a river, pool, baptistry, etc. Yes, but they all dip, and that is what Christ commanded. Mr. Weaver sprinkles, pours, moistens, dips (any kind of a person) and calls it all baptism in the name of Christ! He's a nice man to talk about uniformity!

MR. WEAVER'S NINTH SPEECH.

Our friend is still playing on the word "baptizo." His arguments are as if the word meant to dip exclusively. I submit this challenge to him, first give a lexicon that defines the word dip only. Give one that defines it to dip in Christ's day. Our friend overlooked the request made to let us take up the lexicon question when we are through with our Bible argument, and sift it thoroughly. Will he grant us the privilege, when we get to the lexicons?

Our friend's play on "into" and "place" don't help him out of his trouble. He says I dispute Matthew and Mark. No. If there is a dispute, the Book does that, for it says it was beyond Jordan. As to his exposition of baptisms mentioned in our last, I will risk them with the reader. He says Christ commanded to dip for baptism. That is presumption worse than "Methodist moonshine." He can't show a lexicon that defines the word to mean dip in Christ's day. He assumes that "baptizo" is specific in its meaning while it is generic, and means to wash in the New Testament, with no respect to specific mode.

Our friend did not give our entire quotation from Isa. 56:3-5. He omitted the words, "I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off." We learn from this text that God promised both the stranger and the eunuchs that kept his Sabbaths, and did the things that pleased him, and en-

tered into his covenant, a place in his house and a name better than of son or daughter, even an everlasting name that should not be cut off. We learn from the Scriptures elsewhere that Moses was in God's house,, and that the everlasting covenant was made with Abraham and his seed. So this eunuch was received into God's church, and not into a supposed new one, and this church of God had the sprinkling prophecies in it, and of course the eunuch wanted the baptism of this church, and it as we have seen was affusion.. So we safely conclude, from a right understanding of God's word, the eunuch was not immersed.

We next note Ezek. 36:21-27, in which we will find the mode of Christian baptism plainly pointed out. "But I had pity for mine holy name, which the house of Israel had profaned among the heathen, whither they went. Therefore say unto the house of Israel, thus saith the Lord God: I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for mine holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went. And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." We learn from v. 17 that the house of Israel defiled their land by sinning against God; v. 18 teaches that God poured his fury upon them for their sins; v. 19 teaches that God scattered them

among the heathen throughout the countries. So in the text we have a history of their return to Jerusalem or to their own land. God did this not for their sakes but for his holy name's sake, that is to keep his promise to their fathers. V. 24, God took them from among the heathen and out of all countries and brought them to their own land; v. 25, God was to sprinkle clean water upon them, which he did through his ministry; v. 26, God gave them new hearts and new spirits and took away their stony hearts and gave them hearts of flesh, that is, soft, pure hearts; v. 27, then God put his Spirit within them. God would not put his Spirit in an unclean or hard, wicked heart; before he would come in and take possession, he must take the wicked heart away and give a new or clean one. We find the fulfillment of this prophecy in Acts 2nd ch. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." "The day," the prophesied of day, "was fully *come*." Not the day before nor the day after, but the special day spoken of by the prophet. V. 4: "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." They were filled with the Holy Ghost, or, in other words, God gave them new hearts and new spirits, or right or correct spirits. Then God put his Spirit within them, so that they could do his will to speak with tongues, or do anything God wanted them to do. V. 5: "And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." The prophet said God would gather them out of all countries. So that fits all right. V. 6: "Now, when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language." The prophet said when this great work was performed the heathen should witness it. "And the heathen shall know that I am the Lord." And they learned that the wall between Jew and Gentile was taken down

that day. You ask, Where is the sprinkling of water mentioned in v. 25 of this prophecy? We have it in v. 41. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." So every appointment is clearly fulfilled in Acts 2nd ch. If we believe the prophet, we know as well how they were baptized on that day as if we had been there and witnessed it.

We note the true mode of baptism is taught in figure. Heb. 9:9: "Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." From Deut. 12:23 we learn that the blood is the life, and was not to be eaten by God's people. V. 27 teaches that the offerings should be upon the altar of the Lord God. V. 21 teaches that God hath chosen to put his name on the altar. In Heb. 9th chapter Paul tells us, "When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." In Num. 19:13 we find the law for purifying an unclean person, which reads: "Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord, and that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him." This gives us the mode plainly. Take another figure, Ex. 12:7: "And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door posts of the houses, wherein they shall eat it." V. 13: "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt." The blood on the outposts pointed to the people on the inside as in covenant with God, or, in other words, under the blood. That is the office

of water baptism; it is a token or seal of the Covenant, on the outside, pointing to the inward grace in the heart, and when God sees it he recognizes the person as his child. Take Lev. 17:6: "And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." This token outside to be seen pointing to the blood of Christ the life of the world, Christ's blood to be sprinkled on the heart. "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." We run the reference from this text to Ezek. 36:25. There we have both the sprinkling of clean water and the giving of a new heart, one external, the other internal, one performed by the minister, the other by the Almighty God. See this internal seal, 2 Cor. 1:22: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." V. 21 teaches that God did this work in our hearts. Eph. 4:30: "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Now, the external seal, Rev. 7:3: "Saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads." Below is given the number that were sealed out of all the tribes of Israel. This external seal was water baptism, which was God's name on the forehead of his people; and the internal was the baptism of the Spirit, God writing on the heart."

MR. BURNETT'S NINTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says we argue as if the word *baptizo* means to dip only, and challenges us to produce a lexicon that gives only the word dip. Why, bless your soul, they all give dip, or plunge, or immerse, or overwhelm, or some kindred word. Bagster says: "Dip, immerse." Bass says: "Dip, immerse, or plunge in water." Bloomfield says: "Immerse, or sink

anything in water or other liquid." Dawson says: "Dip or immerse in water, to baptize." Donnegan says: "Immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to sink." Dunbar says: "Dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm." Groves says: "Dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, wash, cleanse, purify." Liddell & Scott say: "Dip in or under water, of ships, to sink or disable them." Sophocles says: "Dip, immerse, sink," Thayer says: "Dip repeatedly, immerse, submerge." We could give others, but they are all alike. Not one says the word means to pour or sprinkle. But Mr. Weaver asks for one that gives dip in Christ's day. They all do it. We have before us as we write this a number of lexicons, and they all give dip as a New Testament definition of the word. Here is one (Thayer), the highest and best: "In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see baptism, 3), viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin," etc. Of the noun *baptisma* he says: "A word peculiar to the New Testament and ecclesiastical writers, immersion, submersion," etc. That is "specific" enough, is it not? Of the many lexicon's taught in the colleges of the United States, not one is "generic" enough to define it by the word sprinkle or pour, and that is the definition Mr. Weaver needs to sustain his proposition. He thinks we ought to let the lexicons alone till he comes to them. Alas, we fear he will never come to them. The first duty of a debater is to define the terms of his proposition, and the terms of the texts he quotes to sustain it. Mr. Weaver continues to quote texts from the prophecies that contain a different word, and has no meaning in common with the baptismal word. He says *baptizo* in the New Testament means to wash without regard to mode: No lexicon says so. It means to wash, but not

by sprinkling and pouring. We challenge him to produce one ease. Water alone was never sprinkled on any person for any purpose in either Old or New Testament. If he will produce one example, we will give up the question.

He says God promised, in Isa. 56, that eunuchs who kept his Sabbaths, etc., should have a name above that of sons and daughters, and he applies this to the eunuch that Philip baptized! To show the utter absurdity of this, it need only be observed that the Sabbaths mentioned in Isa. 56 had been abolished long before Philip baptized the eunuch. They belonged to Judaism, and were "nailed to the cross," (Col. 2:16-17) but Mr. W. has torn them loose and brought them down into the gospel age! Tut! tut!

He next comes to the "clean water" of Ezek. 36, and says this text clearly points out the mode of Christian baptism. Why then is the baptismal word not found in the text? Sprinkle is from *raino* and not *baptizo*. This is Mistake No. 1. The prophecy was fulfilled five hundred years before Christ was born, and not on the day of Pentecost. If Mr. Weaver had paid any attention to the persons addressed in his text, he would have seen that they were Israelites then in bondage, and that the sprinkling was done when they were gathered out of captivity into their own land. The Jews were not in captivity on the day of Pentecost. This is Mistake No. 2. God said: "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land: THEN¹ will I sprinkle (*raino*) clean water upon you." When? God said he would do it when he brought them out of captivity.; Mr. Weaver says he did it on the day of Pentecost! A miss of five hundred years! But that does pretty well for our wild opponent. This is Mistake No. 3. When Ezekiel said "sprinkle clean water" he used the word *raino*. On the day of Pentecost, when Peter said "be baptized," he used the word *bap-*

tizo. Why use a different word if sprinkle "and baptize are the same act? And why is a different word used in all of Mr. W.'s prophetic texts? He could not explain, if his life depended upon it! The life of his unscriptural doctrine depends upon it, but he will not explain, for the moment he makes the attempt the foundation will be knocked from under his whole fabric! This is Mistake No. 4. Listen here, beloved: God said in Ezek. 36: "From all your idols will I cleanse you." Methodists do not think baptism cleanses from idolatry; besides, there was not an idolater present on the day of Pentecost, and there had not been an idolater in Israel since the captivity. Those baptized on Pentecost were "devout men out of every nation," who had come up to Jerusalem to worship the God of Abraham. This is Mistake No. 5. God said in Ezek. 36: "I will cause you to dwell in the cities, and the wastes shall be builded." Mr. Weaver thinks this was fulfilled in Acts 2:5: "There were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven." Jerusalem is not "cities," and he can not show one "waste" that was builded after the day of Pentecost. This is Mistake No. 6. God said in Ezek. 36:29: "I will call for the corn, and will increase it, and will lay no famine upon you." Whereas, immediately after Pentecost a famine commenced and lasted forty years. So, if Mr. Weaver is correct, the prophecy is false. This is Mistake No. 7. God said in Ezek. 36:34-35: "And the desolate land shall be tilled, whereas it lay desolate in the sight of all that passed by, and they shall say, This land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden, and the waste and desolate and ruined cities are become fenced and are inhabited." If Mr. Weaver will show one ruined city that was fenced and inhabited after the gospel age commenced, we will give up the whole question. This is Mistake No. 8. The prophecy of Ezekiel promises great prosperity to the Jewish nation after the captivity, and that

prosperity did come, and is mentioned by Herod in his address to the nation, when he raised the contribution to build the great temple of Herod. But Mr. W. attempts (and fails) to find fulfillment of this prosperity on Pentecost. This is Mistake No. 9. Now what goes with his bold statement, "So that fits all right!" It does not fit a single item of the prophecy, If we should label Mr. Weaver we would call him the "Mighty Methodist Misfit," for he has made nothing but misfits since this debate began. But, you ask, was there a sprinkling of clean water on the Jews when they returned from captivity? Yes, sir. The "clean water" of Ezek. 36 was not water alone, but the cleansing water of Num. 19 (ashes mixed with water), and it cleansed from idolatry and other impurities. And it was actually sprinkled on the Jews when they returned from captivity. See Neh. 12:30: "And the priests and Levites purified themselves, and purified the people, and the gates and the wall." To learn how this purifying was done, read Num. 8:7, "Sprinkle water of purifying upon them."

He thinks Moses baptized the book and the people. Is the word *baptizo* used there? No! It is *raino*, and that word is never used for baptism by the Savior or his apostles. Another one of Mr. Weaver's mistakes. He also gets the wrong word in Heb. 10:22: "Having our hearts sprinkled (*rantizo*) from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed (*louo*) with pure water." If the bodies are sprinkled as well as the hearts, why does the apostle use a different word? Ah, beloved, we know the reason, but Mr. Weaver does not, and if he does know he will not tell you.

He closes with Rev. 7:22, the sealing in the foreheads, and he thinks that is baptism. Why, bless your soul, beloved, that sealing was done after the opening of the sixth seal of the book, and all Bible scholars admit that it is near the end of the world. Was there no baptism till that day? Those sealed

had on white robes, and had palms in their hands, and cried, "Salvation to our God!" Were there any unsealed ones in the company? Better mind, or you will make baptism essential to salvation! The Beast of Rev. 14 sealed his subjects in their foreheads. Did he also have a baptism? This is another wild break.

MR. WEAVER'S TENTH SPEECH.

Our friend uses the lexicons to suit him. Why not give the entire meaning as they give it? Our friend must know that all the lexicons are against his narrow rendering of "baptize" Dr. Carson freely admits as much. Our friend says. "Alas, we fear he will never come to them." I promise him now that so soon as we get through with our scriptural argument he shall have the lexicons to his content. He challenges me to give one lexicon to define the word to mean wash by pouring or sprinkling. I will say that all New Testament lexicons give it wash and nearly all of them prefer the washing by affusion.

Our friend thinks the Sabbath mentioned by the prophet had been abolished long before Philip baptized the eunuch. He claims that it belonged to Judaism, and was nailed to the cross. He seemingly don't like the Old Testament. I think he is as much off on that as he is on all the rest of his new theory. Reader, turn to Gen. 2:1-3, and find the Sabbath before Judaism had any existence. Christ said the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. So it was not made for the Jew, but for man.

Our friend thinks Ezek. 36:21-22 was fulfilled five hundred years before Christ was born, and not on Pentecost. But our friend can't show the mention of Jews out of all the countries, that is out of every nation under heaven, any time prior to Pentecost. Let him give the record—that will settle it. Reader,

the very heading of the chapter shows that it refers to Pentecost. In the heading, v. 25, "The blessings of Christ's kingdom." Our friend gives a kind of detailed argument trying to show that the prophet did not refer to Pentecost; he thinks the prophet mentions some things that did not occur on Pentecost. Take that mode of reasoning, and we could say that Joel's prophecy did not refer to Pentecost. Joel speaks of wonders in the heavens and earth, blood, fire, pillars of smoke, and I could just as reasonably say that this prophecy does not refer to Pentecost, yet we know it does.

Our friend says all Bible scholars admit that the sealing referred to is near the end of the world. I would ask how do they know, and what difference would it make if they were! right? We know it took place in the temple and on earth, for the Book saith, "Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple," and we know that there will be no night in heaven. The truth is our friend can't do anything with this figure, nor with the prophets; admit them to be true, and that settles the controversy as to mode.

I continue the figure. Rev. 14:1: "And I looked and lo, a lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads." Rev. 22:4: "And they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads." When a true minister sprinkles clean water on a proper subject, in the name of the Trinity, this is putting the eternal seal or the Father's name on the forehead. Now take Rev. 2:17: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone and in the stone a new name written," etc. Paul tells us that this writing is "not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart," So then we conclude that it takes both

water and Spirit to make scriptural baptism. God washes the heart by sprinkling it with the blood of Christ, the internal seal, and the true minister washes the body by sprinkling clean water on the forehead in the name of the Trinity. In other words, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." Reference runs us to Ezek. 36: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," etc.

Our next point is buried with Christ by baptism. Immersion is claimed by some to represent birth. Jno. 3:5: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." This text teaches us that we must be born of water and of the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom of God. In v. 3 we are taught that anyone must be born again, or, as the margin has it from above, before he can see the kingdom of God. So one must be born before he can see or enter anything; a person must be born before he can be baptized. I would ask if to be born of water means to be baptized with or in water, does not being born of the Spirit mean being baptized with the Spirit? Our friends do away with Spirit baptism nowadays. How then can baptism represent a birth, when it is a fact the person must be born before he can receive water baptism? Immersion is claimed also to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. I would ask how can water baptism represent birth at the beginning of life, and death at the end of life, at the same time? If water baptism was to represent the death of Christ, John the Baptist did not know it. Mat. 11:1-6: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed to teach and to preach in their cities. Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we

look for another? Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again these things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them; and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." If we believe this record, John did not know absolutely that he was the Christ, much less did he know about his rising from the dead, etc. So he was baptizing to represent what he knew nothing of, if he baptized to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. If water baptism is to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, the apostles did not know it. Luke 18:33-4: "And they shall scourge him, and put him to death, and the third day he shall rise again. And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." Read Luke 24:7: "Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." V. 11: "And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not." So we would have to disbelieve this record, for it is telling us about the death and resurrection of Christ, and it states plainly that they knew not these things. Even after Jesus had risen they would not believe until they saw and handled him, for we read in John 20:9: "For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." Surely if they baptized to represent the death and resurrection of Christ, they did not know what they were baptizing for. If it be a fact that water baptism is, or was, to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, Christ himself did not know it. Mat. 12:39-40: "But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's

belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The text first tells us what kind of people seek a sign. Christ gives them to understand that their desires shall not be gratified, for said he, "There shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas." This figure or sign teaches us that Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights. So, to fill out this figure, Christ must be in the earth three days and three nights. And if water baptism by immersion is to be a figure or sign the party must stay under the water three days and nights. A dip in and out immediately don't fulfill this figure. Suppose a person knowing nothing of Christ, much less his death, burial and resurrection, were to see one of our friends with a crowd on the bank of some pool or creek, immersing some parties, and the person were to make inquiry as to what they were doing there. And our friend would reply to the stranger, we are burying these persons in this liquid grave to represent the death, burial and resurrection of our Savior. Would not that person by that act be led to believe that Christ was drowned in some pool, pond or creek? Would that figure point an untutored person to the tree of the cross on which the Savior died? Or would it point him after death to Joseph's new tomb, the burial place of the Savior? I think not. If your picture did not favor you any more than the immersion picture favors the crucifixion of Christ, you would not have it. A picture must resemble the thing it represents.

MR. BURNETT'S TENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver commences his tenth speech with a mistake—in fact, the whole thing is a continued mistake. He says Dr. Carson admits that all the lexicons are against him. Dr. Carson does not admit that the lexicons are against him on the

point that *baptizo* means to dip, and not to sprinkle or pour, but on the point that it is a *modal* word. Don't misrepresent Carson, please. And do not misrepresent the lexicons, by saying that, "All New Testament lexicons give wash as a meaning, and nearly all prefer wash by affusion." That is a terrible mistake. Some lexicons give wash, but wash does not mean to sprinkle or pour. Say, Mr. Weaver: If you will find one place in the Bible where wash is derived from *baptizo*, and means to sprinkle or pour, we will give up the question.

He says we think the Sabbath mentioned by the prophet belonged to Judaism, and was abolished before Philip baptized the eunuch, but that Gen. 2 shows it existed before Judaism, and was "made for man," etc. Yes, it was made for man, and the Jew is a man, but it was not commanded to be kept before the Jews were a people. Ex. 16. Is Mr. Weaver a man? Why does he not keep the Sabbath? The day he keeps is not the one mentioned in Gen. 2. Paul says the "ministration of death written and engraven in stones" (2 Cor. 3:7-11) was "done away." Was the Sabbath written on stones? Well, it was "done away," but Mr. Weaver has never made the discovery. He mixes Judaism and Christianity, and don't know one from the other. That is where he is off, with his new-old Judaistic-Methodistic theology. Bad, bad!

He says we can not find the Jews assembled at Jerusalem out of all countries at any time prior to Pentecost. Why, the Jews assembled at Jerusalem three times every year, at their annual feasts (read Josephus), and they were there the last Pentecost preceding the death of Jesus just as they were the day Peter preached his notable sermon. But Mr. W. says, "the *very* heading of the chapter shows that it (Ezek. 36) refers to Pentecost." Yes, but the heading of the chapter was not written by inspiration. The body of the chapter shows things that did not occur on the day of Pentecost, or in that age, and

we know it is correct. Mr. Weaver's idea that this argument would upset Joel's prophecy is all a notion. Joel mentioned nothing that did not take place in the "last days." Peter says Joel's prophecy was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost and in the "last days," and Ezekiel says the clean water was sprinkled on the Israelites when they were brought from captivity back into their own land. We believe Ezekiel, and Peter, and know that Mr. Weaver is wrong. Every single argument he has made since this debate began has been based upon a mistake or a misrepresentation of Scripture!

He asks how we know the sealing of Rev. 7 is near the end of the Christian era? We know it by the occurrences that precede it, for the record says, "After these things." All scriptures agree that the events under the sixth seal cover the space near the end of the present dispensation. The first seal shows a white horse, the second a red horse, the third a black horse, the fourth a pale horse, the fifth the souls of the martyrs under the altar, the sixth the great earthquake and darkness of the sun and the falling of the stars, and "after these things" the sealing was done. So our friend is out of date with his sealing, like he is with the sprinkling of clean water. To see this clearly he need only read the 3d verse of Rev. 7. "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, TILL WE HAVE SEALED the servants of our God in their foreheads." The four angels (ready with the four winds to smite the earth) were commanded to hold up TILL the sealing was done. He is confronted with another difficulty. They were "the servants of our God" that were sealed. Can a baby serve God? Well, that leaves all the infants out of the sealing. The sealed ones had "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Can infants wash their robes? Are the robes of infants ever black, so as to need washing? All those sealed stood before the throne with palms in their hands and worshiped God, and

cried Salvation. Can an infant hold a palm in its hand, and worship God, and cry Salvation? Will no one have a palm but the s_ealed—the baptized? Will no one have a white robe except those who have been sprinkled on their foreheads? At one fell swoop you have knocked out infant baptism, and established baptismal salvation! And there is still more to follow. What will become of those you dip in the water, and do not seal on the forehead? The bishop makes you put the seal in the wrong place (on the back of the head or all over the body), and will turn you out of the conference if you do not obey the creed! Eh? As you have got the thing in an awful tangle, we will help you out by stating that baptism is nowhere called a seal in the Bible. The beast of Rev. 13 also has a seal or mark, which he puts in the forehead and right hands of his servants. Has he a baptism, and does he put it in two places on his disciples?

Mr. Weaver thinks that, if to be born of water means baptism in water, to be born of the Spirit means baptism in the Spirit. Not necessarily. The Savior uses a metaphor, and in that metaphor water is the mother and the Spirit is the father. We are begotten by the one and born out of the other. A child is not born of the father exactly as it is born of the mother. He asks, "How can baptism represent a birth, when a person must be born before he can receive water baptism?" The Savior does not say a person must be born before he can receive water baptism. If so, how[?] can you baptize babies? Eh? Has every baby you baptize been born of the Spirit? He also wants to know how baptism can represent both a burial and a birth? Very easily. We are buried in the water (that is burial), then we come forth out of the water, and that is birth. The Methodist creed says, "born of water" is baptism. Will Mr. Weaver tell us if he ever knew anything that was born of a thing smaller than itself? Tell us then how a man can be born of a

spoonful of water? Do not pass this by in silence as you did before, but give us a solution of it. He thinks if baptism represents a burial, John the Baptist and the apostles did not know it. That cuts no figure. The Jews offered lambs on the altars for two thousand years, and yet did not know what it meant. Did not the lambs point to Christ nevertheless? He also thinks the candidate ought to stay under the water three days and nights, to represent Christ's burial. Not so. It is not the time Jesus lay in the grave that we show in baptism, but the fact of a burial and resurrection. When Mr. Weaver shows the death of Christ by eating the Lord's supper, does he eat three hours? Now, beloved, you have cut your head off with your own sword! Mr. Weaver says an untutored person would think Christ was drowned in a creek or pond, if baptism represents his death. Baptism does not represent Christ's death, and no immersionist so teaches. That is a Weaver wobble. We teach that baptism represents burial and resurrection, and it is easy to teach even an untutored Methodist this beautiful lesson. The writer has imparted this tutorage to hundreds of them (several preachers among the number), and in fact we hardly ever hold a protracted meeting that we do not bury some of Mr. W.'s people who have had his sprinkling seal put upon their foreheads by some misguided circuit-rider. The picture must be a good one, for Father Wesley recognized it when he saw it in Rom. 6 and Col. 2. So did Geo. Whitefield, and Dr. Adam Clark, and Martin Luther, and Albert Barnes, and Philip Doddridge, and Dr. Bloomfield, and Dr. Macknight, and Dr. Lightfoot, and Dr. Chalmers, and Philip Schaff, and Dr. Wall, and thousands of the most talented men this world has ever seen. Mr. Weaver can not see it, because he has the Methodist veil over his face, and a sectarian blindfold over his heart! Paul says we are buried in baptism. Say, beloved: Is there anything like a burial in sprinkling and

pouring? Is that picture a good one? The word bury in ail languages means to cover up out of sight. When Abraham bought a piece of ground, it was, "That I may bury my dead out of my sight." Can a person who has been sprinkled say truthfully that he has been buried in baptism? Did you ever hear the story of the little boy who buried the goose by sprinkling a little sand on its head? Ask Mr. Weaver to tell it to you.

MR. WEAVER'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

Our friend warns me against misrepresenting Dr. Carson, when he did not quote what I said of Dr. C. "Don't misrepresent Weaver, please." Let our friend quote Dr. Carson. His language needs no comment. "We will use the lexicons when we get to them.

He proves his reference to Ezek. 36 by Josephus. So that "do settle it."

Our friend says no immersionist teaches that immersion represents the death of Christ. See T. G. Jones, in *The Baptist*, p. 29: "A complex symbol, in it is also represented the death, burial and resurrection of Christ."

We are told there is one baptism, and that is water baptism. If that is true, Christ was mistaken. Luke 12:50: "But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." This would have been a good time for one to have corrected him, saying, Lord, we have but one baptism, and you received that by John in the river Jordan, and that ends the matter of baptism. But the Savior refers to the baptism of suffering, of death on the cross, dying for others, and he calls it baptism. Sinners dread that baptism, dying on the cross. They prefer a dip in the water. No pain or heart sorrow or travail in that. Christ taught in Mark 10:38 that it is for persons now. "Can ye drink of the cup that I

drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Their answer: "We can." Christ's statement to them: "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized with shall ye be baptized." We first die to sin on God's altar, then enter the road of heart travail with Christ for others in this baptism. Paul said: "I die daily." We are told this baptism of suffering is an immersion in suffering, or an overwhelming in suffering. That would do as an explanation, if we had no better. Our Bible hath it: "Because he hath poured out his soul unto death." That settles the mode of this baptism; it is pouring. One asks in this struggle and death if his garments were not dyed? I believe the Book does say that his garments were stained, or dyed red, etc. One asks if we do not dye garments by dipping them in the dye? True, but in this case the dyeing was done by sprinkling. Isa. 63:3: "And their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments." The type and anti-type must agree. 1 Jno. 5:6-8: "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood; and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there fire three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one." We are said to be washed from our sins in Christ's blood. Rev. 1:5: "And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." How was this washing or baptizing in the blood performed? We will let the Book tell us. 1 Pet. 1:2: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of 3 the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you and peace be multi-

plied." Hear Paul, Heb. 9:22: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." These texts settle the mode of the heart washing, or baptism in the blood of Christ. Now what of the Spirit? Acts 10:45: "And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." The prophet said, "Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high." The sprinkling and pouring are same as to mode; they only differ in quantity. When it rains a little we say it is sprinkling rain; when it comes rapidly we say it is pouring down. Yet in both cases it is falling from the clouds upon the earth. Now, what of the water? One prophet speaking of Christ's work said he shall sprinkle the nations. Another says of Christ's work, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you." The law of cleansing says of the unclean person, "Because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him." So if we go by the Book, they agree in one as the text declares.

Our next proposition is buried with Christ by baptism. Paul, correcting errors, Rom. 10:4-10: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise: Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven (that is, to bring Christ down from above)? or, Who shall descend into the deep (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead)? But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach: That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto

righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The Jews believed in that day that Christ was an impostor, and that Christ must yet come from heaven, hence the language, "Who shall ascend into heaven, to bring Christ down?" There be some who teach that the sinner can only meet Christ in the deep. This teaching is just as erroneous, hence the language, "Or who shall descend into the deep, to bring Christ up?" The truth is, the sinner does not have to go to heaven to find Christ, nor does he have to go into the deep to find him. But Christ is nigh him, that is, if he is penitent. Hear the word: "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in and sup with him, and he with me." So he does not have to go in the liquid grave to find Christ. In the case of immersion the person digs his own grave, and yet he is not buried until he opens the water and goes down until the water pours in on him, etc So the burial is by pouring. We don't bury by dipping the dead body into the ground. We prepare the grave for him, and we pour or let him down into the grave, then he is not buried until the dirt is poured in on him. So the burial is by pouring, not by dipping. When we bury the dead body, we don't take it out again, but we leave it permanently there, to wait the resurrection. If we were to take the body up again, we would undo what we did in the burying of the body. Hear Paul, Col. 3:3: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." That is, permanently hid, not for a moment only. I will state that it takes four things to constitute water baptism as a Christian ordinance in any church. 1. There must be an administrator, who has authority from God to do that work. No church now allows one to baptize himself. 2. A ceremony, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Any one in baptizing a person now, purposely leaving off either the Father, Son or Holy Spirit, would be condemned, and no

church would accept his work, for we have the formula given us in the word of God. 3. We must have the element water. If the administrator should baptize the person in milk, syrup, vinegar or mud, it would not do; we must have water. 4. There must be a scriptural subject. If the administrator were to baptize a pup, pig, or a non-believer, it would not be Christian baptism. Christian baptism can not be had in Christian churches without these four things. Now, let us try Rom. 6:4 by this rule, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." This baptism is into Jesus Christ, and not in the creek or water. To make Christ a pond of water, would deify the water, but what would it do for Christ? This baptism, or burial with Christ, is by baptism, and not by a human administrator. I find no formula in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. So we find the water minus, the human administrator minus, and the ceremony minus. So three things out of the four are not found here, only by presumption. I therefore conclude it can't be water baptism. Note the verbiage: "Therefore we ARE BURIED." They were not still, immersed in water, but every regenerate person is buried with him. "Ye are dead, and your life is HID with Christ in God." They were not hid in or under water, but with Christ in God, referring to the spiritual relationship every child of God enjoys in this life.

MR. BURNETT'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says we did not quote Mr. Carson,. Nor did he, but he referred to Carson so as to misrepresent him. He says we prove our interpretation of Ezek. 36 by Josephus. No, we made Josephus contradict Weaver, in the assertion that the Jews were never assembled at Jerusalem out of all coun-

tries except on the day of Pentecost when Peter preached his sermon. Josephus says they were there at the three annual feasts. We made Ezekiel contradict Weaver, as to the time when the "clean water" was sprinkled. Mr. Weaver says it was on the day of Pentecost. Mr. Ezekiel says it was when God brought the Israelites out of captivity, five hundred years before Pentecost. He also says that after this water was sprinkled there should be an era of great prosperity to the Jewish nation, and no more famine. There was no prosperity after Pentecost, but a forty-years' famine, and the nation was destroyed. How did Mr. Weaver meet this difficulty? He just passed it by in silence! That is the way he meets all his difficulties in this debate.

He says if there is only one baptism, and that is immersion, Christ was mistaken, for long after John baptized him with water he said: "I have a baptism to be baptized with." Christ had reference to his baptism of suffering, but that was in the past when Paul said there is "one baptism." Mr. Weaver thinks that, because Christ said to the two disciples that they should be baptized with the baptism that he was baptized with, this baptism of suffering has been perpetuated. And he thinks some of our converts don't suffer much. Well, if baptism is only a slight sprinkling, it would seem that a convert would not have to suffer much! Say, Mr. Weaver, do you think Christ endured only a slight sprinkle of sufferings (only a few drops) when he bore our sins upon the cross? Is that the baptism that "straitened" him? Tut! tut! He thinks that if "our friend" had been present, he would have corrected the Lord when he spoke of another baptism. Mr. Weaver forgets that it was not "our friend," but friend Paul, who said there is one baptism. If he had been there, he would have doubtless corrected the apostle, by saying: "Paul, you are wrong, and you had better correct that mistake before you send it out to the

Ephesians. It is likely to mislead somebody, and two thousand years from now some dipper will be troubling the Methodists with it. You know we have Spirit baptism, and fire baptism, and several water baptisms, and all our mourners have a baptism of suffering, and it will not do to say there is one baptism!" As Mr. Weaver was not there, the mistake was put into the Book, and as Methodists (with their several baptisms) differ from Paul, he defends the Methodists against Paul! Bad! bad!!

Mr. Weaver thinks that as Christ "poured out his soul unto death," his baptism of suffering was by pouring. Why, then, is the word for pour *cheo*, and not *baptizo*? He forgets that it was Christ that was baptized. Was his soul poured upon himself? He was. not baptized by his soul, but in suffering. He thinks that the staining of Christ's garments by his blood was the baptism. In that case the garments were baptized, and not Christ, and the garments were baptized with suffering! And Mr. Weaver's converts all undergo this kind of a baptism—they pour out their blood upon their garments! What wild breaks a wild Methodist will make to save his unscriptural rantism!

His next point is, that as three witnesses (Spirit and water and blood) agree in one, it must mean they agree in one mode of baptism! If he will read the chapter intelligibly, he will see that the three witnesses testify to the sonship of Jesus, and not to the mode of baptism. Let us try his exegesis. He quotes Rev. 1:5: "Washed us from our sins in his own blood," and then quotes Peter: "Unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The word sprinkle is *rantizo*, and not *baptizo*, the word the Savior used when he said baptize. If the water and blood agreed here, in the mode of application, the same word would be used. He next quotes Paul: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies

washed with pure water." But Paul used one word for the sprinkling of the hearts, and another word for the washing of the bodies! Why did he do that? He wished to express a different action! Ah, beloved, Mr. Weaver's witnesses contradict each other all along the line! When a lawyer's witnesses contradict each other, he loses his case, and Mr. W. has lost his case beyond a doubt. Let us try his next witness, the Spirit. The Spirit "fell on" or was "poured on" the Gentiles, and Mr. W. says this falling or pouring was the baptizing act. The word *cheo* is used for pour, and *epiipto* for fall upon, and neither of these words was used by the Savior when he said baptize with water. So here is another discrepancy among the witnesses! There is even a discrepancy between the Spirit and the blood. The blood was sprinkled, the Spirit was poured, and this is not the same. The dictionaries define pour: "To turn out in a stream." They define sprinkle: "To scatter in drops or small particles." Say, Mr. Weaver, you have never given us the case where the Spirit was sprinkled on any person? Eh? Nor have you explained, why not one of the texts you quote from the prophecies (as foretelling baptism) contains the baptismal word. Isa. 52 does not contain it, nor does Ezek. 36, nor Isa. 44. You may know how you can fulfill a *raino* prophecy with a *baptizo* text in the New Testament, but the readers of this book do not know, and thus far we have tried in vain to, induce you to tell them. Pull off your coat and roll up your sleeves, now, and show them that there is one Methodist preacher that can debate! They are in considerable doubt on the subject, but it may be you can convince them. And while you are at it, you might explain another little matter that we have brought to your attention about six times, viz.: Was anything ever born of a thing smaller than itself? If not, can a man be born of a spoonful of water? It is said of the man who did not have on the wedding gar-

ment: "And he was speechless." Mr. W. is generally speechless in the presence of a difficulty like this.

Mr. Weaver says when we bury the dead we do not dip the body into the ground, but prepare the grave and four dirt in on the body, so the burial is by pouring. Yes, and when we bury a man in baptism we put him down into the grave, and the water pours in on him till he is buried. And there is always a burial. It is not the manner of digging the grave that we show in baptism, but the fact of a burial and resurrection. The reason we reject Mr. Weaver's so-called baptism, there is in it no burial and no resurrection. No man that has been sprinkled or poured upon can say truthfully that he has been buried with Christ in baptism. Our opponent says in Rom. 6 the baptism is "into Christ" and "into his death," and not into a pond or creek. That is correct. The burial is in water, but the person is put into Christ or, into his body. Persons remain permanently in Christ, but not in the grave of baptism, else there could be no resurrection in baptism. Paul says in Col. 2: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him." They rise out of the grave, for Paul says further on, "If ye then be risen with Christ," etc. Let Mr. W. harmonize his idea that baptized people are still buried with this statement of Paul that the Colossians had risen with Christ. "Are buried" is Greek aorist and means "were buried," and is so rendered in the Revised version. Baptized persons are "hid with Christ in God," in a sense, but they are, not hidden in baptism after they have "risen with him" from the baptismal grave. Mr. Weaver thinks the body ought to be left in the grave, to show a burial. So it ought, if a burial were all that is shown. But there is a resurrection in baptism, and also in the gospel, and in the Christian faith. Christ's body was raised, and our bodies will also be raised. Our opponent finds three things minus in Rom. 6 (simply because

they are not mentioned), viz., water, administrator and formula. If he had half an eye he could see that two of those things are minus in Bom. 6 when he tries to make out a case of Spirit baptism! The element and the administrator are not mentioned. All the learned men of the world for eighteen hundred years said Bom. 6 had reference to water baptism, and never discovered their mistake about the three minus things. Wesley, Luther, Adam Clark, Albert Barnes, Bloomfield, Doddridge, Macknight, Lightfoot, Philip Schaff, Wall—all in the dark till the rise of Rev. J. C. Weaver, the great Texas discoverer!

MR. WEAVER'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

Our friend still insists that our sprinkling prophecies have the wrong word, and intimates that the baptism word does not mean sprinkle. We say it does mean to sprinkle in the Bible. So it is a good word to use. We will test that when we come to the lexicons.

Our friend thinks we can't be born of a thing less than we are. The true child of God is born of God, and the spoonful of clear water recognizes or points to the fact. So- God is larger than any of his children.

Our friend admits that the water pours in on him till he is buried. So the burial is by pouring. Every man that has died to the world or sin, and has had pure water sprinkled on him as an evidence or token of the fact, can truthfully say that he is buried with Christ by baptism. Our friend admits that the baptism of Rom. 6:3-4 is into Christ. Then, unless Christ be a pond of water, it can't be immersion in water. Our friend says baptized persons are hid with Christ "in a sense." Paul says they are dead and their life is hid with Christ in God. If it had been immersion, they would not be dead, but their living bodies would have been hid in water for a moment. Our

friend says there is a resurrection in baptism. The death is a death to sin, and the resurrection is from death to life, and not from a pond of water. Let's try the logic. We have a death, burial and resurrection in the text. Is it a physical or spiritual death? All admit that the physical man does not die, else we would have need of a different kind of burial. Then it must be a death to sin, a spiritual death. Now, if the death be spiritual, then the burial must be spiritual. Hence the statement, "Ye are dead (not physically but to the world), and your life is hid." There is the burial—hid, not in water, but with Christ in God—hence it is a spiritual burial. Then we might expect a spiritual resurrection to walk in newness of life. To have a literal or physical burial, we must have a literal or physical death, and the resurrection will be the same as the death and burial. We bury the person that dies. I will ask what is it that dies? Eph, 4:22-24: "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." It is plain to be seen that the old man of this text is the man of sin. This man of sin had the sinner dead in sin, or under his dominion. Now God has slain the man of sin, and he is buried forever; and the man that was dead in sin is created or made new by God giving him a new heart and a new spirit. So the truth is, God slew the man of sin in answer to prayer, and put him off or away; and raised up the man that was dead in sin, and made him a new man, and he is hid in Christ with God. Immersionists dip the physical man's body under water, which is not dead, for if it were dead it would be put under ground and not under water. So they bury the live man, while the rule is to bury the dead man. There is a reversal of the order in this text. The man of sin was dead in

sin, that is, dead to God and alive to sin; now the man of sin being dead, the man once dead to God and alive to sin is now dead to sin and alive to God. So his life is hid from the world. I will state as a fixed fact, that which a person is buried in he is covered with. If he is buried in sand, he is covered with sand; if he is buried in air, he is covered with air; if he is buried in water he is covered with water. Now try our text by that rule. "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." Paul says we are buried into death. Then it must be Christ's death and not water that covers us, for what the person is buried in he is covered with. So we are covered with the effect of Christ's death. Or, in other words, the regenerate are covered with God's Spirit. Isa. 30:1: "Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me; and that cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin." My friend, you may have the water covering if you like; I prefer the spiritual covering. I lay down this proposition, which is sternly true. When a person's body is put under the water by another, it is raised out by him also. I read Col. 2:10-11: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power. In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." In this baptism there is a burial, also a raising, but not with human

hands. They are "risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Also we find remission of sins, but of God who quickened, forgave and raised from the dead. This is not the work of a human being. I would ask if this great result could be reached by a mere dip of the physical body under water by another, or is it not reached through another way by the Spirit? 1 Cor. 12:13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." This text puts it beyond cavil. We are baptized into Christ, or one body, by the Spirit, and are raised from death to life by the Spirit. "We note the term plant in the text. V. 5: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." The word plant in this text means to be firmly fixed in Christ and his doctrines, etc. Like an army planted. The word don't mean to cover up in this text.

I bring three objections to immersion. 1. The persons who believe in immersion put too much confidence in it, and too little in Christ. They must have immersion as the finishing touch to their salvation. 2. If a person believes in exclusive immersion, though he may declare it does not save him from sin, or is not for remission, yet he excludes every one not immersed from privileges in the church of God. He would not commune with his own mother unless she be immersed, yet he believes she can be saved without it, and if so, he believes she is good enough to go to heaven, but not good enough to commune with him. 3. It is not found in our Bible; hence it is, or must be, of man's invention. We are often asked why we immerse anyone, if we do not believe the Bible teaches it. We answer, first, because we are not to decide the matter of mode for any one. Paul did not believe that circumcision in

the flesh was to be practiced under the new dispensation, yet to satisfy others he circumcised Titus and Timothy. Yet he declared in Christ it would not avail anything. Our second answer is, because God accepts it, if the person is honest and that is the best he knows. The prophet told Naaman to "go and wash in Jordan seven times," and promised him a cure. While the law of God said "wash them with water," and the law said he should sprinkle water on them to cleanse them, yet Naaman being a heathen, and not knowing the law, but did the best he knew, God accepted it of him. So we follow the God-given example, and accept it on the same grounds. We are sometimes asked to throw away our creeds and to all meet on the Bible. We, as Methodists, do meet all on the Bible. Here comes one to join us: he says he has been converted or regenerated, and wants to join the church; he is intelligent, reads the Bible for himself, and he wants to be sprinkled and is candid. We take him and baptize him as he sees it from God's word. Here comes another. He, too, is regenerated, so he says. He is intelligent and honest, and he sees in the book baptism by pouring, and nothing will satisfy his conscience but pouring. We take him and give it to him as he sees it. Here- comes a third. He, too, tells us he is regenerated; he is intelligent and honest, and he wants immersion, and nothing will satisfy his conscience but immersion. We take him and give him as he sees. Yet an immersion church would discard the two former, and yet say, "Meet us on the Bible." Better say on your interpretation of it.

MR. BURNETT'S TWELFTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver refers to our objection, that a man can not be born of something smaller than himself, and hence can not be born of a spoonful of water. But he does not try to meet it. He

intimates that it would prove that God is larger than any of his children. If he "fills immensity," he must be larger than any man. We have seen some pretty large Methodists, but we never before heard one intimate that he was perhaps as big as God!

He says we admit that the water pours in on the man baptized till he is buried, hence the burial is by pouring. Yes. But the trouble with Mr. Weaver's pouring is that there is not enough of it—he does not pour on long enough, and there is no burial at all. He says the man who is dead to sin, and has had clean water sprinkled on him, can say truthfully that he has been buried with Christ. How can he say it truthfully, when he knows there has been no burial in the case? He can as truthfully say that he flies with Christ in baptism? There is no more burying than flying. There is no burial in the Methodist system, and we challenge Mr. Weaver to find it from start to finish!

He says the baptism of Bom. 6 is into Christ, and Christians are still hid. Yes. But if the hiding with Christ in God is the burial, where is the resurrection? We are raised up out of the grave in which we are buried. Christ was raised out of the grave in which he was buried. If Christ is our grave, we are raised out of Christ! See? Hence not still hid. Baptism is a burial in water, and the resurrection is from that grave, but the ordinance puts us into Christ (into his body) where we remain permanently. A marriage takes place in a house, and the parties enter a state where they remain permanently, but they do not remain in the house. He says the death is to sin, and the resurrection is to a new life, and not from the water. But where is the burial? If it is the hiding in God, where is the resurrection? We affirm that there is no burial in Mr. Weaver's system, and challenge him to show it. He at one time says the burial is into the death of Christ (or its effects),

at another time he says the burial is into the Spirit, which covers us, and at another time he says the burial is into God! He is confused. But no matter where he takes his stand, we will trip him up. Listen:, If we are buried into the death of Christ (its effects or benefits), as soon as we are raised up out of the burial the effects or benefits are all gone! If we are buried in the Spirit, and then raised up out of it, the Spirit is gone! That is not a falling from grace, but it is a rising from grace! Did you ever hear of a Methodist falling upward? We have known a good many of them to fall downward, but never knew one to fall upward! Mr. Weaver, you must fix up that better, for you have got it in a terrible jangle. He says he prefers the Spirit covering. But he hasn't got that now, for he has been raised up out of it! That is, if he has had a resurrection! Paul tells us what the burial is, and what the resurrection is, and tells us when they take place, and we are not left to guess at the matter as Mr. Weaver does. He says, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him." Here is a burial and a resurrection, and the resurrection is from the element in which we are buried. The effort to find a burial in the statement, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God," is a grand failure, for there is no resurrection from that hiding. Are we buried in God, and raised up out of God? Is that the best you can do? Tut, tut!

But he says, if the death be spiritual, the burial must be spiritual also. That is correct. Baptism is spiritual. If it were a physical death, we would have a different grave, and the buried person would remain till the resurrection. Baptism is not an actual burial, but a religious burial. But Mr. Weaver says if it is the spirit of man that dies, it should be the spirit of man that is buried and raised. So it is. The spirit is in the body, and is buried and raised with the body.

But in Mr. Weaver's system the spirit is not buried at all. If so when? If it be when it is hid with Christ in God, then there is no resurrection from that burial. He tries to find the resurrection in the rising of the sinner to a new life. In that case a burial must precede it, and that puts it too far in the rear to be the hiding in God, or the covering with the Spirit! Does the sinner rise out of God, or out of his spiritual covering, to a new life?

He says as the sinner- (in Col. 2) is raised "through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead," it can not be by human hands. Why not? The writer has buried and raised many hundreds, and every one was raised by faith in the operation of God that raised Christ from the dead. Without that faith on the part of both preacher and sinner, there would be no baptism. Mr. Weaver says there was remission of sins in that burial and resurrection, and only God can remit sins. Yes, sir. But he remits sins in baptism. He told Peter to tell the Pentecostans to be baptized "for the remission of sins." But he don't think "a mere dip of the physical body under water" could produce such results. Nor does anybody else. But a man who understands God's plan of saving sinners never speaks of a "mere dip of the physical body under water." There is no such act. People who know anything of the gospel of Jesus Christ never use any such language.

Mr. Weaver tries to explain why he dips people, when he does not think it is taught in the Bible. He does it like Paul circumcised Titus (?) and Timothy. Did Paul do that as a part of Christianity? Did he say, "By the authority of Jesus Christ I circumcise thee!" Ah, that will never do. And he thinks God will accept it (though he never authorized it), like he accepted Naaman's dipping in the Jordan, when the prophet told him to wash, and the law said sprinkle. But the

Bible says Naaman "dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God." The dipping was "according to the saying of the man of God," but our Methodist opponent says it was because Naaman was an ignorant heathen and did not know the law! Mr. Weaver does not know the plain English Bible. A presiding-elder who thinks that Paul circumcised Titus, and says that the law commanded WATER to be sprinkled on the leper, and denies that the leper had to "wash himself IN WATER," ought to touch lightly on Naaman's ignorant heathenism! See Gal. 2:3, Num. 19:18-19, Lev. 14:9.

Mr. Weaver files three objections to immersion:

1. Persons put too much confidence in it, and too little ha Christ. Will he show wherein immersionists lack confidence in Christ? The charge has always been the other way—that those who change Christ's ordinances show a lack of regard for Christ. Jesus says: "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father." We are not sticklers for immersion because we love immersion, but because we regard Him who commanded it. Nor will we let popularity, or desire for increase of numbers, or any earthly consideration, lead us from the path of loyalty to accept a thing as scriptural when we think it is not scriptural—like the Methodists!

2. His second charge is that we exclude people from the communion. That is a mistake. The Lord's table is in the Lord's house, in his kingdom, and Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The Methodist creed says "born of water" is baptism. A man who is not baptized (born) is not in the kingdom, and Mr. Weaver will not tell us how a man can be born of a spoonful of water. How, then, shall he eat, when

he will not come in the house where the table is set? Shall we take it out doors for. his accommodation?

3. "Not found in our Bible, hence a man's invention." Yet he will get out of the Bible and practice a man's, invention (by the authority of Christ) in order to gain a few converts, or because he knows the bishop would cut his head off at the next conference! We suppose he knows that Christ and his apostles did not speak and write in English, but in Greek, and every Greek lexicon in the world says that the word they used for baptize means to dip or immerse. Hence its equivalent is in the Bible. Immerse is a new word—newer than the translation—and could not be in the King James. But dip is there, and translates the word *baptizo* in the case of Naaman. It would have translated it in the New Testament also, if the translators' hands had not been tied.

Mr. Weaver says he asks people to meet him on the Bible. He will even get off the Bible to meet people on the Bible! He is exceedingly accommodating with the Lord's things! It would be a grand performance to unite with the Methodist church on the Bible, when the Methodist church is not in the Bible;—by seventeen hundred years.

MR. WEAVER'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend thinks I am confused. He admits my statement, then tries to prove the conclusion to be false. Our friend assumes there is a burial and resurrection in water baptism. I defy him to show such an idea taught prior to 325. He says baptism is a burial in water. I deny the statement, and demand the proof.

But to the lexicons. I present Dr. Gallaher, of Rensselaer, Missouri:

"I published a series of articles in the Observer concerning

the import of baptidzo in the classic Greek, older than the Christian era. I found 21 such examples—only 21. Pindar, B. C. 500, uses the word baptidzo once. Plato, B. C. 400, uses it twice. Eubulus, B. C. 380, uses it once. Aristotle, B. C., 360, uses it but once in all his voluminous writings. Even us, of Paros, B. C. 250, uses it once. While Polybius, the historian, B. C. 180, has occasion to use it five times. Nicander, B. C. 150, uses it once in a recipe for making pickles. Strabo, the historian, B. C. 30, uses the word baptidzo five times, and Diodorus Siculus, B. C. 30, has occasion to use it four times. These 21 are positively all the undoubted examples of the use of the word in the whole range of Greek classic literature older than the New Testament. In the extant writings of many of the most eminent of the pure classic Greek poets, historians, orators and tragedians the word is not found. In my article, above mentioned, I proved to a demonstration that in all classic baptisms, older than the New Testament, the person or thing baptized was passive, stationary and receptive, while the baptizing element or instrumentality was moved and brought upon, or in contact with, the person or thing baptized. This demonstration forever eliminates from baptidzo in classic Greek the idea of clipping or immersing or plunging for baptism. The arguments and deductions of those articles have been printed time and again since they appeared in the *Observer*, and, as far as I am informed, no serious attempt has been made by any one who can read Greek to break their force, or escape their terrible consequences to the dipping theory of Christian baptism. In a recent discussion of the Mode, Subject and Design of Christian Baptism, my opponent introduced the seventh edition of Liddell & Scott's Greek Lexicon, edited by Prof. Drisler of New York, and the Lexicon of the New Testament Greek, edited by Dr. J. H. Thayer, of Harvard University. He quoted from various college professors (among

them Dr. Hodge of Princeton- and Dr. C. C. Hersman of Richmond) who had certified that the seventh edition of Liddell & Scott and Thayer's Lexicon of the New Testament were the very best and most reliable in existence. He read the first definition given by the editor of Liddell & Scott with a great flourish, viz.: 'To dip into or under water.' I asked for the reference to the Greek 'classics' where baptidzo was used in that sense. He would not tell. When I secured a copy of the lexicon, two days later, I found the classic reference that Prof. Drisler gives is to the writings of Plutarch! When did Plutarch live and write? Were his writings 'current literature' when the New Testament was written? By no manner of means. Plutarch was born A. D. 50, and probably did not write his 'Treatise on Superstition,' to which Prof. Drisler refers, till 80 or 100 years after Christ. If baptidzo ever had such an idea in it as 'dip into or under water,' prior to the birth of Christ, why did not the editor of the seventh edition of Liddell & Scott's lexicon find it and refer to it as a proof that his definition was correct? He did not find or use such an example, and his reference to Plutarch is a confession that baptizo was not used in the sense of 'dip into or under water' by any Greek classic author who lived before the Christian era. How could such an idea get into baptidzo in the New Testament? The 'current Greek classic literature' at the time the New Testament was written gave no support to any such an idea, and the Greek of the Old Testament taught the very reverse. So the word baptidzo in the New Testament can not contain such an idea as 'dip or immerse.' I advise the reader of this to always insist on having the Greek classic author given with the date he lived, whenever any confident reference is made to the seventh edition of Liddell & Scott's lexicon. The reference to Plutarch's writings by Prof. Drisler confirms the position I have taken and published, that in all classic baptisms older

than the New Testament the person or thing baptized is passive, stationary and receptive, while the baptizing element of instrumentality is represented as being moved and brought upon or in contact with its object. It can be very easily shown that even Plutarch, born A. D. 50, did not use baptidzo in the sense of 'dip into or under water.' The reference made by Prof. Drisler to Plutarch is Dr. Conant's example 64, and the Greek words are *Kai baptison seauton eis thalassan*. Of course, Dr. Conant translates these words thus: 'And plunge thyself into the sea.' Now, I ask, did Plutarch design to say what Conant makes him say-; I look at example 66 in Conant's book and find another quotation from Plutarch's writings. Example 6() is in these words: 'Why do they pour sea water into wine and say that fishermen receive an oracle commanding to baptize Bacchus at the sea?' Now wine is Bacchus. If they baptize Bacchus at (pros) the sea, by pouring sea water into wine, then the baptism was the changed condition of the wine by dilution, and the mode of that diluting baptism was by pouring. And this is Plutarch, A. I). 80 or 100. Again; look at example No. 3, also from Plutarch. He says: 'Some of the vessels thrusting down with a weight firmly fixed above, they sank into the deep, and others with iron hands or beaks like cranes, hauling up by the prow till they were erect on the stern they baptized.' Dr. Conant says, with his usual tenacity, 'submerged.' But submerged was the very thing done to the other vessels that were 'thrust' down with a weight firmly fixed above and sunk into the deep. The Greek is *Katadunon eis buthon*. The words *katadunon* and *duno* are translated by the Latin word *submergo* in the Vulgate Latin of Ex. 15:10, and Jer. 51:64. In this passage, then, it is clear that Plutarch uses the word baptidzo in clear and positive contrast with submersion or putting into or under water. *Kataduno* expresses that idea and action; the baptism was something else. It is

a bold assumption for Prof. Drisler to say that Plutarch uses baptidzo in the sense of dip into or under water. It is easy to prove from the classics that ships were baptized by waves and spray lashing over them."

Now you see, my friends, that Mr. Weaver is not the first man in the world to discover that dip is a new meaning of baptidzo, and before I am done with this word I think I'll find some good Baptist scholars in company with me. I now propose to let the readers have the benefit of this Presbyterian scholar on Thayer's New Testament Lexicon. He says in a former article:

"I have examined the reference to Plutarch by Prof. Drisler, editor of the seventh edition of Liddell & Scott's lexicon, and showed that even Plutarch's use of the word baptidzo did not give-any support to the meaning 'dip into or under water,' which Prof. Drisler thinks he finds in Plutarch's writings. Now we will examine the Lexicon; of the New Testament, by Prof. J. H. Thayer, of Harvard University. This lexicon was also introduced as 'the best in the world,' so estimated by Dr. , Hodge, Hersman, etc; I have no inclination to doubt or gain-say their testimony. Now Liddell & Scott's editor referred to Plutarch as authority that baptidzo signified to 'dip into or under water.' But Plutarch wrote his 'Treatise on Superstition' eighty or one hundred years after Christ. This is virtual concession that classic authors, older than the New Testament, did not so use it. If they did, why did not Prof. Drisler refer to them? Let us look now at what Prof. Thayer says about that word baptidzo. His very first definition is 'To dip repeatedly.' He unfortunately fails to give us any reference to any classic author who used baptidzo in that sense. But further on, in what he says about the word baptidzo, he betrays the origin of the idea of 'dip repeatedly,' by reference to the 'patristic writings respecting the mode, ministrant,

subjects,' etc., of the rite, as given by Prof. E. A. Sophocles, in his lexicon, Boston, 1870. I turn to Sophocles' lexicon, and find that the chief patristic writings he refers to are Tertullian (220), Basil (370), and the Apostolic (?) Constitutions. These Apostolic Constitutions are of uncertain date and authorship. Certainly not older than 335 or-340. They contain the first trace of the burial theory of baptism."

MR. BURNETT'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver has discovered that he cannot defend sprinkling and pouring, and so has substituted his Presbyterian friend Gallaher. Hitherto Mr. W. has had the reputation of being the wildest man in the woods, but he must now take down his sign. Mr. Gallaher beats him. He not only exceeds our Methodist friend in wildness, but he upsets all his precedents, and all the precedents of all the debaters that have gone before him. Mr. W. used to say (in all our debates) that baptidzo means to dip in classic Greek, but the New Testament was written in Hellenistic Greek, and the word changed its meaning. That is what Dr. Jacob Ditzler says, and what Mr. Wilkinson says, and what all the great debaters have said, till this great Gallaher appeared upon the scene. He reverses the machinery, and puts the cart before the horse, and says baptidzo does not mean to dip in classic Greek, but in Hellenistic Greek! And he knocks out all the lexicons with one fell swoop of his philological war-club! What a racket there will be when Liddell & Scott and Robinson and Thayer and Sophocles and all the rest burn their books and take to the brush in consternation and shame! But Mr. Weaver does not know what a trick his friend Gallaher has played on him. The New Testament was not written in classic Greek, but in Hellenistic Greek—the Greek that was spoken all over the world in the days of the Apostles! And

Mr. Gallaher condemns Drisler and Thayer for basing their lexicons upon this language (the language the Savior talked), instead of the language used five hundred years before Christ! And he makes the point that (therefore) these lexicons do not define baptidzo properly! Mr. Weaver thought he had discovered a great man, and a great linguistic bombshell for the dippers, and he just shut his eyes and said, "Let her go, Gallaher!" It is a pity to spoil Mr. G.'s wonderful performance, but baptidzo means to dip or immerse in both classic and Hellenistic Greek, and his magnificent discovery is but magnificent moonshine. Listen at this statement from Mr. Wilkinson, one of the great sprinkling champions, on p. 17: "I do not deny that lexicographers give 'dip, plunge, immerse,' and that the word has that meaning primarily. My opponent wants to confine you to the classical meaning." Listen at this, from Dr. Jacob Ditzler, p. 426: "Again he says he has proved that baptidzo, in classic Greek, meant to submerge, and that when I say it does not, I had better study Greek instead of Hebrew, Arabic, etc. He knew that I said in my opening speech that in classic Greek it meant submerge, sink, and all that; that it was habitually so used; and yet he tried to make you believe I denied it!" On page 406 (Wilkes-Ditzler) he says: "Baptidzo, in classic Greek, means to make drunk, to intoxicate, to sink the ship—that it goes to the bottom and baptidzo puts it there, and there leaves it, and this is its ordinary meaning in the classic Greek." On page 405 he says classic Greek is that which was spoken in the days of Homer, Aristotle and Plato.

If any further proof were necessary, we have it in writers that lived long before the birth of Christ. Pindar, born 522 B. C., in Pythic Odes, comparing himself to a cork, says: "For as when the rest of the tackle is toiling deep in the sea, I as a cork above the net am un-dipped (unbaptized) in the brine."

Aesop 560 B. C. in his Fables, tells about a mule that lightened his load of salt by lying down in the water, and tried the same experiment when loaded with sponges and wool. "One of the salt-bearing mules, rushing into a river, accidentally slipped down, and rising up lightened (the salt becoming dissolved), he perceived the cause and remembered it, so that always, when passing through the river, he purposely lowered down and immersed (baptized) the pannier." In view of these two cases, what goes with Mr. Gallaher's wild statement, that in all classic baptisms the thing baptized was always stationary, and not put into the element? His researches have been very limited. But immersionists do not claim that the person or thing baptized must be put into the fluid. What they do claim is, that there must be a covering up or burial, else there is no baptism.

But why is Mr. Gallaher so mad at Prof. Drisler? He talks like Drisler is the editor of only the seventh edition (and that he has ruined the book), while Drisler edited the old editions as well as the new. All the colleges use the new edition, and say it is the best. Princeton (Presbyterian) uses it, and Vanderbilt, and all the rest of the schools. We have before us letters from professors of Greek in various colleges in the United States, and they all say that book is the best, and that it is the standard. We wrote to the great Methodist Publishing House at Nashville, Tenn. (Bingham & Smith, Agents), and told them we wanted to purchase a Greek lexicon that defined baptidzo to sprinkle or pour, and they replied that they had no such book, and that there was no such book in print, but they could furnish us with the standard lexicons, and Liddell & Scott was the best, and Thayer's New Testament lexicon was the best in that line! But Mr. Weaver sets up Rev. Gallaher, and he knocks Liddell and Scott and Thayer on the head. Why does he do it? Ah, beloved, there is a reason. All the scholars in the world know that these two lexicons are the standards, and

that they give no support to sprinkling and pouring. The former defines baptidzo: "To dip in or under water; of ships, to sink or disable them; to be drenched; soaked in wine; overhead and ears in debt; seeing that he was being drowned with questions or getting into deep water; to draw wine by dipping the cup in the bowl," The noun *baptismos* is defined as follows: "A dipping in water, ablution." And *baptistes* is defined: "One that dips; a baptizer." Thayer defines baptidzo: "1. Pr., to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge. 2. To cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water; in the mid. and 1 aor. pass., to wash one's self, bathe 3. Met., to overwhelm, to be overcome with calamities, of those who must bear them. II. In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see *baptisma*, 3), viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin," etc. Liddell & Scott are members of the Episcopal church, and Prof. Thayer is a Congregationalist. Prof. Drisler is also a Pedobaptist.

As to the words, "dip repeatedly," Dr. Robinson says baptidzo is a frequentative in form, but not in signification. Mr. Gallaher tries to deduce it from the three dips of the Trinitarians in the third century, but his effort is a failure, as is also his attempt to show that the "burial idea of baptism" is not earlier than 335 A. D. Paul is the first writer to advance the "burial" theory, and he antedates 335 A. D. by several years. He says, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him." Col. 2.12. Then we have Barnabas (perhaps Paul's companion), who says, "We descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our heart." Then Hermas, A. D. 140, who says, "They descend into the water dead, and they arise alive." Then Justin Mar-

tyr, A. D. 140, who says, "We represent our Lord's sufferings by baptism in a pool." Mr. Weaver and Mr. Gallaher are great discoverers. They discover things that do not exist—except in moonshine. Mr. Weaver discovered that dip was a new meaning of baptidzo (about A. D. 1641), and Gallaher thinks he finds its origin about the birth of Christ! But Dr. Ditzler knocks this theory sky high by showing that baptidzo sent ships to the bottom of the sea in the days of Homer, a thousand years before Christ! Mr. G. thinks Plutarch meant to say that the ships were just hauled up by the prow till they stood erect on the stern and had a little spray sprinkled on them! Because *kataduno* means to submerge, he thinks another word (of like meaning) would not have been used. There are a half dozen words in English, and we have heard a minister use three of them in describing the immersion of one candidate. The baptism of Bacchus, by covering wine with sea water, is quite plain. The pouring was not the baptizing act, for *cheo* and not *baptizo* is used to express that act. So much for Gallaher.

Mr. Weaver had better do his own debating. As poor as he is, he can beat his Presbyterian friend.

MR. WEAVER'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.

I. continue the quotation from Dr. Gallaher:

"No trace of this interpretation of Rom. 6:3-5 (the burial theory) can be found in any of the Ante-Nicene (A. D. 325) writings. These Constitutions are simple forgeries, palmed off on a credulous world as the work of the apostles. But they taught with Tertullian, Basil, and all the most learned writers that baptism was to be administered by three partial dips. That is the reason Prof. Thayer, when he gives the first definition of baptidzo, as 'to dip repeatedly,' refers to the patristic writers, quoted by Prof. Sophocles, who gives the 'mode, ministrant,

subject, etc., of the rite.' Prof. Thayer is not alone in giving 'to dip repeatedly' as the first definition of baptidzo. He found it in the Grimme-Wilke lexicon (German, which he was translating into English). Liddell & Scott's first edition gave 'to dip repeatedly' as their first "definition of baptidzo. So does Donnegan, Rost & Palm, and others. It now comes to light by the teaching of Prof. Thayer, in his *Lexicon of the New Testament Greek*, said by competent judges to be the best in the world, that the origin of the idea that there ever was any 'dip or immerse' in baptidzo is found in the teaching and practice of the superstitious Catholics after the death of the last apostle; yea, long after the death of Plutarch, the only authority quoted by Prof. Drisler as using baptidzo in the sense of 'to dip into or under water.' The early Catholic writers developed the idea that at the invocation of the priest the Holy Spirit came down into the water, dwelt therein, and thus fertilized the water, so that when the naked body was put into that 'baptized water' the Spirit would enter the soul of the subject through its body by his sanctifying influence, and thus drive out all sin, and leave the soul pure and spotless as an angel. This partial dip was repeated three times—once in the name of the Father, once in the name of the Son, and the last in the name of the Holy Ghost. This is called in literature 'trine immersion,' or three-fold dipping. This was the common and almost universal practice among the Greek and Roman Catholics for many centuries. And they claim it was apostolic. This practice of dipping three times, to effect one baptism, and the teaching of the spurious *Apostolic Constitutions*, believed for ages to be of apostolic origin, so colored and controlled the literature of the whole of Christendom that it is little wonder if the idea got into the heads of multitudes that baptidzo must signify 'to dip repeatedly.' Prof. Thayer is to be congratulated on the fact that he is the one lexicographer

who has boldly and plainly referred to the patristic writers (Catholic Fathers) as the original source of the erroneous idea that there is somewhere about baptidzo a 'dipping' even 'dipping repeatedly.' No one who knows how to read Greek will dare claim that baptidzo ever had such a meaning as 'to dip repeatedly' in the New Testament or any Greek writings older than the New Testament. And now Prof. J. H. Thayer, in his Greek lexicon (one of the best in the world), virtually concedes that the teaching and practice of the Catholics after the second century is the only foundation on earth for the claim that baptidzo ever or anywhere had such a significance as dip or immerse. I have long believed and contended that there was no other ground for the idea that there was any 'dipping or immersing' in the word baptidzo than the Catholic practice of putting their subjects into the blessed water as the safest way to imbibe from the water the saving influence of the Spirit; but I really did not expect any lexicographer to give away the whole matter, as Prof. Thayer does when he refers to the patristic writers quoted by Prof. Sophocles. But it has gone to record now. Prof. Thayer finds the foundation of 'immersion' and 'submersion' in baptidzo in the patristic writings of the Catholics later than the second century. And it must be remembered that even these Catholics did not deny that sprinkling is scriptural; some of them, as Cyprian, quoted Scripture to prove that; but dipping repeatedly was the safest and surest way to get all the parts of the naked body, infant or adult, wet with the sanctified water. The theory that baptism symbolizes a burial was invented for the purpose of supporting the dipping theory. That perversion, of Rom. 6:3-5 and Col. 2:12 was fabricated after A. D. 325, and like the dipping theory has crept into the lexicons and into much of the literature of Christendom. Both theories originated with superstitious Catholics."

I now read from Young's Analytical Concordance, seventh edition, page 70:

"Baptize, to consecrate (by pouring out on, or putting into), baptidzo."

I read from Mr. "Webster's International Dictionary, p. 117:

"Baptism, the act of baptizing; the application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible church of Christ. This is performed by immersion, sprinkling or pouring."

I read his definition of baptize, on page 117:

"To administer the sacrament of baptism to. 2. To christen (because a name is given to infants at their baptism), to give a name to, to name."

I read his definition of immerse, page 731:

"To plunge into anything that surrounds or covers, especially into a fluid; to dip; to sink; to bury; to immerse. 2. To baptize by immersion. 3. To engage deeply; to engross the attention of; to, involve; to overwhelm. 'The queen immersed in such a trance.' Tennyson."

No mention of water by Mr. "Webster. I read his definition of immersion, p. 732:

"1. The act of immersing, or the state of being immersed; a sinking within a fluid; a dipping, as the immersion of Achilles in the Styx. 2. Submersion in water for the purpose of Christian baptism, as practiced by the Baptists. 3. state of being overwhelmed or deeply absorbed; deep engagedness."

I read him on sprinkling, p. 1394:

"The act of one who, or that which, sprinkles. 'Baptism may well enough be performed by sprinkling or effusion of water.' Ayliffe."

I read from Dr. Carson on Baptism, published 1832, p. 79. He is speaking of bapto and baptidzo; of bapto the root as having two meanings only, to dip and to dye, and asserts that

baptidzo has but one, then refers to the mistakes of others on these words. He defines his position in these words:

"I do not admit this with, respect to either. I have already proved this with respect to bapto; the proof is equally strong with respect to baptidzo. My position is that it always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons. Many may be startled at the idea of refusing to submit to the unanimous authority of lexicons, as an instance of the boldest skepticism."

He admits that lexicons are an authority, but not an ultimate authority.

On page 11 he says: "The idea of water is not at all in the word." I will read from Wall's History of Infant Baptism, edited by Cotton, vol. 1, p. 536:

"They bring three proofs of the necessity of immersion or dipping. 1. The example of John baptizing Christ, of Philip baptizing the eunuch, and generally of the ancient Christians baptizing by immersion. 2. That baptism ought, as much as may be, to resemble the death and burial and rising again of Christ. 3. That the word to baptize does necessarily include dipping in its signification; and that Christ, by commanding to baptize, has commanded to dip. To which these answers are commonly given: The first proves what was said before, that in Scripture times, and in the times next succeeding, it was the custom in those hot countries to baptize ordinarily by immersion; but not; that in cases of sickness, or other such extraordinary occasions, they never baptized otherwise. Of this I shall speak in the next chapter. The 2d proves that dipping, where it may safely be used, is the most fitting manner. But our Savior has taught us a rule. Mat. 13:3, 4, 7, that what is needed to preserve life is to be preferred before outward ceremonies. The 3d, which

would if it were true be more conclusive than the rest, is plainly a mistake. That baptidzo in Scripture signifies to wash in general, without determining the sense to this or that sort of washing. The sense of a Scripture word is not to be taken from the use of it in secular authors, but from the use of it in the Scriptures. What baptidzo signifies among Greek writers, and what interpretation critics and lexicons do accordingly give it, is not much to the purpose in this ease to dispute (though they also, as Mr. Walker in his Doctrine of Baptism has largely shown, beside the signification immerse, do give that of lavo in general), when the sense in which it is used by the penmen of Scripture may otherwise be plainly determined from Scripture itself."

MR. BURNETT'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver's substitute (Gallaher) repeats the false statement, that the burial idea of baptism did not antedate the Nicene writings, A. D. 325. We showed that Paul introduced the idea in Rom. 6 and Col. 2, and that Barnabas and Hermas and Justin Martyr all refer to it. This is Mistake No. 1. The "Substitute" also says that "superstitious Catholics" developed the idea that the Holy Spirit fertilized the baptismal water, and that the more thoroughly wet the body became the more grace the Subject received, hence immersion. This is Mistake No. 2. The "fertilizing" idea existed in the world three hundred years before there was a Roman Catholic on the earth. It originated infant baptismal regeneration, but not immersion. All the historians in the world say the apostles and primitive Christians dipped in baptism, but not one dates the "fertilizing" idea earlier than the third century. See Neander, Mosheim, Stackhouse, Bingham, Schaff, et. al. We have before us the comments of one hundred of the most celebrated and scho-

larly men of Christendom, and they all say the "burial theory" of baptism originated with Paul in Rom. 6 and Col. 2. Here are the names of some of these eminent scholars and theologians, all of whom are members of sprinkling churches; John Wesley, Dr. Adam Clark, Dr. Albert Barnes, Dr. Bloomfield, Richard Baxter, Dr. Bingham, Dr. Chalmers, Conybeare and Howson, Philip Doddridge, Dr. Cranmer, Dr. Dollinger, Grotius, Hoadly, Lightfoot, Knapp, Martin Luther, Dr. Macknight and Dr. Wall. They say that Paul referred to the burial in water baptism, and that it did not originate with the superstitious Catholics. The Catholics changed baptism from dipping to sprinkling, but not the other way. Give the devil his due, please.

The "Substitute" misrepresents Thayer's lexicon as follows: "It now comes to light by the teaching of Prof. J. II. Thayer, . . . that the origin of the idea that there ever was any 'dip or immerse' in baptidzo is found in the teaching and practice of the superstitious Catholics after the death of the last apostle."

Thayer does not quote an author that lived within three hundred years of the first Catholic writer! To show that the word means to immerge, submerge, sink, etc., he quotes Plato, Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo, Josephus and Plutarch, all born before Christ except Josephus and Plutarch, and they were born A. D. 37 and A. D. 39. Josephus was contemporary with the apostle John, and he said baptidzo meant immerse. In describing the drowning of Aristobulus he said the swimmers pressed him down and baptidzoed him (ducked him) as if in sport till he was suffocated. Thayer refers to John the Baptist, Matthew and Mark and Luke, and even the Old Testament and Apocrypha, for examples of his use of the word. Yet this great Presbyterian ignoramus, that Mr. Weaver sets up here to do his debating for him, says Thayer derived the dip idea from

the superstitious Catholics! Is not that a pretty kettle of fish?

. Dr. Robinson is a Presbyterian doctor of divinity. Here is the way he begins the definition of the word in his Greek lexicon: "Baptidzo, a frequentative in form, but apparently not in signification.; to dip in, to sink, to immerse, in Greek writers spoken of ships,,galleys, etc." He gives examples in Polybius (B. C. 204), Diodorus (B. C. 60), Strabo (B. C. 54), and; Josephus and Plutarch. Did these writers obtain the dip idea from the superstitious Catholics, who lived five hundred years after they wrote? Why, this Presbyterian lexicographer (Robinson) says: "In Greek writers, as above exhibited, from Plato onwards, baptidzo is everywhere to sink, to immerse, to overwhelm." He gives, as definitions, 'overwhelmed with debts,' a boy 'overwhelmed with questions,' etc. Of the baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire (Mat. 3:11) he says: "Tropically and with direct allusion to the sacred rite, to baptize in (with) the Holy Ghost, and in (with) fire, i. e., to overwhelm, richly furnish with all spiritual gifts, and to overwhelm with fire unquenchable." Did he get that idea from the superstitious Catholics? Eh? The wonder is that Mr. Weaver would put up such an old superannuated, out-of-date granny as Gallaher to debate with a man that knows anything about literature. He contradicts every author and scholar in the whole world. His article is a slander on the intelligence and learning of the age. Then he misrepresents every author he quotes. Mr. Weaver would not do so dirty a trick as that, but he sets up the dirty thing that does do it, and hence is responsible for it. His wild notion that the dip idea crept into baptidzo after the apostolic age knocks Dr. Robinson and Dr. Ditzler and all the other doctors on the head. Dr. Robinson says that from Plato onwards baptidzo means to sink and immerse everywhere. Dr. Ditzler says, p. 426, "I said in my opening speech that in classic Greek, it meant submerge, sink, and all that; that it was habitually so

used." On p. 406 he says that it means "to sink the ship, that it goes to the bottom and baptidzo puts it there, and there leaves it, and this is its ordinary meaning in the classic Greek!" Good-by, Dr. Ditzler!

Mr. Gallaher also slanders the Roman Catholics, in saying that they originated the three dips. The Trinitarians originated the three dips, three hundred years before the Roman Catholic church was born. Tertullian, A. D. 200, mentions it, and says that it was "somewhat more" than the Lord required. But the one dip was in force two hundred years before the three dips began, according to all historians.

Mr. Weaver misrepresents Carson, though he may do it ignorantly. He quotes Carson, that all the lexicons are against him in saying that baptidzo means to dip and only to dip. Carson held that it was a word of mode or motion, and the dip motion was always in it, while the lexicographers held that a thing is baptized if it is covered up, even though the enveloping fluid comes upon it. There was no issue between him and the lexicons that the word meant to dip and not to sprinkle. Every lexicon in the world says it means to dip, and not one says it means to sprinkle.

Mr. Weaver started out to discuss the lexicons, and what has he done? He introduced Gallaher, who flatly contradicted the two standard lexicons of the world, and tried to throw opprobrium upon them, because they said dip and not sprinkle. Now Mr. Weaver introduces three men, two of whom (Dr. Young and Dr. Wall) are pedobaptist doctors of divinity, and not lexicographers, and Mr. Webster is the author of an English dictionary! Webster gives the current meaning of baptize, and gives it right (for people now use it in the sense of sprinkle, pour and dip), but that has no more to do with the question we are discussing than a chapter from the Sanscrit! If he had given Webster's derivation of the word, it would have

had a bearing. Why did he not do that? Webster says baptize is, "From *baptein*, to dip in water!" Did you not see that, Mr. Weaver? Or were you called and sent not to see it? Ah, that is Greek, and Mr. Weaver is afraid of Greek! The New Testament was written in Greek, and Webster says the word in Greek means to dip in water.

Dr. Wall admits (in his statement) that in scriptural times, and the times next succeeding, it was the custom to baptize (ordinarily) by immersion, but in case of sickness and "other such extraordinary occasions" (well, yes!) they might baptize otherwise. He also says that immersion is "the more fitting manner" to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ. Dr. Wall says in another place (which Mr. Weaver failed to see!) that the Savior was immersed! Would you like to read it? Here it is:

"Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it was an infant or grown man or woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages that, as one can not but pity the weak endeavors of such pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it. . . . It is one thing to maintain that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent; when it was in all probability the way by which our bleated Savior, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians, did receive their baptism."

How do you like Dr. Wall, as an advocate of sprinkling and pouring? As for Dr. Young, he is a modern pedobaptist doctor of divinity, and is of no more authority on this question than J. C. Weaver would be. Why does not our friend discuss the Greek lexicons, as he set out to do? Why does he not bring

one that says baptidzo means to sprinkle? Ah, beloved, there is a reason—he can not do it!

MR. WEAVER'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH.

We will finish the quotation from Dr. Wall. He says: "Baptize is a word applied in Scripture not only to such washing as is. by dipping into the water the thing or person washed but also to such as is by pouring or rubbing water on the thing or person washed, or some part of it. Secondly, that the sacramental washing is often in Scripture expressed by other words besides baptizing, which other words do signify washing in the ordinary and general sense. For the first there are, besides others these plain instances: The Jews thought it a piece of religion to wash their hands before dinner. They blame the disciples (Mark 7:5) for eating with unwashen hands. The word here is *nipto*, an ordinary word for washing the hands. Their way of that washing was this: They had servants to pour the water on their hands. 2 Ki. 3:11: 'Who poured water on the hands of Elijah,' that is, who waited on: him as a servant. Now this washing of the hands is called by St. Luke the baptizing of a man, or the man's being baptized (Lu. 11:38), for where the English is, 'The Pharisee marveled that he had not washed before dinner.' St. Luke's own words are *otii ou ebaptisthe pro tou aristou*, 'that he was not baptized before dinner.' And so they are translated in the Latin. A plain instance that they used the word to baptize for any ordinary washing, whether there were dipping in the case or not. Also that which is translated (Mark 7) the washing of pots, cups, brazen vessels, tables, is in the original the baptizing of pots, etc. And what is there said, 'When they come from market, except they wash, they eat not,' the words of St. Mark are, 'Except they be baptized they eat not.' And the divers

washings of the Jews are called *diaphorois baptismois*, divers baptisms, Heb. 9:10, of which some were by bathing, others by sprinkling. Num. 8:7, 19:18-19. For the second there are these: Baptism is styled '*Loutron tou hudatos*,' Eph. 5:26, '*Loutron tes paliggenesias*,' the washing of regeneration, Tit. 3:5. And to express this saying, 'Having our bodies baptized with clean water,' the apostle words it, '*Leloumenoi to soma*,' having our bodies washed, '*kai errantismenoi tas kardias*,' and our hearts sprinkled. Heb. 10:22: These words for washing are such as are the most usual for the ordinary ways of washing; the same, for example, with that which is used Acts 16:33, 'He washed their stripes.' No man will think they were put into water for that."

On page 538 Mr. Wall says:

"I did not, in the first nor second edition, proceed to give any instances out of any other book beside the Scripture of the word baptidzo used for washing by perfusion, partly because it does not belong to the main matter of my book, which is a history, not of the manner of administering baptism, but of the subjects of it, etc."

Mr. Wall gives us a case in Origen's Com. in Joann. Tom 7, p. 116, Ed. Rothom., 1668. It is the case in 1 Ki. 18:33. The order given by Elijah is: "Fill four barrells with water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood. And he said, Do it the second time," etc. This Origen calls the baptizing of the wood. I will call the reader's attention to the case given in Mark 7:5. The word *nipto* is used, yet Luke called this baptism. Luke's word for it is *ebaptisthe*. Now, when I called attention to the fact, in the baptism of the Spirit, that it was poured out on us, my friend said it was the wrong word—it was *cheo*. Yet the Book calls it baptism of the Holy Ghost. I read from Wall, page 574 and 575:

"There are some of the most ancient instances of that sort

of baptism that are now extant in records. But the further one proceeds in reading the following times, the more frequent they are; insomuch that Gennadius of Marseilles in the fifth century speaks of baptism as given in the French church in differently, by either of the ways, of immersion or aspersion. For having said, 'We believe the way of salvation to be open only to baptized persons, we believe that no catechumen, though he die in good works, has eternal life' He adds, 'Except the case of martyrdom, in which all the sacraments of baptism are completed.' Then to show how martyrdom has all in it that baptism has, he says, 'The person to be baptized owns his faith before the priest, and when the interrogatories are put to him, makes his answer. The same does a martyr before the heathen judge—he also owns his faith, and when the question is put to him, makes answer. The one after his confession is either wetted with the water, or else plunged into it; and the other is either wetted with his own blood, or else is plunged (or overwhelmed) in fire.' In the times of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura immersion was in Italy the most common way; but the other was ordinary enough. Thomas speaks thus: 'Baptism may be given not only by immersion, but also by affusion of water, or sprinkling with it, but it is the safer way to baptize by immersion, because that is the more common custom.' And again: 'By immersion the burial of Christ is more lively represented, and therefore this is the most common and commendable way.' Bonaventura says that the way of affusion was probably used by the apostles, and was in his time used in the churches of France and some others; but he says the way of dipping into the water is the more common, and the fitter, and the safer."

Now, my friends, you see that while both these fathers believed in the immersion way simply because it was the most common, yet they admitted that baptism could be performed

by affusion, "and one says that affusion was probably used by the apostles. They seemed to base their belief on the idea of bury. We believe in burial in Christ's death, but not so much in water. Our friend says: "We have before us the comments of one hundred of the most celebrated and scholarly men of Christendom, and they all say the burial theory of baptism originated with Paul in Rom. 6 and Col. 2." Now, reader, note this language, and ask our friend to quote one that does 1,0 give, and give the devil his dues. Our friend don't like "Granny Gallaher." Let him meet his challenge. That is, find any history that mentions the idea of water baptism (immersion) as a burial prior to 325. Now don't overlook the wording of the challenge, that is, immersion in water as a burial. He charges "Granny G." of misrepresenting the authors he quotes. Then it would be well for our friend to quote "G. G.," and the authors he misrepresents side by side, and point out the misrepresentations. Our friend says I misrepresent Carbon. Let him give my quotation from Carbon, and then quote Carson, and in that way put me to shame. Our friend says: "Every lexicon in the world says it means to dip, and not one says it means to sprinkle." All I ask of you, reader, is to not forget this statement. Our friend says, "Dr. Wall says in another place that the Savior was immersed." He says I did not see that. No, I did not see it that way. If Dr. Wall had said it in as plain language as our friend said he said it, I could have seen it. Our friend asks how I like Dr. Wall as an advocate of sprinkling and pouring? I reply I am well pleased with him, for he did not believe in nor teach exclusive immersion. Our friend don't like Dr. Young, but he wants to go to the lexicons. We will come to them some time in the future. And I now lay down this plain challenge. I challenge our friend to give a lexicon on the earth that defines baptidzo to mean immerse only as Christian baptism.

MR. BURNETT'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver substitutes Dr. Wall for Gallaher. Well, Dr. Wall is a more reputable opponent, but if we have to debate with these doctors of divinity instead of J. C. Weaver, we should like to have the privilege of selecting our opponent. Dr. Wall is a learned man, and Dr. Wall says the Savior was immersed, and he says that was the "most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism." Mr. Weaver says he failed to see that statement. We quoted the exact language of Dr. Wall. It is found on p. 570 and p. 571, vol. 1, and Mr. Weaver made a quotation within a few pages of the same place! Dr. Wall also says the burial theory of baptism originated with Paul, and not with the Catholics, as Mr. Gallaher asserts. Do you wish to hear what he says? Here it is, Vol. 2, p. 452: "St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way, call baptism a burial." Did you see that, Mr. Weaver? We said we had before us the comments of a hundred of the most celebrated and scholarly men of Christendom, who said the burial idea came from Paul and not from the Catholics, and gave some of their names. Mr. Weaver wishes to hear their words. Well, here is what one of them says—a celebrated man named John Wesley. Did you ever hear of him? Commenting on Rom. 6:4, he says: "Buried with him—Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Here is the comment of the celebrated Methodist evangelist, Whitefield, on same text: "It is certain that in the words of our text there is an allusion to the manner of immersion." Here is the comment of Dr. Lightfoot on Col. 2:12: "Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new." Now hear Dr. Albert Barnes, the great Presbyterian commentator, on Rom. 6:4: "It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place has allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Dr. Bloomfield says

on the same text: "We were thus buried (in the water of baptism), for the term has allusion to baptism, according to mode in which it was originally administered, viz., by immersion." We could give the words of the entire hundred, if we had space. Dr. Philip Schaff, the celebrated Presbyterian, says: "All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse . . . the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied." So, Mr. Weaver's Substitute No. 1 (Gallaher) is grossly in error, in the estimation of "all commentators of note" in the world, in supposing the "burial idea" came from the Catholics, Mr. W. says he believes in the burial, but not in water. Yes, but we have shown that his burial (into God) has no resurrection, except when there is apostasy, and in that case the apostate is raised downward, or falls upward! But he wants us to accept Gallaher's challenge, and quote some writer prior to 325 that held the burial idea. We did that before-quoted Barnabas, Hennas and Justin Martyr, who lived long before 325. And we accepted his other challenge, as to the classical meaning of baptidzo, and showed that he contradicted all the lexicons, and all the Greek writers from Homer down to Christ, and was in conflict with Dr. Ditzler and Dr. Wilkinson and all the sprinkling champions. They all say the word meant to dip originally, and that it sent ships to the bottom of the sea, from the days of Homer to the Christian era.

Substitute No. 2 (Dr. Wall) comments on Mark 7:3, "Except they wash their hands" (which is nipto and not baptidzo), and then jumps over to Luke 11:38, where the Savior did not wash (baptidzo) before dinner, and tries to make it the same kind of washing. Now these passages are of easy explanation. The Savior had been in a public place, where he might have touched some unclean person, and in such cases it was customary for the Jews to bathe before eating. Hence in this text the

word baptidzo is used. But in Mark 7:3, where it is said the Jews do not eat except they wash their hands, the word nipto is used. That word does not mean an entire bath. As great a man as Dr. Wall ought not to have made as great a mistake as he makes here. The two words are used in contrast in Mark 7:3 and Mark 7:4, as follows: "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash (nipto) their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the market, except they wash (baptidzo), they eat not." Why this repetition, if the same washing is meant? And why are two different words used? The plain meaning of it is the Jews never ate at all without washing their hands (nipto), and when they came from the market (where they might have touched some unclean person) they never ate except they washed (baptidzoed) their bodies. The testimony of Maimonides, the celebrated Jewish rabbi, is in place on this point. He says:

"Wherever, in the law, washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than dipping of the whole body in a laver. For if a man dips himself all over, except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness. Every one that is baptized (as they were on coming from the market) must immerse the whole body. In a laver which holds forty seahs (about one hundred gallons) of water, every defiled person dips himself, except a profluvius man, and in it they dip all unclean vessels."

The Substitute is in error when he says Luke calls the washing of hands the baptism of a man. He does not do it. He is also in error when he says the washing of cups and pots and brazen vessels was a sprinkling expressed by baptidzo. It was an immersion, as Maimonides says, and as anybody can learn by referring to the law of Moses. See Lev. 6:28, Lev. 11:32, Lev. 15:12, where the vessels had to be put into water to cleanse them. And the greatest mistake of all is in saying that the

"divers baptisms" (*diaphorais baptismois*) of Heb. 9:10 has any reference to any sprinklings under the law. There was no sprinkling of water under the law (not a single case), but there were divers immersions. In Lev. 15 there are twelve immersions in water in one chapter, and frequent cases elsewhere.

Dr. Wall says the "washing of water" in Eph. 5:26, and the "washing of regeneration" in Titus 3:5, which mean baptism, are from *louo*, which may be defined to wash in a general way, and he cites the case of the jailer, who "washed their stripes." Yes, *louo* is a general term, and may mean to wash in a general way, but that does not show that the specific word *baptidzo* means to wash in a general way—not at all. The word *save* means to preserve, and the word *preserve* means to pickle (sometimes), so we can interpret the Lord's language as follows: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be—pickled!" How will that do? There is just as much sense in it as there is in Dr. Wall's criticism on the word *wash*. It is astonishing that so learned a man should make so childish a blunder. *Baptidzo* is interchanged with *louo* (wash), but it is never interchanged with *cheo* or *rantidzo*. In Heb. 10:22 the text reads: "Having our hearts sprinkled (*rantidzo*) from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed (*louo*) with pure water." Why are two different words used here, if the action is the same?

We can easily see how Origen, A. D. 215, might say Elijah's altar was baptized, for there were twelve barrels of water poured on it! Does Mr. Weaver use twelve barrels of water when he rantizes an infant? Our friend makes his old-time blunder in saying that the Bible calls the pouring of the Spirit baptism. The pouring was not the baptism, and *baptidzo* is not used. We accept his challenge for a lexicon, and give

MR. WEAVER'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend complains of having to meet Drs. Wall and Gallaher. I will ask the careful reader who left the Bible first, and introduced other men's works?

Our friend still insists that Dr. Wall says the Savior was immersed. He refers to Vol. 1, p. 570-571. I have examined his quotation, and still say I do not see the statement where Dr. W. says Christ was immersed. I would like to have the proof. Our friend says Dr. G. is grossly in error, when he challenges the world to find the burial theory of water baptism prior to 325. If he is, our friend ought to show it. He refers to Wesley, et. al., but does not quote them. I wish our friend could be induced to quote Mr. Wesley or Dr. Adam Clark on Rom. 6:1-10, and let us see what they do say about it. Will our friend be kind enough to do so? We will wait and see.

Our friend thinks, "As great a man as Dr. Wall ought not to make so great a mistake" on Mark 7:4. He calls it a "childish blunder." The thing that puzzles me, kind reader, is, that men of less learning will attempt a criticism on such a man as Dr. Wall. You will note that Dr. Gale tried to expose some of his "childish blunders," to his own confusion and hurt. I asked our friend to give one lexicon that defines baptidzo to dip only, for Christian baptism.

Our friend says that in the baptizing of the altar there were twelve barrels of water used. But the water was poured on the wood, and the pouring on the water was called baptizing the wood. Hence the baptizing was by pouring, without doubt.

Allusion is made to the baptism of suffering or martyrdom, by some writers. They admit that that baptism can be either by affusion or immersion, but think immersion more lively represents burial. We think differently. Then what does the word of God say? Take Christ's baptism of suffering on the

cross. Luke 12:15: "I have a baptism to be baptized with." How was this baptism performed? Isa. 53:12: "Because he hath poured out his soul unto death." If we believe God's word, that settles the mode of baptism. They also spoke of being wetted with, or plunged into, water, and being wetted with their own blood, or plunged into fire, for baptism. But what does the Book say? Isa. 63:3: "And their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments." So, in this baptism, the Savior's garments were wetted by sprinkling. So the word must mean sprinkle and pour, for the Book to be true.

I read from Wall, Vol. 2, p. 447:

"I had, in the first edition, referred to Mat. 26:23, 'He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish,' etc., but left it. out of the second, because the word there is not baptidzo, but embapto, which, though it be rendered and do signify to dip, yet not in the sense that the anti-pedobaptists understand dipping, viz., to immerge the thing spoken of all over. For the whole hand was not dipped. Now this Mr. Gale grants,, and says, 'The question is not about the whole, or a part of the subject, but whether the Greek word signifies to dip,' and concludes, 'if it be true that baptidzo does only signify to dip, it is all we ask, and our present dispute is at an end.' (P. 112.) He should have minded that the word he speaks of is not in the text, but another word, which is generally by the English rendered to dip; whereas baptidzo is never in the New Testament so rendered by them. Yet, for the word baptidzo itself, if the dispute will end upon its being granted always to signify dip, in Mr. Gale's sense of the word dip, I see nothing to the contrary but it may end presently. He yields his word dip to mean the very same thing (neither more nor less) we mean by

subject, or some part of it.' All that I fear is, that the anti-pedobaptists will not stand to the determination of this their manager, but will say he has betrayed and given up their cause. If they do all mean by dipping no more than he has yielded it to be, it is true what he says, 'the dispute is at an end,' it is no matter whether we call it washing or dipping. But, then, the schism would be at an end, too, which would be, as Mr. Gale knows, a formidable thing."

We read, p. 520:

"And besides, Origen tells them that they had no reason to think that Elias or the Christ would baptize in their own persons, but by deputies, as Elias did not baptize the wood himself, but ordered it to be done; and as Jesus when he came did not himself baptize, but his disciples. Heracleon thought that not only these, but any prophet might baptize. Origen shows him to be mistaken in that, if he means any ordinary prophet; since he can not show that any prophet (meaning such an one) did use to baptize; nor the greater ones by themselves. So manifestly does Mr. Gale pervert the sense, when to Origen's words any prophet, he (in spite of Origen's distinction expressed in the line before) adds Moses, rendering it, not any prophet, neither Moses nor, etc. Both Origen and this heretic, Heracleon, must have well known the customs of the Jews, for they both lived in Alexandria in Egypt, where great numbers of Jews dwelt. Origen, one hundred and ten years after the apostles, and Heracleon, eighty years before, viz., thirty years after the apostles. Thirdly, he will see that Origen here does plainly call pouring water on a thing, baptizing it. For what Elias ordered, 1 Ki. 18:33, was, 'Fill four barrels of water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice, and the wood.' And this he styles the baptism of the wood and sacrifice, which should have made Mr. Gale, when he read and questioned this place, for shame to have retracted what he so confidently had

averred in his third, fourth and fifth chapters, that baptizing never in authors signifies pouring of water, but dipping."

Now, my friend, this language from Mr. Wall, whom the learned Christian world recognizes as both learned and honest, needs no comment from me, for he states our position as pedo-baptists, and shows it to be true. Now, as to Origen's chance to know the truth about this baptismal question, I will read Wall, Vol, 1, pp. 77-78:

"There is one circumstance that makes Origen a more competent witness to give evidence, whether the baptizing of infants had been in use time out of mind or not, than most other authors that we have left us of that age; because he was himself of a family that had been Christian for a long time.. Tertullian and all the rest that we have mentioned, except Irenaeus, must have been themselves baptized in adult age, because they were of heathen parents, and were the first of their family that turned Christian; but Origen's father was a martyr for Christ in the persecution under Severus, the year after the apostles, 102, and Eusebius assures us that his forefathers had been Christians for several generations: 'The Christian doctrine was conveyed him from his forefathers.' Or, as Rufinus translates it, 'ab avis atque atavis, from his grandfathers and great-grandfathers.' That which gave occasion to Eusebius to inquire into his pedigree was the slander of Porphyrius; for he, endeavoring to show that the Christian religion had nothing in it of learning or science, and had none but illiterate followers, and not being able to deny or conceal the great repute of Origen for his skill in human literature, had feigned that he was first a heathen, and having learned their philosophy and then turned Christian, had endeavored to transfer and apply it to trim up the Christian fables. In confutation of this lie Eusebius, as I said, sets forth his Christian descent. Now, since Origen was born anno 185, that is, the year after the apostles

85 (for he was seventeen years old when his father suffered), his grandfather, or at least his great-grandfather, must have lived in the apostles' times. And as he could not be ignorant whether he was himself baptized in infancy, so he had no further than his own family to go for inquiry how it was practiced in the times of the apostles. Besides that, he was, as I said, a very learned man, and could not be ignorant of the use of the churches, in most of which he had also traveled; for he was born and bred at Alexandria, so it appears out of Eusebius that he had lived in Greece, and at Rome, and in Cappadocia, and Arabia, and spent the main part of his life in Syria and Palestine."

Surely this man knew not only as to whether the apostles practiced the baptism of infants, but he knew the mode the apostles practiced. He also knew the meaning of baptizdo. And he said when the water was poured on the wood and sacrifice that both the wood and sacrifice were baptized. So baptizdo must have meant to pour in his time.

MR. BURNETT'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.

As an excuse for substituting Wall and Gallaher, Mr. Weaver says that we first left the Bible. That is a mistake. We have not left the Bible. To consult a lexicon in regard to the definition of a Bible word is not to leave the Bible. Nor is it a resort to men's work to introduce historians in proof of a historical fact, or eminent theologians in regard to the interpretation of a text. But we say it is not in accordance with the rules of debate to copy bodily another man's speech. That is, unless you have run out of soap. As Mr. Weaver seems to be in a soapless as well as hopeless condition, we will have to let him go ahead.

He says he has examined Wall, and does not see the state-

ment when he says the Savior was immersed. Mr. Weaver is like the man who did not see the hundred rats his neighbor ran out from, under the barn—he shut his eyes! The quotation reads just as we gave it. Perhaps Mr. Weaver has a different edition of Wall, in which the quotation does not occupy the same page. But he ought to be better posted in Wall than to dispute the statement, for it is quoted into hundreds of discussions, and is found in many books. If he will send us his copy of Wall, we will mark the passage and turn down a leaf.

He sticks to the error of Gallaher, that the burial theory does not antedate 325, and says we ought to show it! We have shown it twice—by giving quotations of authors who lived prior to 325, and by giving the views of many learned theologians who said Paul originated the burial theory—yet he wants us to show it! Then he says we ought to quote what Wesley and others say on Bom. 6—which we did in our last speech! Wake up, Joe Weaver—you are sound asleep!

He is puzzled that men of less learning will criticise the great Dr. Wall. Wall was not great in the Scriptures, else he would not have made so many childish blunders, and he would not have belonged to the Episcopal church. There is no such church known to the Scriptures. Why did not our opponent meet us on the criticism of Wall's exegesis of Mark 7:3-4? Wall says the washing of hands (*nipto*) before meals, and the washing when they come from the market (*baptidzo*), are one and the same washing. Yet he knew there were two different words used.

Mr. Weaver thinks Christ's baptism of suffering was by pouring, because Isa. 53:12 says, "He poured out his soul unto death." The word used in this text is *cheo*, and not *baptizo*. In Luke 12:50, where the Savior says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with," the word is *baptisma*, and not the word used in Isaiah for pouring. Mr. W.'s proof-texts always con-

tain the wrong word. We have called his attention to this matter a dozen times, but he offers no explanation. Anybody ought to know that Christ did not say that he had a little sprinkling to be sprinkled with, or a slight pouring to be poured with, and that he was straitened till it be accomplished, but that he had an overwhelming amount of suffering to endure, and hence called it baptism.

He next quotes Isa. 63:3, where Christ says, "Their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments," and thinks this settles the mode. Does Mr. Weaver think the baptismal word is used in this text? He knows it is not. Nor is it the same word that is used in his other text from Isaiah. He changes his mode as often as he changes his texts, and never finds *baptizo* in any of his texts. Did the Savior say his garments were baptized with their blood? No! Did he say his soul was baptized out of his body? No!! Did he use the word *baptizo* in either one of these texts? No!!!

He next brings up a debate between Dr. Wall and Mr. Gale, about the dipping of the hand of Judas in the dish, but the word there is *embapto* and not *baptidzo*, and has nothing to do with the issue between Weaver and Burnett. The King James translators rendered the word *dip*, and Mr. Weaver (at the first of this debate) said *embapto* always means to dip. So he cut Mr. Wall's head off before he ever introduced him as a witness! Joe Weaver must be sound asleep! *Embapto* and *baptidzo* have the same root, and mean much the same. The reason the King James translators rendered one *dip*, and transferred the other, their hands were tied as to *baptidzo*. They translated it *dip* in the Old Testament, in the case of Naaman, when their hands were not tied, but they never translated it *pour* or *sprinkle* anywhere. The dish into which Jesus dipped his hand was a large dish, and he dipped within the space called the dish, and *embapto* expressed the act. Wall says

Gale surrendered the issue, and Weaver swallows it down, just like a little bird with its mouth wide open, after saying himself that embapto always means to dip! Now as great a man as Dr. Wall (or Dr. Weaver) ought not to make so great a blunder as to think that Judas sprinkled his hand into the dish, or poured it in, or washed his hand with the dish! But that is just as sensible as to say that John poured the people into the river Jordan!

Mr. Weaver says that in the baptism of the altar by Elijah, although there were twelve barrels of water used, the act was pouring. We asked him if he performed such an act as that when he baptized a baby, and he would not answer. Bear in mind that the Bible does not call the flooding of the altar baptism. An uninspired man named Origen, who lived 225 years down the Anno Domini, called it a baptism. And that is the best proof Mr. Weaver has for affusion! Two hundred years after Christ, an uninspired man calls the flooding of an altar with twelve barrels of water a baptism, and he gets this out of Wall, a historian who states as a historical fact that Christ was immersed and the ancient Christians did generally receive their baptism in that way. And this learned man, Origen, whom Wall and Weaver extol so highly, said baptism was immersion, and he was himself immersed, and was a dipper and not a sprinkler! Do you want the proof? We dislike to take all our friend's witnesses away from him, but Origen dipped little babies in the font. And he did it to save them from the damnation of hell! If he denies it, we will produce the evidence. But at present we wish to give some more attention to the baptism of the altar. Dr. Wall says there were four barrels of water; the Bible says there were twelve. Listen:

"Fill four barrels with, water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood. And he said, Do it the second time. And they did it the second time. And he said, Do it

the third time. And they did it the third time. And the water ran round about the altar; and he tilled the trench also with water."

The purpose of the flooding of the altar was to assure the people that no fire was concealed about it, and hence the great amount of water. The altar was as thoroughly soaked as if it had been dipped in the water, and that is why Origen called it a baptism. We say a man is drenched or soaked when he is thoroughly wet with a pouring rain, though the usual way of soaking a thing is to put it into the water. We have reference to the effect. A boy at school poured a cup of water on another boy's head, and the children said: "You got a ducking." Origen did not call the pouring a baptism. If the pouring was the baptism, the altar was baptized twelve times. "We will suppose two men to each barrel. The first two pour on their barrel; that is one baptism. The next two pour on their barrel; that is another baptism. And so on to the end. The altar is baptized twelve times—that is, if the pouring is the baptism. But Origen speaks of only one baptism, which shows that he did not call the pouring baptism. Mr. Weaver is wrong about the matter, as he has been wrong all the way through this discussion.

We suggest to our opponent that he give up this proposition, and try his hand on something else. He has lost the issue by all the rules of fair and honorable controversy. The lexicons are all against him; they all define *baptize* to dip, and not one defines it to pour or sprinkle. The historians are all against him; they all say with one voice that the primitive baptism was a dipping or immersion, and the first case of affusion they find on earth was in the middle of the third century. The Bible is against him; it says that people "went down into the water" to be baptized, and they were "buried in baptism," and "born of water." His texts from the Old

Testament prove nothing, for the baptismal word is not found in one of them. Sixteen speeches, or sixteen failures, ought to satisfy him that he can not defend his doctrine.

MR. WEAVER'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend accuses us of quoting bodily another's speech. The trouble with our friend is, he will not make a full quotation from any man. He complains that I do not see Mr. Wall's statement. I could see it, if Mr. Wall stated it. Our friend says, "Wall was not great in the Scriptures." I wonder if our friend ever saw but one great man? He thinks the baptism of suffering was not a little sprinkling. Yet Christ called it baptism, and Isaiah said he "hath poured out his soul unto death." What Isaiah called pouring out his soul unto death. Christ called baptism. I suppose they knew what they were talking about.

Our friend says Origen, an uninspired man, called the pouring on of water the baptism (which he did), yet in the same speech he says, "Origen did not call the pouring a baptism."

He says the lexicons are all against me, "not one defines it (baptidzo) to pour or sprinkle." Dr. Adam Clark says it (baptidzo) means to sprinkle.

I will introduce Dr. Lofton, an eminent Baptist divine. I will ask you, Dr. L., if you believed the thesis of 1641? "I answer no, for I solemnly determined to renounce the 1641 thesis if facts of history were against it." Did you find any one opposed to the thesis that lived and wrote in the 17th century? "I found among the 17th century authorities, of both Baptist and pedobaptist, nothing which did not confirm the thesis." What Baptist historians have lately written on this thesis of 1641, or the introduction of immersion into England in 1641? "Besides the learned and able work of Dr. Wm.

II. Whitsitt, the author is indebted to the great work of Dr. Newman (History Antipedobaptism), which reaches down to the date at which this work begins, and Prof. Vedder's Short History of the Baptists, a very valuable production, lately revised and enlarged. He also commends as most able and opportune the Baptist History of Prof. Rauschenbusch, only the 17th chapter of which he has seen, but which squarely adopts the 1641 thesis from Crosby. These late Baptist publications, bearing upon the subject under discussion, are written with scholarly ability and unpartisan courage, and should be read by every impartial Baptist." So then, Dr. L., you took what they said for granted, and made no search yourself, but wrote in your book what you found in theirs? No. "While the author feels indebted to these later writers, he has made an investigation of his own; and he bases his conclusions upon the original sources of the 17th century, and upon the original history of the English Baptists, based upon the same sources by Thomas Crosby, Evans and others." I will ask you, Dr. L., if the thesis of 1641 was your sentiment before you made the examination for yourself, and if you were not rather from the facts driven to adopt it? "The thesis of this work is not of the author's choosing, but one to which he has been driven by careful study contrary to his former predilections and bearings." So then you know how to sympathize with a Baptist still holding the old false thesis you once believed and held dear? "The author knows how to sympathize, therefore, with his brethren of a contrary opinion; and but for such opinion the question would be of little moment, apart from the facts of Baptist history? I will now ask Dr. L. why he wrote his book. "For this reason, however, the author feels that he has made a valuable contribution to his brethren, (1) because he has contributed to a better understanding of Baptist history and position, (2) because he has reset the ancient Baptist

landmarks of constant reproduction instead of visible succession, which was unknown to the English Baptist churches." Now, Dr. L., I will ask if the exclusive immersion idea was not regarded a new thing after 1641? I read from p. 23: "This brings us to a consideration of the mode of baptism among the Anabaptists of England in the sixteenth century. At the beginning of their history, 1538, Thos. Fuller (Stow's Chr., p. 576) speaks of them as 'Donatists new dipt.' According to Dr. Newman, these Dutch Anabaptists were of the Hoffmanite first and later of the Mennonite type; and it is almost certain that both types practiced pouring or sprinkling." Dr. L., when you say "almost from a Baptist standpoint," would it not be a fair conclusion to say they were not immersionists? Reply: "Historically they were not immersionists." I will ask you, Dr. L., as you have made examination of the Baptists of the 17th century, don't all claim a new beginning? P. 37: "The principle upon which the first English Baptist church was founded was maintained not only by the immediate followers of Smyth, but by all the Baptists, so far as I have read, in the 17th century. They all claimed that they had a new beginning." On what ground did they claim a new beginning? "Upon the ground that the true baptism, church and ministry were lost in the apostasy of Rome." I read a quotation, p. 147: "Though some please to mock and deride, by calling it the new found way, and what they please. Indeed, it is a new found truth, in opposition to an old grown error." I read on p. 184: "Among the rest the church is now ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the doctrine of baptism of water, raked up heretofore in an imitation of pedobaptism." Do you mean to say that this new baptism, or babe, was born of the new church in 1640-41? Answer: "The clear implication is that Denne here refers to the Baptist movement, 1640-41 and onward, to restore believers' immersion, the doctrine of baptism of water,

and he calls this movement a 'new born babe, just delivered amid the throes and agonies of the church.'" Dr. L., I will ask you how long the English church practiced affusion? P. 72: "The church of England hath been now a long time, time out of mind, mind of any man now living, in firm possession of baptism, and practice of it by sprinkling or pouring on of water upon the face and forehead." Dr. L., you Baptists say that affusion was the almost universal practice in England prior to 1641, will you kindly point us to the recorded cases of immersion, if there were any such cases? "Watts was a learned English clergyman, rector of Much Leighs, and knew what he was saying; and his testimony is proof that no man living in 1656 could remember when immersion was practiced in England until the Baptists restored it." I will ask you now, Dr. L., if it were not a fact that all Baptists did not baptize by affusion prior to 1641? P. 63-64: "It has been affirmed that there were three Baptist churches, Hill Cliff, Eythorne and Booking, which dipped before 1641, and three individuals, Wm. Kiffin, Hanserd Knollys and John Canne, with Paul Hobson thrown in for good measure, who were dipped before that date. As already shown, the antiquity of these three churches, as Baptist, is purely-traditional. Even if they had a continuance from the early Lollards, or Anabaptists, and had anciently practiced immersion, that practice had long since been 'dis-used' before 1641. There is not the slightest evidence that they were in the practice of immersion prior to 1641, when the English Baptists 'revived' it; and if the so-called Kiffin manuscript, or Hutchison, Crosby, Spilsbury, Tombes, Lawrence, Barber, Kilcop and other writers are authority, it is clear, if these churches belonged to the English Baptists of 1640-41, that, like the rest of them, they were practicing affusion down to that date." I read p. 68: "In the body of Vol. 1 Crosby begins what he claims as English Baptist History, with John Wyck-

liffe, 1371; and through the Lollards, Wyckliffites and foreign Anabaptists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries he traces this irregular evangelical line as a kind of Baptist, succession without reference to the mode of baptism or church organization and with reference simply to the practice of believer's baptism as opposed to infant baptism and their devotion to certain other Baptist principles and peculiarities. He traces no organization among the Anabaptists of England till 1611-1633, and he does not refer to immersion as a mode of believer's baptism until in 'later times' it was restored by the English Baptists, about 1640-41." I now read from page 76: "Crosby, speaking of the English Baptists, says, "They are generally condemned (1738-40) as a new sect whose opinion and practice with relation to baptism was not known in the Christian church till about 200 years ago,' (1549). He is here and onward speaking of their 'opinion and practice' with regard to believer's baptism with reference to mode before 1640-41; for he never pretends to show that the practice of immersion was adopted by the English Baptists until that date. It is impossible to suppose the case otherwise."

MR. BURNETT'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver has abandoned Wall and Gallaher, and introduced a third Substitute—this time a Baptist! Moreover, he has abandoned the question in debate and gone off after a matter that is not in controversy, viz., whether there were any Baptists in England prior to 1641. What do you want to debate that question for. Mr. Weaver? We are discussing the question whether there was any sprinkling or pouring in Palestine (not England) in the apostolic age (not 1641), and whether Christ authorized the practice of your church! Why don't you

stick to the question? If you are ready to surrender the proposition in debate, and will do so like a man, we will then turn you over to Dr. J. N. Hall for a discussion of Baptist succession. But that is not the issue between us at the present time. We have run him out of the Bible (for he could not find a case of affusion in that book), we have captured all his texts from the prophecies (for not one of them contained the baptismal word), we have taken all the lexicons away from him (for not one of them defines *baptizo* to sprinkle or pour), and we have shown that all the historians and encyclopedias are against him, for they all say that the apostolic practice was dipping. Even his own great Wall says, "It was in all probability the way by which our blessed Savior, and for certain was the way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism." Vol. 1, pages 570-571. When a man has said all he can say for his doctrine, and nothing he has said contains any proof or argument, he ought to have wisdom enough to give it up and stop the controversy. Mr. Weaver, it seems, intends to fill out his time, if he has to talk about the man in the moon, or about the Baptists in England in the seventeenth century!

What is he trying to prove by his lengthy quotations from Dr. Lofton? Does he have any idea? Dr. Lofton is discussing one subject, and J. C. Weaver another! Our wild opponent has not even learned what the 1641 theory is! The issue among Baptists is about "alien immersion," and not about whether dipping was a new thing in England in 1641. The Whitsitt theory is that they "revived" (not immersion but) dipping as now practiced by southern Baptists—that is, the immersion of believers by persons who had themselves been immerse. And Whitsitt has been repudiated by his denomination for his heresy and false historical views. He was president of the Theological Seminary, but he had to resign. He wrote his piece (as he said) 'from a pedobaptist standpoint,' and did not

sign his name. Dr. Lofton swallowed the 'pedobaptist standpoint,' and he has also been repudiated.

Does Joe Weaver actually think that immersion was a new thing in England in 1641? Is he honest in what he says on that subject? Why, dipping was the law of the land in England (except in case of sickness) till long after 1641, and it was so printed in the creed of the Church of England and in the Methodist Discipline after that date! If he had read his own Dr. Jacob Ditzler, it would have knocked all that mess of ignorance out of his head. Listen here:

"My brother says that, in our English version of the Bible, it (tabhal) is rendered dip so many times, which is true; but that translation was made by immersionists, when immersion was the law of the land."

When was the King James version made? It was printed in 1611, and Dr. Ditzler says it was made by immersionists! He also says on p. 521:

"As late as 1736, more than a hundred years after it was made, John Wesley refused to baptize a child because the law of the land required a certificate to be brought showing it was too delicate to be dipped, and they not doing so, he refused to sprinkle it."

Here is what your great Dr. Wall says about it:

"Calvin was I think (as I said in my book) the first in the world that drew up a form of liturgy, that prescribed pouring water on the infant absolutely without saying anything of dipping. It was (as Mr. Walker has shown) his admirers in England who, in Queen Elizabeth's time, brought pouring into ordinary use, which before was used only to weak children." Vol. 2, p. 463.

We guess Mr. Weaver will shut his eyes and refuse to see that passage! But Dr. Ditzler saw it, and quoted it in his book. And here is some more he saw: "Dr. Wall shows that

in Elizabeth's time they almost universally dipped!" Prince Arthur, the eldest brother of Henry VIII., was dipped, as also the king's sister Margaret. Leland describes the new font that was made on purpose. He also describes the dipping of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth. Mr. Weaver, as usual, has the thing backwards. It was affusion that was a new thing in 1641. The whole world dipped for thirteen hundred years, except in case of sickness; then the council of Ravenna declared affusion to be valid even for well people, and Catholic countries began to change; but England held on three hundred years longer, and the eastern half of Christendom has never adopted the pope's baptism. The first permission for sprinkling found in any rubric of England was in 1549, and Wall says it came by Calvin's influence.

But suppose Mr. Weaver could prove that immersion was a new thing in England in 1641, and that the Baptists revived it at that time, what would he gain? It was in general practice outside of England in 1641. When the Baptists of England sprang their issue about 'alien immersion,' they settled the question by sending to Holland for a legal administrator. Here is what history says about it:

"The severity of Elizabeth's measures having exiled all dissenting ministers, they found it necessary to send to Holland for a regular administrator of believers' baptism, as other denominations had for ordination. Hearing that regular descendant Waldensian ministers were to be found in the Netherlands, they deputed Mr. Blount, who understood the Dutch language to visit Amsterdam. He was kindly received by the church in that city, and their pastor, Mr. John Battle. On his return, he baptized Mr. Samuel Blacklock, a minister, and these baptized the rest of the company, fifty-three in number." Ivey's History, Vol. 1, p. 143.

Mosheim says these Dutch dippers were regular descendants

of the Waldenses, and came in "shoals" to this German country before 1641. If, as Mr. Weaver tries to prove by Dr. Lofton, the English Baptists of 1641 both sprinkled and dipped, why did they send to Holland prior to that time for a legal administrator of baptism?

One thing our poor, suffering friend overlooks, in his mad rash after the 1641 theory, and that is, that neither Dr. Whittitt nor Dr. Lofton, nor any advocate of the 1641 theory, nor any Baptist in England in the 17th century, nor anywhere else on earth in any century, ever believed that sprinkling or pouring is scriptural baptism! Hence, there is not one word in all their writings that is worth a button to his proposition! Why, then, does he waste time and space with such foolishness? Why not debate the question he set out to discuss?

In reply to our statement that no lexicon defines *baptizo* to sprinkle or pour, Mr. Weaver says Dr. Adam Clark said it meant sprinkle or pour. But who was Dr. Adam Clark? Was he a lexicographer? He was a Methodist preacher!

Our friend is in error when he says we stated that Origen called the pouring on of water baptism, and in the same speech said Origen did not call the pouring baptism. Rub your specs and read again. We said Origen called the flooding of the altar baptism, but it took twelve pourings to flood the altar. If the pouring was baptism, there were twelve baptisms. Each separate barrel was poured, and there were twelve barrels, hence twelve baptisms. Why did not Mr. "Weaver try to meet this argument, instead of copying all that irrelevant nonsense from Dr. Lofton?

Our friend sticks to his erroneous position, that because Christ had a baptism of suffering, and Isaiah said he "poured out his soul unto death," the baptism was pouring. We have met that senseless sophistry a half dozen times, but will meet it again. The word Isaiah used for pour is *cheo*, and the word

the Savior used when he said he had a baptism to be baptized with is *baptisma*. If the baptizing act was a pouring act, or a sprinkling act, why was a different word always used? We have dinned this into his ears ever since the debate commenced, and have not thus far obtained one line of reply. He would rather run off after the 1641 foolishness than to attend to the pertinent issues of the debate. It would gratify us greatly to have all our points tested, but we have despaired of having it done in this debate. Though we should bray him in a mortar with a pestle, yet will he not give up his foolishness and meet us on the issue!

MR. WEAVER'S EIGHTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend says, "Mr. Weaver has abandoned Wall and Gallaher, and introduced a third substitute." I used Mr. Walt and Gallaher to show, they being scholars, that immersion was never considered in any previous age to be the only mode of baptism. And the reader has what they said about the question, and can make his own decision. I introduced Mr. Lofton for the same purpose. As to our friend's claim that he has run me from the Bible, prophecies, lexicons, histories and encyclopedias, having found them against me, I leave that for the reader to judge for himself. I stated, and will re-state, that the facts given to date show that neither of these lines of authority teaches exclusive immersion.

Our friend gives a quotation from Dr. Wall, quoting Calvin, and says, "We guess Mr. Weaver will shut his eyes and refuse to see that passage." Mr. Weaver sees it just enough to see our friend stops quoting a little too soon. If he will give the full quotation from Mr. Wall, we will see what he can make of it. He says, "Mr. Weaver, as usual, has the thing backwards; it was affusion that was a new thing." Our friend says, "Whit-

sitt, Lofton, nor any advocate of the 164.1 theory, nor any Baptist in England in the 17th century, nor anywhere else on earth in any century, ever believed that sprinkling or pouring is scriptural baptism." See Lofton, p. 63: "Not a single instance of believer's immersion has been pointed to as occurring among the anabaptists of England prior to 1641." Page 63-64: "It is clear, if these churches belonged to the English Baptists of 1641, that, like the rest of them, they were practicing affusion down to that date." On page 72 we learn that the church of England practiced sprinkling and pouring time out of mind. On 82 we learn that the Baptists changed from affusion to immersion. On page 129-131 we learn that one Bampfield thought he was equal with Paul, and that God had given him the right to begin baptism. So he baptized himself, and then the man that was with him. Whitsitt, p. 164: "The weight of evidence appears to incline very clearly towards the view that Roger Williams was sprinkled and not immersed, at Providence, in 1639. Mr. Armitage, on p. 336, gives us to understand that one Baptist preacher pours water on the head of another Baptist for baptism.

I now begin with the unfinished quotation from Mr. Lofton's book. "Else, as already seen, Crosby, who traces the only line of immersion in England for the first 1600 years, would not have ignored a single instance of immersion among his Baptist brethren, nor would he have otherwise recorded the fact that after the lapse of 1241 years they restored immersion at a 'later date.' To be sure, he only implies that the anabaptists from 1611 to 1641 were pouring and sprinkling for baptism; but he clearly takes the fact for granted, when he only traces immersion through the British churches down to 1600, and then records its restoration by the English Baptists after its 'disuse.' He perhaps did not desire to emphasize the fact as a matter of Baptist history, but he certainly implies the fact that the

Baptists were affusionists before 1640-41, by showing at that date that they restored the 'disused' ordinance, which they could not have been practicing." I will ask you, Dr. L., if affusion was an innovation, when did it begin, and where? I will answer that Jeffrey Watts says, "The church of England hath been now a long time, time out of mind, mind of any man living, in firm possession of baptism, and practice of it by sprinkling, or pouring on of water upon the face and forehead." I will ask Dr. L. who was this man Watts? "Watts was a learned English clergyman, rector of Much Leighs, and knew what he was saying, and his testimony is proof that no man living in 1656 could remember when immersion was practiced in England till the Baptists restored it." I will ask how many ways did Baptists have to restore immersion? Page 82r "There was the old self-baptism theory of some of the old Helwys Baptists, who never changed from Smyth's idea even when he had abandoned it. 2nd. There was the Puritan idea of regular baptism suggested by some of the Particular Baptists, who caught their view from the Puritans. 3rd. There was the Spilsbury idea of some who took the position that when immersion was lost some one had a right under the Scriptures to begin it without a baptized administrator, like John the Baptist," I will ask now if this was truly a Baptist movement? "The very fact that the division of opinion is expressed by the suggestion of the three modes proposed for the restoration of immersion, shows it to have been a Baptist movement." Did you find in your search for truth such a thing as a Baptist being called of God to begin the exclusive immersion idea of baptism? Page 129, foot-note: "Bampffield was satisfied that this baptism was not right, and he offers arguments to prove that either self-baptism or that an unbaptized person baptizing another, must be sent of God, and that such an administrator must have evidence of an extraordinary call, as he himself claimed to have,

and who doubtless baptized himself in the river at Salisbury." I will ask when did Mr. B. become a Baptist? "Bampfield became a Baptist in London about the year 1676." Did Mr. B. claim equal rank with the apostles? "The most peculiar case in the restoration movement was that of Bampfield. He conceived himself as the parallel of Paul in an extraordinary conversion and call to the ministry." Did he claim a divine commission of God to perfect baptism? "Having an extraordinary conversion and call to the ministry, he claimed that he had an extraordinary commission from God to perfect baptism, and so with another he went to Salisbury and there passed under the waters of baptism in the river at that place, evidently by self-baptism, and then baptized the man with him." I will ask if you know who put the idea of exclusive immersion to baptism? "The argument at that time among pedobaptists and Mennonites was that while baptism meant to dip, it also meant to wash, as in Mark 7:4, 8; and they had no hesitation in using the symbolism of immersion in connection with the definition, washing with water by affusion. This, as we have said before, was most probably the view of Smyth and his followers; and it can only be conceived that Leonard Busher took an advanced step in his exclusive definition of baptism which did not obtain among Helwys and the rest of the anabaptists of his day. It remained for 1641 to Blunt and his followers to put in practice what Busher had defined by the same Scriptures, and upon which the whole Baptist fraternity followed, not in the reformation of the principle, but in the form of believer's baptism." I will ask if Mr. Smyth was ever immersed? Page 83: "Smyth, was affused and never immersed, and this is the baptism which Helwys and his church brought to England." I will ask if it is not claimed by Baptists that God revealed, this baptism to his elect? Page 165, foot-note: "This passage from Barber is in perfect keeping with Spilsbury, Jes-

sey, Cornwell, King and others who claim that immersion was a 'discovery,' a 'revelation' from God to the Baptists in the 'latter age.' Dr. Whitsitt has been unjustly criticised for the word 'discovery' (invention), and yet this was the very word of the 17th century Baptist writers." I read from p. 197: "Kaye treats immersion, as a new discovery from beginning to end; and he appeals to the elect under every form of Babylon. Having the light now revealed, if they see not, 'in something newly discovered.' Such as this new baptism, then they are not the elect, and so he closes his appeal. He emphasizes, more definitely than the rest of the Baptist controversialists, his fight against 'sprinkling' as the root of the Episcopal tree; and hence he means nothing but immersion, as believer's baptism, when he puts the question and answers it: 'How comes it to pass that this doctrine of baptism hath not been before revealed.'" Page 198: "Like all the rest, he regards immersion as a special revelation to the Baptists, whom he regards in their separation from the Reformers as the true church of believers." Dr. L., Dr. Wall tells us the English translators never rendered baptidzo to dip in New Testament. Will you tell us when it was first rendered dip in a Baptist confession? Page 51: "Hence the word immersion was never put into an English Baptist confession until 1644, for the reason, as we shall see, that immersion was never adopted by the English Baptists until 1640-41. It was not put into the confession of Smyth and Helwys, 1611, because they practiced Mennonite affusion, and called it, as the Puritans did, a 'washing with water.'"

MR. BURNETT'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver wastes two speeches and five columns of valuable space, in quoting all this nonsense from Lofton's book, which Lofton copied from the renegade Baptist (Whitsitt), when it

has no more relation to the proposition we are debating than the shape of a goose-nest has to the nebular hypothesis! If we had moderators, we would call him to order, and require him to confine himself to the question before the house. As we have no power to restrain him, we shall have to let him rattle on in his wild career till his time is out. In our last speech it was shown that the restoration of believer's baptism (not immersion) with a valid administrator, in England, in the 17th century (which is the 1641 theory), had no possible relation to the proposition that Joe Weaver set out to discuss, viz., that the sprinkling or pouring of water on a proper subject is scriptural baptism, yet our wild friend paid no attention to what we said. We showed him that Lofton had misled him—that there was no historical truth in his quotations—that Lofton and Whitsitt had been ridiculed by Baptist scholars all over the nation. We showed by his own Dr. Wall and Dr. Jacob Ditzler that immersion prevailed in England in the 17th century—that it was the law of the land—and that exclusive immersion was in the rubric of the Church of England (except in case of sickness), and that it was put into the first copy of the Methodist Discipline—but he pays no attention to what his own authors say about it! He intends to speak his piece, if it makes all the angels in heaven blush for his ignorance! Say, Mr. Weaver: If immersion had ceased in England, how did immersion sentiment color the King James translation, as Dr. Ditzler says it did? How did exclusive immersion (except in sickness) get into the rubric of the Church of England, and become the universal practice, till (as Dr. Wall says) the influence of John Calvin wrought a change? How did it get into the Methodist Discipline? How did it happen that John Wesley was indicted by the grand jury of Georgia because he would not sprinkle Mrs. Parker's child (which was not sick), contrary to the law of his church? As you have quit the sub-

ject in debate, and gone off after the affairs of England in the 17th century, you ought to explain these affairs of the 17th century. Why, bless your soul, Joe Weaver, old John Wesley himself was immersed in England before the Baptists got immersion "restored."

But back to the subject. What if Bampton immersed himself in the river at Salisbury, does that prove that the apostles sprinkled for baptism sixteen hundred years before that date? What if John Smyth dipped himself, because he could not find a legal administrator in England, does that prove that John the Baptist poured water on Christ on the banks of the Jordan? What if Roger Williams was sprinkled and not dipped, does that prove that baptidzo means to sprinkle? Suppose Bampton imagined he had a special call to restore the true baptism, John Wesley imagined he had a special call (and that before his conversion) to restore true religion. He even imagined he had a call to start a new church (and one unlike that found in the New Testament), and write a church creed, and he even went so far as to ordain Coke and Asbury bishops when he was only a presbyter! (You know in the Church of England and the Methodist church a presbyter or elder is a smaller officer than a bishop.) And that is all the ordination the Methodists have today! They are not the people to ridicule the origin of Baptists. Remember the old grandmother and the pope! The Baptists of this country did not descend from Bampton, John Smyth or Roger Williams, but received their baptism and its administratorship from the dippers of Holland and Wales. As shown in our other speech, from Mosheim's and Ivey's histories, the irregularities referred to by Lofton caused the regular Baptists of England to send to Holland for a regular administratorship of baptism. John Smyth started the General Baptists, and the Roger Williams church soon became extinct. No Baptist church in America derived its baptism from Roger

Williams. We make these statements, not because they are necessary, but as we have nothing to do on the proposition we might as well put in the time following the wild careerings of our wild friend.

We said we had driven Mr. Weaver out of the Bible, the lexicons, the histories, and encyclopedias. Let us prove it. We challenged him to find one case of sprinkling or pouring for baptism in the whole Bible. He found sprinkle and pour in the law and the prophets, but the word baptidzo was not used. The pouring of the Spirit was produced, but the wrong word was found there. Mark 7:3-4 was quoted to show that the washing of hands before dinner was called baptism, but we caught both Weaver and Wall in that blunder. In the third verse,- where it is said the Jews eat not except they wash their hands, the word nipto is used. In the fourth verse, where it is said when they come from market they eat not except they baptidzo, it was shown by Maimonides that an entire immersion is meant. So we followed him, and took all of his texts.

We have challenged Mr. Weaver in nearly every speech to produce a Greek lexicon that defines baptidzo to pour or sprinkle. The reader can testify as to how the challenge has been accepted. Do you not know that if baptidzo ever meant to sprinkle or pour, some lexicon would so define it? We are waiting for our opponent to make the attempt to find a lexicon, and then we will tell our experience among the pedobaptist publishing houses of the United States in quest of said lexicon, and, what said publishers say about it. For you must know that we have been hunting for a sprinkling lexicon. Ah, it would be "the chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely"—if we could find it! We could make money by re-printing it, for every circuit-rider would want a copy, and every presiding elder would want three copies!

We challenge Mr. Weaver to produce one reputable historian

in all the world that said the apostolic baptism was not dipping. He could not find one. We produced Bingham, Bossuet, Conybeare & Howson, Dollinger, Fisher, Gregory, Kurtz, Mosheim, Neander, Robertson, Schaff, Stackhouse and Waddington, all members of pedobaptist churches, and they all testified that the apostolic baptism was immersion. Our opponent set great store by Dr. Wall, but Wall testified as follows:

"Their general and ordinary, way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant or grown man or woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages that, as one can not but pity the weak endeavors of such pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so also we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English anti-pedobaptists merely for their use of dipping. It is one thing to maintain that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent; when it was in all probability the way by which our blessed Savior, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism." Vol. 1, pp. 570-571.

When we read this testimony of Wall, it made Mr. Weaver so sick he closed his eyes and refused to look at it! He even tried to pretend it was not in the book! But when we proposed to mark the passage in his own copy of Wall, and turn down a leaf, if he would send us the book, he dropped Wall like a hot potato, and fled to the Baptists of England! The historians are all against him.

The encyclopedias are historical in character. We challenged him to find one reputable encyclopedia that said the apostolic baptism was sprinkling and pouring. He did not produce it. We produced the Americana, Blaikie's, Brande's, Brittanica,

Chambers', Edinburg, Globe, Loudon, International, Manifold, Metropolitan, New American, Penny, Perthensis, Popular, the Schaff-Herzog, Rees', Students', and Zell's, all of which say the primitive practice was an immersion in water. These books are in all the public libraries, and the reader can consult them for himself, and see that our statement is correct.

Mr. Weaver is out of the Bible, the lexicons, the histories, and the encyclopedias. Is he not? Now we are going to make him another promise: If he doesn't drop the lunatic twaddlings of Lofton, and come back to the proposition in debate, in our next speech we will go after him and chase him out of England!

MR. WEAVER'S NINETEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend thinks I am wasting time and space quoting from "Lofton's nonsense." He thinks if we had moderators he would force me to the subject. If he will think he will remember that I proposed to select a man and he a man, and the two to get a third man, and they to examine every speech before publication and after and to say if they were correct, and further to correct every error. Our friend refused to do it. He can have a board of moderators yet, if he desires it.

He says there is no historical truth in Lofton's statements. Then why can't he meet them? He says Whitsitt and Lofton have been ridiculed by Baptist scholars all over the nation. That is not quite true. They have been ridiculed by Baptists who have not examined the records.

How does our friend know that "old John Wesley was immersed in England before the Baptists 'restored immersion?'" Our friend says the Baptists did not get their baptism from Smyth and Williams. In that he contradicts Armitage, Benedict and Cramp, as well as Lofton and Whitsitt.

Our friend wants us to find a lexicon that defines baptidzo

to sprinkle. Let's wait till we get to the lexicons, and we shall see what we shall see. He calls for "one reputable historian that does not teach that the apostolic baptism was immersion." See Wall, Vol. 1. p. 574:

"Eusebius also mentions Basilides, baptized in prison by some brethren. The strict custody under which Christian prisoners were kept, their tyrannical jailers hardly allowing them necessaries for life, much less such conveniences as they desired for their religion, makes it very probable that this must have been done by affusion only of some small quantity of water. And the like may be said of the jailer baptized by St. Paul in haste, the same hour of the night (in which he was converted), he and all his, straightway."

There is an apostolic case by Mr. Wall, and he is a reputable historian.

Our friend names several pedobaptists that give the apostolic mode of baptism as immersion. I challenge him to give a true quotation from any true pedobaptist, or standard lexicon on earth, that defines baptizo as he defines it, to immerse only. Let him give one.

Let us hear Mr. Lofton on Smyth, p. 49: "Here Smyth defines the inward baptism by sprinkling; and hence the outward baptism, which he calls a 'washing with water,' was in his mind defined by affusion." I will ask how the modern Baptists define it? Page 50: "A Baptist, believing in immersion, would define water as the element in which, but not 'instrument' by which a man is baptized, and sprinkling or 'washing' is now out of the question in any sense with Baptist definition." Page 65: "The year 1644 was the date of the adoption of the Confession of Faith by the Baptists, in which they first defined baptism as dipping." Will you tell us when the English people adopted immersion? Page 43: "This intimate relationship not only led the English into some Mennonite errors, which

permanently injured their original orthodoxy, and narrowed their spirit and usefulness, but it indicated their agreement on the mode of baptism which was affusion. Prof. Scheffer affirms that this relationship continued till 1641, when it was suddenly broken off on account of the adoption of immersion by the English Baptists at that date." I will ask if in your search of the records you found any one to define baptism as a washing or sprinkling? Page 23: "The Mennonite classic is the Martyr's Mirror. In first part, written by Van Brugh, 1660, he says (on seventh century) that the word baptism means not only immerse, but also washing or sprinkling, which gives the Mennonite idea of his day. So Schyn, 1729. In the light of all this testimony, it can only be supposed that Fuller was simply characterizing these Dutch anabaptists, as Dr. Whittitt says, under a new name, that is, new christened, under the alliteration of 'Donatists new dipt.' Historically they were not immersionists."

Now to the lexicons. We are challenged to produce a lexicon that gives sprinkle or pour for baptism. I read from Mr. Wilkes' sixth reply, Wilkes-Ditzler Debate, p. 511:

"Ewing—Lexicon, 1827. 'Baptidzo: In its primary and radical sense, I cover with water, or some other fluid, in whatever manner this is done, whether by immersion or affusion, wholly or partially, permanently or for a moment; and, in the passive voice, I am covered with water or some other fluid, in some manner or other. Hence the word is used in several different senses, referring either mediately or immediately to the primitive idea. It is used to denote, first, I plunge or sink completely under water; second, I cover partially with water, I wet; third, I overwhelm or cover with water by rushing, flowing, or pouring upon. And, in the passive voice, I am overwhelmed or covered with water in that mode. Fourth, I drench or impregnate with liquor by affusion. Fifth, I oppress or

overwhelm in a metaphorical sense, by bringing afflictions or distress upon. Sixth, I wash in general, without specifying the mode. Seventh, I wash for the special purpose of symbolical, ritual, or ceremonial purification. Eighth, I administer the ordinance of Christian baptism, I baptize."

Hear Mr. Wilkes under the eighth division:

"Mr. Ewing uses this language: 'The ordinance of baptism is the pouring out of water, from the hand of the baptized, on the face of the baptized.' But for this he gives no example."

You see, reader, if Mr. Wilkes quotes him correctly, he gives the meaning of baptidzo to pour. So we have found one lexicon. Our friend said in his second article that all the lexicons excluded sprinkle and pour, by leaving them out. He had better read up on the lexicons. We note Parkhurst, as read by Mr. Wilkes, Wilkes-Ditzler Debate, p. 510-511:

"Parkhurst—New Test. Lexicon—died 1797: 'Baptidzo, from bapto, to dip. 1. To dip, immerse, or plunge in water. But in the New Testament it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included in sense 2d and 3d below. 2. Baptizomai, mid. and pass., to wash one's self, be washed, wash, i. e., the hands by immersion or dipping in water. Mark 7:4, Lu. 11:38. The LXX. use baptizomai, mid., for washing one's self by immersion, answering to the Heb. taval. 2 Ki. 5:14. Thus also it applied in the Apocryphal books. Jud. 12:7, Ecclesiasticus 34:24. 3. To baptize, to immerse in or wash with water in token of purification from sin, and from spiritual pollution. 4. Figuratively, to be immersed or plunged in a flood or sea, as it were, of grievous afflictions and sufferings. Mt. 20:22-23. Baptisma: 1. An immersion or washing with water; hence used in the New Testament for the baptism both of John the Baptist and of Christ. 2. Baptism or immersion in grievous and overwhelming afflictions and sufferings. Baptismos: An immersion or washing in water. Occ.

Mark 7:4, 8, Heb. 9;10, 6:2. Bapto: Perhaps from the Heb. taval, to sink by transposition. To dip, plunge, immerse."

Now, reader, note the first meaning given: "To dip, immerse, plunge." Yet, he says, "In the New Testament it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless as far as this is included in sense 2d and 3d below." Then he gives that sense to wash, which is the Bible meaning of the word. The good Book says, "Wash you, make you clean." Parkhurst refers to Mark 7.4: "Except they wash." Now please take your Revised version and turn to Mark 7 A, and find out how it was done. Margin reads: "Gr. baptize, some ancient authorities read sprinkle themselves." Hence this washing was by sprinkling. He refers to Lu. 11:38: "Had not first washed before dinner." See their custom, 2 Ki. 3:11, "Which poured water on the hands of Elijah." He refers also to 2 Ki. 5:14. Naaman was told to 'wash,' and he dipped himself. This man, being a heathen, did the best he knew, and God accepted it. So we say this washing may be performed by sprinkling (Rev. version Mk. 7:4), or by pouring (Lu. 11:38, and 2 Ki. 3:11), or by dipping (2 Ki. 5:14).

We now take Fuerst: "Wilkes-Ditzler Debate, p. 453. I read from Mr. Wilkes. Hear him:

"I must say to you in candor that Bro. Ditzler has represented Fuerst correctly. He read from Fuerst that taval means to sprinkle, in its fundamental sense. But Dr. Gesenius says it means 'to dip in, to immerse.' Here are two great lexicographers divided in their opinion, if they are represented to us correctly."

Now I will read from Mr. Wilkes on Stockius:

"My friend, speaking of Stockius, said that he commences with classic meanings, and then gives New Testament definitions. But Stockius' lexicon is a New Testament lexicon, and it gives the New Testament use of words. It says that immer-

sion was the practice formerly, pointing back to the beginning of the Christian dispensation, but now, it says, the water is sometimes only sprinkled upon them. That is just the true history. My friend quoted abundantly from that author."

So then, if we can rely on Mr. Wilkes, we have found another lexicon to give sprinkle.

MR. BURNETT'S NINETEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says that he proposed that we have a board of moderators. Our friend has a very poor memory. There was nothing said about moderators. He proposed that we have a committee to examine his copy and the proof-sheet, to see that his speeches were printed just as he wrote them, and we objected because of the unnecessary trouble and delay it would occasion. As he has now left Lofton and his 1641 nonsense, and come back to the question in debate, there is no need of moderators.

He asks, if there is no truth in Lofton's statements, that immersion was restored in England in 1641, why do we not meet them? We have done that very thing. We gave the testimony of Dr. Wall and Dr. Ditzler that dipping was the law of the land at that date, and it was the, law of the Church of England long after that date. Why would not John Wesley sprinkle Mrs. Parker's child? And why will Mr. Weaver credit a renegade Baptist rather than his great Dr. Wall, and his great Dr. Ditzler, and his great Dr. Wesley? But if all Lofton said were true, it would cut no figure in this debate. Lofton wrote about the practice of Baptists in England in 1641, and we are debating about the practice of the apostles in Palestine in A. D. 33! Mr. Weaver is sixteen hundred years and sixteen hundred miles off the proposition!

He wants to know how we know that John Wesley was im-

mersed? We know it by the fact that exclusive immersion was the law of the Church of England, and the law of the land, when he was born (except in case of sickness), and his father and mother belonged to that church. It was still the law of the land when John was a grown man and a preacher, and that is the reason he would not sprinkle Mrs. Parker's child—as Dr. Ditzler testifies.

In reply to our challenge for one reputable historian that says the apostolic practice was not dipping, he gives Dr. Wall. But Dr. Wall says the apostolic practice was dipping, except in case of sickness or emergency. We gave his exact language—how he says the Savior was in all probability immersed, and it was "for certain the way the ancient Christians did most generally receive their baptism." True, Wall quotes Eusebius, where he says Basilides was baptized in prison, and Wall thinks he may have been sprinkled (because there was an emergency), and he thinks the Philippian jailer may have been sprinkled for a like reason, for he says Paul did it "in haste." But Eusebius does not say Basilides was sprinkled, and Basilides did not live in the apostolic age, and the Bible says the Philippian jailer was baptized outside the prison. Wall does not say what Weaver tries to make him say—that the apostolic practice was not dipping—but the very opposite. So Weaver has again lost Wall.

He challenges for a "true quotation from a true pedobaptist" that says the apostolic practice was dipping, and for a standard lexicon that defines baptidzo "immerse only." We gave him true quotations from a half dozen historians (all pedobaptists), and definitions from about a dozen lexicons, and they all testified against him, but he paid no attention to what they said. Why doesn't he notice Eusebius, and Neander, and Mosheim, and Stackhouse? Why doesn't he notice Thayer, and Liddell & Scott, and Sophocles, and Donnegan, and Cremer, and Bagster?

What Mr. Weaver should call for (and find) is not a lexicon that says "immerse only," but one that says "sprinkle or pour." He has not found it yet, as we shall show. He claims that he has found "one lexicon" in Ewing, but he is in error—as he always is. While Ewing is a violent pedobaptist theologian, and his lexicon is not a standard, and is not taught in any school, he defines the word correctly till he reaches the close, then he adds a little modifier or apology as his "eighth" statement to save his ecclesiastical practice. But he does not say this is the meaning of the word baptidzo—not at all. Listen: "The ordinance of baptism *is* [not was] the pouring of water, from the hand of the baptizer, on the face of the baptized." That is, such is the practice of the Scotch Congregational Church in 1827. Ewing's own lexicon defines *eccheo* (not *baptizo*) to pour out. To assert that he here says baptidzo means to pour out a little water from the hand on the face of a person, is to make absolute nonsense of his whole definition. Just listen at his definition: "Baptidzo: In its primary and radical sense, *I cover with water* or some other fluid, in whatever manner that is done, whether by immersion or affusion." What is done? Why, *cover with water*. Can that be done by affusion? Certainly, but not by pouring a few drops. Now listen again: "In the passive voice, *I am covered with water* or some other fluid, in some manner or other." Can you cover a thing with a few drops of water? No! Now listen again: "Hence the word is used in several different senses, referring either mediately or immediately to the *primary idea*." What is the primary idea? "I cover with water or some other fluid." But doesn't he say it denotes, "(1) plunge or sink completely under water, (2) cover partially with water, wet, (3) overwhelm or cover with water in that mode, (4) drench or impregnate with liquor by affusion?" Yes, but he says in all its different uses it has reference "mediately or immediately to the primary

idea"—I cover with water or some other fluid! There it is! Ewing is against Weaver. To drench or intoxicate a man with liquor is to overwhelm him with its influences. The effect is the baptism.

He next tries Parkhurst, and makes a complete failure. Parkhurst says: "1. To dip, immerse, or plunge in water; but in the N. T. it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included in sense (2) and (3) below." (And Weaver shouts.) But what are "(2) and (3) below?" Listen at (2): "Baptizomai, mid., and pass., to wash one's self, be washed, wash, i. e., the hands by immersion or dipping in water. Mark 7:4, Lu. 11:38, comp. Mark 7:3, and under *pugme*. The LXX. use baptizomai, mid., for washing one's self by immersion, answering to the Hebrew taval, 2 Ki. 5:14, comp. 5:10." That knocks the shout all out of him. Now listen at (3): "To baptize, to immerse in or wash with water, in token of purification from sin, and from spiritual pollution." So there is nothing there to shout over. Weaver would not have quoted Parkhurst, if he had not seen the words, "But in the N. T. it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless," etc. He did not wait to see what Parkhurst meant by "2 and 3 below." Parkhurst simply meant that in the New Testament baptism is not merely a plunge or immersion in water, but there is also a washing or cleansing connected with it. He also says that Mark 7:4 is a dipping in water, as well as Lu. 11:38, and says that Judith was immersed, and that the prophet told Naaman to dip himself in Jordan! Moreover, he says the baptisms of Heb. 6:2 and the "divers baptisms" of Heb. 9:10 were immersions, and that the Savior's baptism of suffering (Mat. 2C:22) was immersion! See his references. Parkhurst is evidently against Weaver all the way through. Our wild friend has been whipped enough on Mark 7 A to let it alone, but he will not—even with Parkhurst against him. He has found a note

in the margin that says some authorities read "sprinkled themselves." But no translation of the Bible has those words in the text. Of course if a man can't prove his doctrine by the text of the Bible, he will have to resort to the margin. The Jews always washed their hands (nipto) before eating, and when they came from the market they bathed—baptidzoed. Maimonides says this latter was an entire immersion. However, it is better for Mr. Weaver to go to the margin, than to flatly contradict the Scriptures, as he does in Naaman's case. The prophet told Naaman to wash, and Mr. W. says he was a heathen and made a mistake and dipped himself! The Bible says, "Then went he down and dipped himself, *according to the saying of the man of God*"—not according to the mistake of a heathen! Weaver versus Bible! It is Rev. Joe Weaver that is the heathen in this case.

He next tries Fuerst and Stockius. Fuerst defines taval to sprinkle, but the King James translators rendered it fifteen times dip and one time plunge, but not a single time sprinkle. Stockius is exactly against Weaver, as we shall show in next speech.

Mr. Weaver will not notice our lexicons, but we intend to show that every one he quotes is against him, and on our side of the question.

MR. WEAVER'S TWENTIETH SPEECH.

Our friend says he has the evidence of Wall and Ditzler that dipping was the law of the land in 1641. But do they claim that dipping as Christian baptism? Wall, vol. 1, p. 4, Introductory, traces dipping back to David. I read: ".Therefore the Judges received no proselyte all the days of David and: Solomon. Not in David's days, lest they should have come of fear." And on p. 17 he traces it to Moses' day. Armitage,

Hist., p. 30 to 32, we learn that John did not pick up and use an old, effete institution. John's baptism is called by Mr. Armitage, "The new rite of baptism, unknown under the Mosaic dispensation." P. 189: "It is not easy to determine when trine immersion was introduced, but at this time it appears to have been the universal custom." P. 247 to 248, we learn that trine immersion was voted out during the 6th century. On p. 134, 269, 270, 378, 445, we learn that this baptism was given with the person "entirely undressed," and pictures represent all the baptized and even Christ in entire nakedness. I will ask, was this Christian baptism? This is the baptism Mr. Wesley says Paul alluded to as an ancient baptism. The lesson he draws is, as they put off their clothes for baptism, etc., we put off our sins, or the old man. When we ask for a case of immersion as Christian baptism in any authentic history, our friends run to this three-dip, naked baptism, because there was no other, as Mr. Lofton and Dr. Whitsitt show, prior to 1641. Hear Carson: "It is true indeed that early church history shows that baptism was performed by three immersions; but it is equally true that this is neither scriptural nor indicated by the termination of the verb."

Our friend has been stating boldly and roundly that there was not a lexicon on earth that gave sprinkle and pour as definitions of baptidzo, and when I gave some he passes them over and lights on Mr. Ewing, and charges him as being a violent pedobaptist, and that his lexicon is not a standard. He has been saying no lexicon, now it is no standard lexicon. I state now, as I stated before, that there is not a lexicon on earth that defines baptidzo as he defines it, to mean exclusive immersion. We will now introduce Mr. Schleusner, said to be "the greatest of all New Testament lexicons that the world has ever produced." I read from Dr. Ditzler's speech, Wilkes-Ditzler Debate, p. 487:

"Baptidzo. 1. Properly, to immerse or dip, to plunge into water, from bapto. But in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament, but in it frequently in (classic) Greek writers, for example, Diodorus Siculus, 1 ch. 36, used of the overflowing of the Nile, in Strabo, etc. Now because rarely (not unfrequently) a thing is accustomed to be immersed or dipped in water that it may be cleansed, hence, 2, it means to cleanse, to wash (i. e., in any way that will cleanse), to purify with water. Thus (in this sense) it occurs in the New Test., Mark 7:4, And having come from the public place they will not eat, unless first cleansed and purified with water (in many texts it is sprinkled), (i. e., for baptized). Lu. 11:38, baptized, washed, *baptizesthai* (to baptize), not only means to wash, but also wash one's self, as can be proved in many places. 3. Hence it is transferred to the solemn rite of baptism, etc. 4. Metaphorically, as (i. e., equivalent to), the Latin to imbue, to give and administer to (any one) largely, to pour forth abundantly. Baptisma, baptism; baptismos, a washing, cleansing, purification."

Dr. Ditzler says:

"I have now translated all of his definition literally, just as he wrote it. Now while Schleusner gives immerse and dip, he takes care to say it never occurs in this sense in the New Test." He charges Mr. Campbell with leaving that fact out. He also charges M. C. with trying to make it appear that the washing referred to was by immersion, which the author shows was not the case. For the author had stated that it never meant immerse in New Testament. So we find another lexicon defining baptidzo to pour, etc. On p. 495 Mr. Wilkes admits that Stookius gives, "Formerly immersed, now sprinkle." He claims it as a fact that they did it profusely. So another lexicon gives sprinkle and pour. Mr. Wilkes, speaking of Schleusner, p. 493, says, "Schleusner goes on to say that it is not used in the

New Testament strictly in the sense of immerse, plunge or dip, he then says it is more frequently used in the classic Greek writers in this sense." He then says, "That is true." So Ditzler was correct in his translation of Schleusner. I read, p. 489. Ditzler says:

"But here we have the Greek version, which the apostles used, rendering *taval* by *moluno*, which means 'to stain, to sully, to sprinkle.' Liddell & Scott's Gr. Lex. It is stained by sprinkling. And then, in the best translation that the world has ever known, the Peshito-Syriac, it is rendered sprinkle and never immerse."

Our friend says we found sprinkle in the margin, but not in the book. Here we find it in the best version ever made. On p. 496 Mr. Wilkes says of this translation of the word of God: "The old Syriac, or Peshito, is without doubt one of the most ancient and accurate versions of the New Test, ever made." He admits it was made in the century in which the apostles lived and wrote; also that its language was very nearly like that in which the apostles and Savior preached. So it was a good book. Yet Dr. Ditzler read from it sprinkle, and said it never translated to immerse.

I present the Itala translation. Dr. Ditzler, p. 489, says it is next best. "It never renders baptidzo by immerse, dip or plunge, but it does render the Chaldec word for baptize by sprinkle, and it renders bapto by sprinkle." Robinson's Gr. Lex., p. 119, says in the Itala the Greek verb baptidzo is uniformly given in the Latin form baptizo, and is never translated by immerse or any like word. He also says this version was connected with the apostolic age. We present Jerome's translation:

"He was a man who thoroughly understood both Greek and Hebrew, and he never rendered it by immerse, dip or plunge.

He translated the bapto of Rev. 19:13 by sprinkle, and the Chaldee word for baptidzo by sprinkle."

Now friends, you have a few lexicons and a few ancient translations given you, and you can judge for yourselves as to the true meaning of the word. In Rev. 1:5 we read: "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Here we have the washing or baptizing of the heart from its guilt, or sins, in Christ's blood. No one doubts that this baptism is for remission. Now how is the baptism or washing of the heart performed? 1 Pet. 1:2: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Heb. 10:22: "Let us draw near, with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." The Spirit washes or baptizes the heart by sprinkling. That settles it.

We close this proposition with this speech. I ask you, readers, to examine the argument closely and candidly, and decide for yourselves. I think I have shown you most emphatically that the word baptidzo, or baptize, in the Bible means to wash, cleanse, purify, and that washing, cleansing or purifying may be performed scripturally by either sprinkling, pouring or immersion, as seen from lexicons and pedo historians, and as our church teaches and has ever taught. I now ask our friend, in his last reply, to give the quotations from the lexicons he may use in full, and the pedo historians in full, and then you examine them as he gives them, and I will be satisfied; for they will take care of themselves, if he will deal fairly with them. The reader will remember the lexicons I have given. Some of them admit immersion, but you see by reading them they prefer sprinkling as the New Testament meaning of the word. Others plainly state that, while the word means immersion from a

classic standpoint, it is never used in that sense in the New Testament. Also the versions or translations, claimed to be the best, most ancient and most accurate, and reaching back to the apostles' and Christ's day, give sprinkle and exclude immersion entirely. So I think, the argument is overwhelmingly in our favor, and I am content to leave it with you, to examine for yourselves, and make your own decision in the fear of God. We shall all have to appear before him, and give account to him for all our doings and all our thoughts, in that great day.

MR. BURNETT'S TWENTIETH REPLY.

In view of the fact that we all have to give account for our deeds, at that great day, Mr. Weaver ought not to use books and authors as he has done in his last speech. He starts out by asking if Dr. Wall and Dr. Ditzler claim that the dipping (which was the law of the church and state in 1641) was Christian baptism! Why, it was all the baptism Dr. Wall's church had (except in case of sickness), and dipping is scriptural baptism in Dr. Ditzler's church today! He next discovers that the ancient baptism was trine immersion of naked people, and wants to know what we think of that. We think it shows that those people did not believe in sprinkling and pouring, but believed in immersion and a great deal of it! He thinks Wesley has reference to this practice when he says Paul (in Rom. 6) alludes "to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." A mistake. The three dips and nude style did not begin till some two hundred years after Paul wrote Rom. 6, and Wesley does not say anything about "putting off their clothes for baptism." It was A. D. 200 when the three dips began, and Tertullian said it was "somewhat more" than the Lord commanded.

Mr. Weaver says he has produced lexicons that state that

while baptidzo means immersion from a classic standpoint, they say it is never used in that sense in the New Testament. A greater mistake was never made. He has misrepresented one or two lexicons (blindly following Dr. Ditzler), and derived that conclusion, but no lexicon on earth denies that the word means to dip or immerse in the New Testament. Here is the way Dr. Ditzler quotes Schleusner:

"Baptidzo. 1. Properly, to immerse or dip, to plunge into water, from bapto. But in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament."

This is a wicked perversion of Schleusner. It makes him say that in the sense of dip or immerse it does not occur in the New Testament. Here is Schleusner's language:

"Baptidzo. Properly, I immerse and I dip (intingo), I sink into the water, from bapto. And corresponds to the Hebrew *taval*, 2 Ki. 5:14, in the Alexandrian version; to *tabha* in the writings of Symmachus, Psalmody 68:5, in anonymous Psalmody 9:6. But it is never used in this signification in the New Testament, but is frequently thus used in Greek writers."

By leaving out the words to which Schleusner refers when he says "in this signification," Dr. Ditzler makes him say exactly what he does not say. Mr. Weaver does not understand Latin, and blindly follows his wild guide. Schleusner says in the sense of *tabha* it is never used in the New Testament. That word means to sink or be immersed as in mire or a pit, and destroyed. A learned author says that to thus leave out Schleusner's explanatory words is to suppress his testimony and "put a lie in his lips!" Dr. Ditzler himself has been forced to admit (in debate) that his version of Schleusner's definition, as here copied by Mr. Weaver, is false, but he lays it on the short-hand reporter! See Carrollton Debate, p. 364. Yes, the reporter was short, and Ditzler was short, and the quotation falsifies Schleusner! This lexicographer is also mis-

quoted in what he says on Mark 7 A, that many texts have *rantizontai* for baptize. No text has *rantizontai* *for* baptize. One or two copies have *rantizontai* in the text of Mark 7 A,, because the copyist made a mistake, or purposely changed the word, thinking the washing before dinner was not immersion. Ditzler adds the words "in any way that will cleanse" to Schleusner's definition of *baptidzo*, for which there is not a word in the Latin! He also leaves out all his definition of *baptisma* except one word!

Mr. Weaver claims that Stockius' lexicon gives sprinkle and pour, but he only quotes a line or two. Why did he not give the whole definition? Ah, beloved, Stockius condemns him. Here is his definition of *baptisma*, the only Greek noun- used in the New Testament for- baptism:

"*Baptisma*. 1. Generatim et vi originis notat immersionem vel intinctionem. 2. Speciatim, (a) proprie notat immersionem, vel intinctionem rei in aquam, ut abluatur, vel lavetur. Hinc transfertur ad designandum primum Novi Testamenti sacramentum quod initiationis vocant, nempe baptismum, quo baptizandi olim in aquam immergebantur, utut hodiernum aqua iis saltern adspargatur, ut a peccai sordibus abluantur, illius remissionem consequantur, et in foedere gratia? recipiantur, tanquam haeredes vitae aeternae."

Which we translate:

"*Baptisma*. 1. Generally, and by force of the original, it denotes immersion or dipping. 2. Specially (a) properly, it denotes the immersion or dipping of a thing in water that it may be cleansed or washed. Hence, it is transferred to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament, which they call initiation, namely baptism, in which those to be baptized were formerly immersed into water, though at this time the water is only sprinkled on them, that they may be cleansed from the

pollutions of sin, receive the remission of it, and be received into the covenant of grace, as heirs of eternal life."

Now we know that a lexicographer that defines the noun *baptisma* as Stockius does, could not define the verb *baptidzo* as Mr. Weaver and Dr. Ditzler try to make out. Here is his definition of *baptidzo*:

"1. Generally, and by force of the word, it obtains the sense of immersion or dipping. 2. Specially (a) properly it is to dip or immerse in water. 3. (b) Tropically by a metalepsis it is to wash, to cleanse, because a thing is usually dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed, although also by sprinkling the water washing can be, and generally is, accomplished."

He says the washing generally is (now, not in the apostolic age) accomplished by sprinkling. And it is only by a metalepsis that, the word means to wash at all. Under the 3d head he says: "Metaphorically (a) it designates the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and other believers, on account of the abundance of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, since anciently" (not in the apostolic age) "the water was poured copiously upon those baptized or they were sunk deep in the water." The miraculous and overwhelming effusion of the Spirit is called baptism by metaphor. But not one of these lexicons hints at affusion till they reach the metaphorical sphere of the word. And the Lord's ordinance is not a metaphor. So we have captured Stockius,. just as we did Ewing, and now we are going after Schleusner. There are two statements in Schleusner's definition that forever estop Mr. Weaver. Listen at this:

1. "Properly, I immerse and I dip (*intingo*), I sink into the water; from *bapto*; and corresponds to the Hebrew *taval*. 2 Ki. 5:14."

That is where Naaman dipped himself in the Jordan. So

baptidzo *properly* means to dip, and corresponds to *taval*. Then *taval* means to dip. The King James translators rendered *taval* sixteen times in the Old Testament, and fifteen times they gave dip and one time plunge. Now listen at another¹ statement from Schleusner's definition:

2. "Now, because not unfrequently a thing is accustomed hence it denotes I cleanse, I wash, I purge with water."

In the language of the celebrated Rev. J. C. Weaver, "that settles it." So we have captured Schleusner and Stockius and Ewing—all the lexicons that he has produced—and we have one dozen that he has not touched, or noticed. Farewell, Bro. Crawford! Here is Schleusner's definition of baptisma, the Greek noun which is never used for anything but baptism, and which Dr. Ditzler suppressed:

"1. Properly, immersion, a dipping into water, a bathing; hence it is transferred (2) to the sacred rite, which pre-eminently is called baptism, and in which formerly they were immersed in water, that they might be obligated to the true divine religion."

Does anybody think this author said the word was never used in the sense of dip in the New Testament? If Weaver copies Ditzler knowingly, he is a sinner; if he copies him ignorantly, he is an ignorant sinner, for Ditzler has been frequently exposed.

Our friend follows his wild leader, Dr. Ditzler, into the Chaldee and Syriac and the old Itala. What do they know about these versions? They can not give a Greek-Latin definition correctly, and we know they are wrong on the versions, for the scholarship of the world is against them. They even try to press Jerome's Latin Vulgate into their service. Here is what Jerome said about baptism in one of his commentaries:

"Et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum."

Which means in plain English:

"And thrice we are immersed, that there may appear one sacrament of the Trinity."

Here is the way his version describes the baptism of the eunuch: "Et descenderunt uterque in aquam." Does Mr. Weaver know what "descenderunt" means? Does he know what "in aquam" means?

The Peshito-Syriac renders baptidzo by *amad*, and all the lexicons define that word to dip. See Castell, Gotch, Schindler, Buxtorff, and Schaaf. The Syrian Christians for the first three centuries dipped exclusively, as Neander and Dr. Wall testify. The word in Rev. 19:13 is *bapto*, and not *baptidzo*, and so proves nothing. The Vulgate of Jerome and the Itala do not render *baptidzo* at all, but transfer it. So Weaver is again misled by his wild leader, Dr. Ditzler.

SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

PROPOSITION: *Infant baptism is authorized by the word of God.* Weaver affirms, Burnett denies.

MR. WEAVER'S FIRST SPEECH.

We mean by infant baptism the baptism of little children; by the word of God, our common Bible, or the James version.

We note first that the church of God assumed organic form with Abraham and his family. We read in Gen. 12:1-3: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee; and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." We are told by some that this is the gospel covenant, and that the covenant of circumcision in Gen. 17th chapter is a land covenant or promise. We find in this a land promise. Verse 1: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee." This refers to land, a literal land, and this promise developed into a land covenant in the 15th chapter of Genesis. Verse 7: "And he said unto him, I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit." So this is the land. Abraham wants a token of this land covenant, and God gives it to him, but the token is not circumcision. Verses 8-10: "And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it? And he said unto him, Take me a heifer of three years old, and a

ram of three years old, and a turtle dove and a young pigeon. And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another; but the birds he divided not." Verses 12-28: "And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram, and lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him. And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them, four hundred years; and also that nation whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterwards shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age; but in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. And it came to pass that when the sun went down and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces. In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying. Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates." So we find the land promise of Gen. 12th chapter here a land covenant, with no mention of circumcision in it, neither the word everlasting connected with this land promise.

We note the gospel promise in verse 3 not only embraced Abram and his literal family, but all families of the earth. Babes are members of families, hence we conclude that this gospel promise embraced the Jew, the babe, the Gentile. I now read Acts 3:29: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." So we find here the promise embraced the Jew, the babe, the Gentile. Now this gospel promise, and not the land promise, developed into the covenant of Gen. 17:1-14: "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am

the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face, and God talked with him, saying, As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations; neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called. Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee; and I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, and all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations,, he that is born in thy house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

We find perfection in this covenant. "Walk before me, and be thou perfect." We find circumcision of the flesh to be the token of this covenant, and that it was an everlasting covenant. We find neither of these in Gen. 12th chapter, connected with

the land promise, nor in the 15th chapter where this literal land promise developed into a land covenant. Hence we conclude they can not be the same covenant.

We next note that circumcision was not only a token of the covenant, but a seal of righteousness. Read Rom. 4:11: "And he received circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised." Abraham's faith had steps. First, he took the obligation of a holy life on himself, and then he was entitled to the token, circumcision in the flesh, so he was circumcised. Second, he put his children into covenant relationship with God, and gave them the token, circumcision in the flesh. Gen. 21:4: "And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac, being eight days old, as God had commanded him."

We next note the membership of this covenant. Deut. 29: 10-15: "Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: That thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day. That he may establish thee today for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath; but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this

day." So we find that the Jew, the babe and the Gentile have a place in this covenant or oath relationship with God.

We now note the length of this covenant. Was it to last until Christ came to make a new one? or to the end of the world? I read in 1 Chron. 16:11-17: "Seek the Lord and his strength, seek his face continually. Remember his marvelous works that he hath done, his wonders and the judgments of his mouth. O ye seed of Israel his servant, ye children of Jacob, his chosen ones. He is the Lord our God; his judgments are in all the earth. Be ye mindful always of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance, when ye were but, few, and strangers in it. And when they went from nation to nation and from one kingdom to another people, he suffered no man to do them wrong; yea, he reprov'd kings for their sakes, saying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm."

MR. BURNETT'S FIRST REPLY.

It is a fortunate thing that the proposition we are debating is printed at the head of this page—else you would not know what the discussion is about! Mr. Weaver set out to discuss infant baptism, but in his lengthy speech he has not said "infant," and he has not said "baptism!" On a former proposition, on the action of baptism, he spent most of his time in the jungles of prophecy, where baptism was not mentioned, to show how an ordinance of the New Testament should be administered! We presume he will now spend most of his time in the covenants and the prophecies, where no person was baptized, and about

next July he will reach the New Testament and the question in debate! We would be very glad to have him come at once to the issue. In fact, we challenge him to meet us on the commission of the Lord (Mat. 28:19), or on the household baptized in Acts of Apostles, or any other part of the Bible that speaks of baptism, and not waste so much valuable space on matters that have no bearing upon the subject. But we are in no wise afraid of the Abrahamic covenants, and it will be seen when we are done with them that they have been no benefit to the cause of infant baptism.

Mr. Weaver takes a new dodge, on the two covenants made with Abraham. He says the 12th chapter covenant is a land covenant, and the 17th chapter covenant is the gospel covenant, when everybody knows that exactly the opposite is true! What makes him say this? He says it because circumcision was given in the 17th chapter, and he wishes to attach this rite to the gospel covenant, when we all know it belongs to the land covenant. Now let every reader get his Bible, and see how easily we blast this mess of theological nonsense. Paul quotes from the 12th chapter covenant, "In thee shall all nations be blessed" (Gal. 3:8), and calls it the gospel covenant, and says, "The law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul." The gospel covenant then was made four hundred and thirty years before the law, which reaches back to the 12th chapter of Genesis, when Abraham was seventy-five years old. The land covenant (containing circumcision) was made when Abraham was ninety-nine years old, and four hundred and six years before the law. There was a space of twenty-four years between these covenants. They are named and dated, and there is no need of a mistake in regard to them. The 12th chapter covenant contains a promise of Christ and blessings to all the families of the earth, but contains no land and no circumcision. It was made in Ur of the Chaldees, The 17th chapter cove-

nant, made twenty-four years after, in the land of Canaan, has no Christ in it, and includes only the family of Abraham, but has circumcision and the gift of the land of Canaan. So Mr. Weaver has already begun to "wabble on the gudgeon." And he makes a bigger wabble when he says there is no circumcision connected with the land covenant, and the word everlasting is not in it! Just listen:

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. . . . My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant; and the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." Gen. 17:8-14.

This is the land covenant, and circumcision is its seal. No moral qualification was required. All Abraham's male children, and all the servants bought with his money, were entitled to the mark. If Mr. Weaver could prove this to be the gospel covenant, he is forever stopped from all claims under it. He was not born in Abraham's house; he was not bought with his money; and he has not been circumcised! Has he? So he is not entitled to even "forty acres and a mule" in the land of Canaan under this covenant! His assertion that "the Jew, the babe and the Gentile" have rights in the circumcision covenant is the silliest sort of twaddle. Why, its provisions were designed to separate the Jews from the Gentiles!

He runs off to 1 Chron., 16th chapter, to prove the length of the covenant, and asks if it shall only continue till Christ comes to make a new one? He finds it the length of "a thou-

sand generations." But what value is that long covenant to Joe C. Weaver? Listen:

"O ye seed of Israel, his servant, ye children of Jacob, his chosen ones. . . . Be ye mindful always of his covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." 1 Chron. 16:13-18.

So it is the same old land covenant, made in the 17th chapter of Genesis, and in which Joe C. Weaver has not a shadow of a claim!

Mr. Weaver assumes that the 12th chapter covenant is a land covenant because God told Abraham to get out of his country "unto a land that I will shew thee." But any person can see that no land was given in this covenant. Not a word was said about giving land until after Abraham had obeyed all the conditions of this first covenant. Here are the items of the covenant:

ABRAHAM'S PART.

1. Get out of thy country.
2. Prom thy kindred.
3. From thy father's house.
4. Unto a land I. will shew thee.

GOD'S PART.

1. I will make of thee a great nation.
2. Bless thee and make thy name great.
3. Thou shalt be a blessing.
4. Bless them that bless thee.
5. Curse him that curseth thee.
6. In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

The sixth item on God's part is a promise of Christ, and is called by Paul the preaching of the gospel unto Abraham (Gal. 3:8), and "the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ" (Gal. 4:17), though it is here only a dim promise. It finally developed into the "new covenant" of Jer. 31:31, and Heb. 8:8, the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the spiritual seed of Abraham, and a spiritual Canaan above. The 17th chapter covenant (containing circumcision) developed into the law of Moses, a fleshly seed, and an earthly Canaan. Hence its token or seal was in the flesh.

But why does Mr. Weaver try so hard to mix this old land covenant with the gospel of Jesus Christ? His object is to show that baptism came in room of circumcision, and as Abraham circumcised his children we ought to baptize our children. But does the Bible say that baptism came in room of circumcision? No. And baptism does not fill the place of circumcision even in the Methodist church. Does Mr. Weaver baptize only the males? Does he baptize them on the eighth day? Does he baptize them because they are in the church, or in order to bring them in? No child was circumcised into Abraham's church, but born into it, and circumcised because it was in. Are children born into the Methodist church? What saith the creed? Listen:

"Wash him, and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's church." Baptismal Prayer, Meth. Dis., p. 160.

Now hear the Doctrinal Tracts of the Methodist Church, p. 248:

"By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ its head."

To fill the place of circumcision, baptism would have to be administered to persons who are already in the church. We should like for Mr. W. to tell us what he baptizes a baby for?

Does he do it because it is in the church (born in), or to bring it in? Does he do it because the child is a sinner, or because it is not a sinner? Because it is in covenant relation, or to bring it into covenant relation? All these reasons are assigned by pedobaptists, but we want to hear Mr. Weaver's reasons. If baptism is the seal of the spiritual covenant, as circumcision was of the fleshly, when did the new seal go into operation? Why was the new seal put upon people who had the old seal? If all the Jews were in the Abrahamic church, and that church is the church of Christ, why did all the Jewish converts have to be brought in a second time, through the new door of baptism, which the Methodist creed says is the initiatory rite? Are infants members of the Methodist church?

MR. WEAVER'S SECOND SPEECH.

Our friend makes to himself a man of straw, and then spends his time destroying the man of straw. He tells the reader that I made the covenant of Gen. 12th chapter the land covenant, and Gen. 17th the gospel covenant, which thing I did not do or say. Now, reader, if you will read my first speech carefully, you will find about this: I said the land promise of Gen. 12 was in verses 1 and 2, and that land promise developed into a land covenant in Gen. 15, with no circumcision or the word everlasting connected with it; and that the gospel promise contained in verse 3 developed into the gospel covenant in Gen. 17:1-14, with circumcision as its token and the word everlasting connected with it, which I believe to be true. The land of Canaan mentioned in the 17th chapter I believe to be a spiritual land. The land mentioned in Gen. 12:1-3, and Gen. 15, I believe to be a literal land. This I believe because the Bible emphatically declares that circumcision in the flesh is a "token of the covenant" betwixt God and his people, and it was both a

sign and seal of the righteousness of faith. And hence it could not be a token of a land covenant, as claimed by our friend.

So I begin now where I left off, with the length of this covenant. I read Ps. 105:6-10: "O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen: he is the Lord our God, his judgments are in all the earth, he hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance." I now read Heb. 6:13-18: "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee; and so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife; wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." I now read Gal. 3:13-18: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed no man dissannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in

Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

These texts establish the promise or covenant of God with Abraham and his seed beyond any doubt. So, to do away with that covenant, we must do away with these and many other like texts. One asks if the thousand generations were up when Christ came to our world? Let Matthew answer. I read Mat. 1:17: "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations." This text begins with Abraham and brings us all the way to Christ, and we find three times fourteen generations only. Now are three times fourteen a thousand? I leave it" for you to determine yourself. There is one thing said, that the covenant according to God's promise and oath can't fail or be repealed until the end of the thousand generations. And if the land promised in this covenant be a literal land, it has failed, for neither Abraham nor the Jews are in possession of it now. But if, as we claim, it is spiritual, then both Abraham and his spiritual children are in possession of it now, and- ever will be, one part on the other side the Jordan and the other part of the family on this side the Jordan of death, singing, "Canaan, sweet Canaan, it is my happy home, I am bound for the land of Canaan!"

Our friend, with others, claims circumcision as a land possession in Israel. If that be true, then all the truly circumcised would be Jews, or members of Abraham's literal family, and would have equal rights or privileges in the way of land possessions. Yet in Gen. 17:23-27 we read that Abraham circumcised Ishmael and all the males born in his house, or

bought with his money. Verse 25 tells us that Ishmael was thirteen years old when he was circumcised. So he was without doubt circumcised, but what about his rights and privileges as a Jew? Now in Gen. 16th chapter we learn that Ishmael *was to* be a "wild man"—his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him. Then circumcision in the flesh failed to make him a staunch Jew, with the privileges of a true Jew. No, my friends, circumcision was a church privilege, and not a deed to land in Canaan. If circumcision was to make Jews, or to give land privilege in Israel, why circumcise a Jew's boy? Was he not born a Jew, and with that birth did not his privilege come to him? When a foreigner takes the oath of citizenship in the United States, is he not by that made a citizen of the United States, and has he not then the privileges of a citizen of the United States? You say yes. But our children are born citizens with full privilege, so we don't have to administer the oath of citizenship to them. So we say of a Jew's baby—he was born a Jew, with all the privileges of a Jew. Then why circumcise him to make him a Jew, or to give him a title to land in Israel?

I now read Deut. 30:6: "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." In this text we have a promise of God to circumcise both Abraham's heart, and the heart of his seed. When God circumcised the heart he simply purified it. Any person whose heart has been circumcised or purified by the Almighty is entitled to circumcision in the flesh, it being a token of covenant relationship, or token of purity of heart. So we learn that when God circumcised Abraham's heart, he was circumcised in the flesh as a token of the fact that he was a child of God. And so of Ishmael, as we learn from Gen. 17:25. He was circumcised in the flesh to signify that he was a child of

God, and a member of his holy family. And the same holds good with little eight-days-old Isaac. We have here three circumcised hearts—Abraham's, Ishmael's, and Isaac's. God circumcised each of these hearts, and then each of them was circumcised in the flesh as a token of the work God did for their, in purifying their hearts. Abraham was ninety and nine years old when he was circumcised in the flesh, as the token or sign and seal of the purity of his heart, or of his righteousness. Ishmael was thirteen years old when he received circumcision in his flesh, the token of his heart purification, or righteousness. Isaac was eight days old when he was circumcised in his flesh as the token of his heart purity, or righteousness, or, in other words, of his being a member of God's holy family. This text, understood, gives us the key to infant baptism, or infant membership in the family of God.

One objects to infant baptism because, if it be universally practiced, it does away with believer's baptism, which he takes to be positively demanded. If the reader were versed in Scripture, he would know there is no positively expressed command in the Bible to baptize believers only. The same objection might have been urged against infant circumcision only. Had it been given to infants only adults would not have received it. And it was universally practiced in Israel, or the family of God. But persons growing up as heathen, and thus being not circumcised in infancy, were permitted to receive the rite in adult age, when their hearts were circumcised of God, or in other words when they became believers in God. So there was no such practice in Israel, or the church of God, as adult believer's circumcision, only as they received a heathen proselyte on his faith into the church. And I think it would be far better for our world if it were so now.

MR. BURNETT'S SECOND REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says we transformed him into a man of straw, in saying that he made the 12th chapter covenant a land covenant, and the 17th chapter covenant the gospel covenant. Here is what he said: "We find in this (12th chapter) a land promise. Verse 1: 'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee.' This refers to land, a literal land, and this kind promise developed into a land covenant in the 15th chapter." That is what we charged. A land promise is a land covenant, for Paul calls the promise of Christ in the same chapter a covenant. There was no land given or promised in the 12th chapter covenant. God told his servant, Abraham, to get up and go into the land of Canaan, but he did not then say he would give it to him. If we should tell a man to leave his home in Arkansas and go into Texas, would we thereby give him the whole state of Texas? Pooh! Mr. Weaver still admits that he said the 17th chapter covenant is the gospel covenant. We showed that there was no Christ in it, but that it was a land covenant—gave the literal land of Canaan to Abraham's literal seed—and the seal was in their flesh. To set the matter forever at rest, God said, "My covenant shall be in your flesh." A man who has not this covenant in his flesh has no connection with it, and no title to the land it guaranteed. There is no chance to get a Gentile into this covenant. It was designed to separate the Jews from the Gentiles. Mr. Weaver has no part nor lot in it. He goes to it to get its fleshy rite, and he hasn't got that!

Seeing we have him cornered here, and there is no visible means of escape, he makes another wild splurge, and asserts that the land of Canaan mentioned in the 17th chapter is a "spiritual land!" Listen at the words of the covenant: "And

I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan." "Was that a spiritual land? Was it Canaan beyond the Jordan of death? "Was Abraham at that time "a stranger" in heaven? Did God give him "all" of heaven? Tut, tut, tut! It would be better, Mr. Weaver, to give up the question, and give up your Romish rite of infant baptism, than to make such a blunder as that. But he says the covenant was "to a thousand generations," and only forty-two had passed away till Christ was born. Yes, the Jews broke it, and forfeited their rights under it, and it was abolished. But what covenant was it that was to last to a thousand generations? Was it the land covenant? Listen at the 105 Ps., from which he quotes: "Saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance; when they were but a few men in number, yea very few, and strangers in it; when they went from one nation to another, from one kingdom to another people, he suffered no man to do them harm; . . . Moreover he called for a famine upon the land, he broke the whole staff of bread." Ah, if that was a spiritual covenant, and "a spiritual land" (heaven), then Abraham and his seed were "in it," and wandered from kingdom to kingdom in it, and there were enemies in it, and God had to "rebuke kings" in it, and then he "called for a famine" upon the land, and "brake the whole staff: of bread" of heaven! Good gracious, Mr. Weaver, what became of the angels during that famine? Our opponent made himself a man of straw in his first speech, but he has made himself a whole hay-stack in this last effort! But there is not a grain of wheat in his whole speech—not one. He thinks the word everlasting could not be applied to the literal land of Canaan, but it is so applied in Gen. 17, and here it is again in the 13th chapter. Listen: "Lift up now thine eyes and look from the place where thou art northward and southward and eastward and westward, for all the

land which thou seest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed *forever.*" Our wild opponent thinks the Lord failed to fulfill his covenant, if it applies to a literal land. We think Mr. W. ought to get on his knees and ask the Lord to forgive him for that awful sin of so misconstruing his plain Scriptures, it does not matter if that 17th chapter covenant (containing, circumcision) were ten thousand generations long, and had never been abolished, Mr. W. has no connection with it; besides, he has broken it, for he has never been circumcised. So away goes his "forty acres and a mule!" But it was a land covenant, and was made 406 years before the law, and is twenty-four years too young to be the covenant in which Gentiles are interested. Paul says the gospel covenant was four hundred and thirty years before the law (Gal. 3), which goes back to the time Abraham was seventy-five years old, in Ur of the Chaldees, twenty-four years before the circumcision covenant was made. Why did not Mr. Weaver notice our argument on the date of the two covenants? Does he admit that Paul's chronology will not fit the birth of the circumcision covenant, and that he dare not try to reconcile the discrepancy? He seems to have the two covenants "crossed and piled" in his head worse than a brush-heap, and does not know one from the other. His song is all right, but, applies to the spiritual seed, and a spiritual Canaan. And as there is a spiritual seed, there is a spiritual circumcision and seal, but that seal is not baptism. Nor is it applied to any one who is not an Israelite—a spiritual seed. Say, Mr. Weaver, why did you not tell us whether an infant is in the church or out of it? Will you say it is born in, if its parents are citizens.? Then how can your creed tell the truth, when it says the infant is brought by baptism into the church? Do you baptize none but heathen children? If the child is not in till baptized, then baptism does not come in room of circumcision. If your figure of the foreigner and the

home-born citizen is correct, the children of all Methodist parents are in the church by birth. But you baptize all babies alike—to bring them in. Presbyterians baptize only children of members, and to bring them in! How is that? But we deny that Methodist babies are in the church, either by birth or baptism, and we challenge Mr. Weaver to meet us on the issue. He says it is a church privilege, yet not a single infant he baptizes is in the church, and there never was a church member baptized by a Methodist preacher! He ought to post up on his creed!

But he says circumcision was a "sign and seal of the righteousness of faith, and could not be a token of land." It was a seal of Abraham's faith, "which he had yet being uncircumcised," but it was not a seal of faith or righteousness to his infant children. Did the infants have faith? Were they righteous when eight days old? If not, how could circumcision seal that which they did not possess? Eh? Were the servants bought with the money believers and righteous as soon as the money was paid? Was the money "counted to them for righteousness?" Ah, beloved, that is a terrible mess!

But now comes the wildest break that ever was made, even by the wild Weaver. He says that Ishmael and Isaac received circumcision to signify that they were children of God, and that he had circumcised their hearts! Where did he learn all that? Of course when a man has nothing in the Bible he has to draw on his imagination. So we credit that to the 99th chapter of the Ninety-ninth Epistle of Methodist Imagination! He quotes Deut. 30:6, where Moses said to Israel that God would circumcise their hearts and the hearts of their seed *to love the Lord*. But this was not spoken of Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac, but four hundred years after Abraham was dead! Did Ishmael love the Lord when he was circumcised? Did Isaac love the Lord when he was eight days old, and was that the cause of his circumcision? Was "every man child" among them, and every

slave bought with their money, a lover of the Lord, and was his heart circumcised? Do the infants Mr. Weaver rantizes love the Lord? Have their hearts been circumcised? And is that the reason he rantizes them? His creed tells a very different story. Listen: "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." There you are! Mr. Weaver ought to read up.

He says, at the close, there is no express command to baptize believers. Let him show that, and we will give up the question.. It will beat his exhortation and peroration and conglomeration about the thousand generations!

MR. WEAVER'S THIRD SPEECH.

Our friend says that I admit the 17th chapter covenant is the gospel covenant. That is true, and there is no gospel covenant but that. Our friend claims that he has shown that there is no Christ in that covenant. I failed to see the showing. It is only he said he did. God said to Abram, "Walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee." The record tells us that "Abraham fell on his face, and God talked with him, saying, As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." So the Gentiles have part or lot in the covenant. Our friend says none but the Jew. Then the Book should have said that, and not many nations.

Our friend says, referring to me, "He says the covenant was to a thousand generations," etc. The Book said it was. Our friend says, "The Jews broke this covenant, and it was abolished." Then the Book is "wild," and can't be trusted. Read Ps, 89:3-4, and v. 24-37. Our friend says the covenant is

twenty-four years too young to be the gospel covenant. I will ask you, reader, don't forget that, we may need it later on.

Our friend says my "song is all right," and admits that there is a spiritual circumcision and seal, and a spiritual seed. How could that be, with no Christ in that covenant?

Our friend wants to know about the truth, our creed, and challenges me on that question. I will simply say that if we live to get through with the four propositions agreed on, I will gladly meet him on that subject, and defend our Discipline at any and all points he may desire to attack.

Our friend asks if the hearts of the infants we rantize (I suppose he means baptize) had been circumcised? I will let Paul answer, 1 Cor. 15:22: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." If our friend does not know what it was to die in Adam and to be made alive in Christ, I will let Paul explain it to him. Rom. 5:10: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." So we don't baptize dead persons to make them come to life, nor sinners to make them righteous, but when God through Christ brings them from death to life, or from sin to righteousness, we baptize them, whether they be eight days old or a thousand days old, for baptism is a sign or token of righteousness. It is not righteousness.

Back to our subject. Col. 2:10-14: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And you being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." In this text Paul teaches us that the circumcision made without hands, and which put away sin, and the burial with Christ in baptism, were equal the one to the other. So it was spiritual circumcision and spiritual baptism. So in this baptism they were not buried nor raised by human hands, so with this spiritual baptism which was performed without hands there was remission of sins, and those who received this heart circumcision, or baptism, were, entitled to circumcision in the flesh, or water baptism, as a token of the great work of God in the heart. And those who had only the fleshly circumcision had the sign or token of righteousness without being righteous, which Paul declared to. be no circumcision or "uncircumcision." We are told that all Jews were born into the old church, without any reference to heart purity. Our friend failed to give us any proof of the statement, and this text sets aside the statement as false. Then, as we have seen, God said to Abram, "Walk before me and be thou perfect." So the gospel covenant is based on perfection.

I read Ezek. 44:7-9: "In that ye have brought into my sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations." Verse 9: "Thus saith the Lord God, No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of. any stranger that is among the children of Israel." This text teaches us that God not only required circumcision of the flesh, but that of the heart, before any one could legally enter into his sanctuary, and he demands no snore or less now for one to enter.

I read Rom. 2:25-29: "For circumcision verily profiteth, if

thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore, if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." The plain teaching of this text is that circumcision in the flesh, which was a token of a pure heart, or of righteousness, profited if a person kept the law. That is, if he walked before God with a perfect heart, otherwise his circumcision was made uncircumcision. So we find that circumcision of the flesh did profit, if it was connected with circumcision of the heart by faith. Yet the babe being brought back through the death of Christ, received the fleshly circumcision, which was a token of righteousness by faith. Paul said, "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly." So, being a natural descendant of Abraham did not make a Jew in the true or spiritual sense of the word, but every one had to be born of God, or from above, to be a Jew. It is true now, and has ever been true. So circumcision in the flesh was not circumcision, but that of the heart is circumcision. The same is true of water and Spirit baptism. Water baptism of itself is not baptism, unless it be connected with the baptism of the Spirit by faith. So he is not a Christian who is one outwardly, neither is that baptism which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Christian which is one inwardly, and baptism is that of the heart.

We next note the development of this covenant with Abraham into the church of God. I read Ps. 22:22: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will

I praise thee." Paul quotes David in Heb. 2:12, saying, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the church will I sing praise unto thee." Paul calls the church what David calls the congregation. I suppose he knew what he meant. I read Ps. 5:7: "But as for me, I will come into thy house in the multitude of thy mercy; and in thy fear will I worship toward thy holy temple." I read Ps. 27:4: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple." I read 2 Chron. 5:13-14: "It came even to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord; and when they lifted up their voices with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth forever; that when the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God." I read Isa. 2:3: "And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." I will ask what do these ancient worthies mean by the house of the Lord? Paul will tell us. 1 Tim. 3:15: "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." To show that this is no new house, read Acts 7:38: "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in mount Sina, and with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us."

MR. BURNETT'S THIRD REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says that because God said he would make Abraham "father of many nations," in the 17th chapter, covenant, the Gentiles must have been included. Not at all. Abraham was father of many nations after the flesh. Read this: "I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come of thee." Did Gentiles come out of him? Why did our friend miss that part of the quotation? And why did he miss that part which says, "My covenant shall be in your flesh?" Did the Gentiles have the covenant in their flesh? Where then did they have it? Has Mr. Weaver got the covenant in his flesh? The 13th verse says, "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised"—that is all that the covenant includes—and God says, "This is my covenant." Was Mr. Weaver born in Abraham's house? Was he bought with Abraham's money? Has he been circumcised? Well, he has no part in the covenant. Oh, says Mr. W., Paul says fleshly circumcision is not the real circumcision, and he is not a Jew who is one outwardly! Paul is talking about a Jew of the gospel age, a Christian Israelite, and not about a Jew of the 17th chapter covenant. So that powder is all wasted.

Mr. W. asks us to read Ps. 89:3-4, to show that the 17th chapter covenant has not been abolished. That passage contains a promise to David about his royal house (fulfilled in Christ), but says nothing about the circumcision covenant. If that covenant still stands, why did Paul say that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision?

Mr. Weaver says we admit there is a spiritual circumcision, and wants to know how that can be, when there is no Christ in the circumcision covenant? Many things in Judaism are used as types of things in Christianity, but that does not prove they are one and the same thing. Circumcision is a type, but

it, is not a type of baptism. Mr. "W.'s own quotation (Col.2) says the "circumcision of Christ" is "made without hands." Is infant baptism "made without hands?" Well, then, it is not Christian circumcision. Baptism does not take the place of circumcision even according to the Methodist Discipline. Circumcision was given to Abraham's children eight days after they were in his family; baptism is given to Methodist children to bring them into the family—and then they don't get in! Why does he not straighten up his Discipline to fit his argument, or his argument to fit his Discipline? Eh? He says he will attend to the Discipline some other day. We think now is the time to attend to the Discipline on infant baptism.—while we are on that subject. Baptism is given to infants to bring them into the church, but circumcision was given to infants because they were already in Abraham's family or church. Then, according to Methodist practice, infants are not in the church by either birth or baptism! On this point we challenged Mr. W., but he put it off till some future day. Here is the trilemma:

Baptism: To. bring them in!

Circumcision: Because already in!

Practice: Not in at all!!!

We pressed Mr. Weaver to tell why he baptizes babies, but he has never given any answer. He says that when Christ brings a, person from, sin to righteousness, they baptize him, whether eight days old or a thousand years old. How does he know infants have been brought from sin to righteousness? What is the evidence? Do they bring "fruits meet for repentance?" At what age does Christ change them? The Discipline says the change is made in baptism. It says that all infants are "conceived and born in sin," and remain in that condition till baptism, then the preacher and people pray: "Wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's

church," etc. Mr. Weaver says he has already been washed and sanctified and delivered from God's wrath, and is righteous, and for that reason he baptizes him, but the Discipline says the child is washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost in water baptism, and delivered from God's wrath! "Wonder what made God wrathful at the little infant? Our friend quotes two texts, but both have reference to the resurrection from the grave, and not salvation from sin. Paul said, "As in Adam all die" (not died), but if that means spiritual death, then Universalism is true, for he said, "Even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Our opponent has not only run headlong over his creed, but he has run headlong into Universalism!

Our friend quotes Col. 2:10, about the "circumcision of Christ" that was "made without hands" and, as he says, "by faith," and when a person has that inward circumcision he is entitled to the outward as a token of it. But how does he know the infants he baptizes have this inward circumcision that puts off the body of sins? All the sins an infant has are birth sins or Adamic sins, and these are washed away in water baptism according to the Discipline and Doctrinal Tracts of the Methodist church! Again Mr. W. runs squarely over his creed. Listen at the Doctrinal Tracts, written by Mr. Wesley:

"As to the grounds of it: If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism."

We shall hold Mr. W. to his creed till he repudiates it. He ought to straighten his creed, or straighten his argument, one or the other.

He quotes Rom. 2, where Paul says that is not circumcision which is outward in the flesh. Yes, but Paul is talking about Christian circumcision, and uses the present tense. "He is a Jew (Christian Jew) who is one inwardly, and circumcision is

of the heart in the spirit." That text forever blasts Mr. Weaver's infant Jew, for he can not apply the spiritual circumcision to an infant, and he says the outward by itself is "uncircumcision or no circumcision." He misapplies every text of Scripture he quotes. If he had a better doctrine, he would be a better debater. He cuts his own head off. Just listen at this: "Water baptism of itself is not baptism, unless it be connected with the baptism of the Spirit by faith." That forever knocks out infant baptism! Does an infant receive Spirit baptism? Does an infant have faith? O Jewpeter, what a blunder! Mr. Weaver never baptized an infant in his life, according to his own showing. There is nothing but water (and very little of that), and he says that is not baptism!

He quotes a number of texts to prove that the Lord had a house in the Jewish age. Most of his texts have reference to a building of wood and stone, and such a structure is not called a church in the gospel age. But we are willing to admit that there was a church (*ekklesia*) back there, a called-out body of people. And the whole Jewish nation constituted the church, every one that had the fleshly mark on him. But it was not the *ekklesia* of Christ. Any body called out for any purpose is any *ekklesia*. The mob that cried, "Great is Diana," is called an *ekklesia* in that chapter. Certainly, the Jewish nation was an *ekklesia*, and it was God's *ekklesia*. Moses was in "the church in the wilderness," but that is not the spiritual institution we read about in the New Testament. A man has to be "born of water and of the Spirit" to get into this latter institution; he had to be born of Abraham's flesh to get into that old institution. Mr. Weaver doesn't know the one from the other. The Abrahamic thing had stood thirteen hundred years when Daniel said, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom"—using the future tense. The Abrahamic church had stood nearly two thousand years when Christ said,

"Upon this rock I *will build* my church"—using the future tense. No member of the Abrahamic church was allowed membership in the church of Christ without initiation, or baptism, which the Methodist creed says is the door. There were no holding-over members. Why this second admittance, if they were already in, and the church was the same? Was it like the Arkansas jail? "Resolved: 1. We will build a new jail. 2. We will build the new jail out of the material of the old jail. 3. We will keep the prisoners in the old jail till we get the new jail built!" All the apostles, the three thousand on Pentecost, Lydia, the jailer, Crispus, all Jews had to be baptized.

MR. WEAVER'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Our friend wants me. to stop and fix the Discipline. You observe, friends, that he would not accept my challenge to add that as a future proposition. He says now is the time to fix it, on infant baptism, and it would be if I were affirming infant baptism to be authorized by the Discipline. I would be glad for the chance of defending the Discipline, if he will bring on his attack at the proper time.

He admits that circumcision is a type, but says it is not a type of baptism. Of what then was it the type? Our friend says the Discipline says the infant is changed from sin to righteousness by water baptism. Why doesn't he give the language of the Discipline? It was David who said they were "conceived and born in sin." Our friend says 'As in Adam all die' (not died) refers to the resurrection from the grave. Then the fall of Adam, did not affect the human race until after they die. Our friend seems to be blessed with the art of letting texts that he can't handle alone, and forever talking on such as he can handle. I will give him this one: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go stray as soon as they are

born, speaking lies." I will ask if this refers to the resurrection of the dead, or to the depravity of the fallen human heart? Our friend says I misapply every text I quote. Why doesn't he take up the texts and show the misapplication? He says that our position that water baptism is not baptism unless connected with the spirit knocks out infant baptism. That is his think. Circumcision in the flesh was not circumcision unless it was connected with circumcision of the heart, by faith, yet it did not knock out infant circumcision.

Our friend says the most of the texts I quote (about the church) "refer to wood and stone." Then he should show it to be so. He admits finally that there was a church back in Judaism, yet it was Christ's. Then he admits it was God's. Then God had one then, and Christ has one now. Fine! Yet he calls the old one "the Abrahamic thing." Quite reverential. Our friend repeats the old statement no spirituality required to be in the old. Yet I gave him Ezek. 44:7-9. Our friend says I don't know one from the other, speaking of the supposed two churches. That is right, because the Book knows no new church. Our friend says all have to be born of water and of the Spirit to get into the new. He quotes that text like he handles all others—the part he can't use he lets it alone, and the part he thinks he can, he quotes. Yet he doesn't misapply, eh? When our friend came to Acts 7:37-38, he had to own up that God had a church, and that Moses was in it. So good, and if that be true then what he has said before that and against it is untrue, he being witness. We know that Moses was never in a new church, but was in God's church with the fathers, and they "gave the lively oracles unto us." So we have the same oracles, doctrines or revelations they had, and they are not new. We will now learn that the old church was spiritual. Our friend says no, but what saith the Book? I read 1 Cor. 10:1-6: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant

how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased, for (they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted." Paul thought they had Christ, for, said he, they ate and drank him. Our friend says they had no Christ. I believe Paul was right. So this church was not a mob called out, but it was Christ's church, and he was with it then. I read Heb. 4:1-2: "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." This text teaches us that we have the gospel preached to us as well as they had it. No one at that time doubted that the fathers had the gospel preached, but some seemed to doubt our having it. They had a gospel that saved all that believed, and none others. So our gospel will save them that believe, and none others; in that it is the same gospel.

I read Gal. 3:8-9: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying. In thee shall all nations be blessed; so then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." This text is so plain I leave it without comment, and read Rom. 10:16: "But they have not all obeyed the gospel, for Esaias sayeth, Lord, who hath believed our report?" Here Isaiah is quoted, and it is called the gospel. I read Acts 26:22-23: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none

other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come. That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the Gentiles." I read Acts 28:23-27: "And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging, to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening. And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not. And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word: Well spake the Holy Ghost, by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand, and seeing ye shall see and not perceive; for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." If there was a new church with a new gospel, Paul seems to be ignorant of it. We learn from these texts that he preached nothing but what Moses in the law and the prophets preached. If that gospel was good enough to preach then, it is good enough for me now. And I have no desire for a new church, nor for a new gospel. The pure gospel is not new. Anything new preached for gospel is not true.

We want now to test what we have said on this subject. So I will ask if the covenant made with Abraham and developed into the church of God under the old dispensation was repealed. I now call the reader's attention to the fact that all of the texts given to establish the covenant with Abraham as the church of God made mention of Abraham, also of Isaac and Jacob. I think it fair now to demand the mention of these names to repeal it. I aim before dismissing this part of the

subject to examine all the texts used by our friends in repealing it. And if I should overlook one text of importance, of course our friend will present it. There is one important reason our friends have in view in repealing the old church, and that is to get the babes out. for it is an undeniable fact that they were in this by divine authority, and that is why they feel called on to repeal it. I read Jer. 31:31-34: "Behold, the days come. saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying. Know the Lord, for they shall all know me. from the least of them unto the greatest of them; for I will forgive their iniquity, and will remember their sin no more." Paul, in quoting this text in Heb. 8:8-13, says: "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."

MR. BURNETT'S FOURTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says he would defend the Discipline, if he were affirming that infant baptism is authorized by the Discipline! He knows his argument made from the Bible (on circumcision) contradicts the teaching of the Discipline, and it will not do to

have them both on the floor at the same time! Children were not circumcised into Abraham's church, but born in, but the Discipline says they are baptized into the Methodist church. They don't fit, and that is why we said he must amend his argument or amend his Discipline. Methodism in a debate must be the same as Methodism in its creed. Mr. W. can have the chance to defend the Discipline any time he wants it, and then we will pick forty flaws in it instead of one. But now is the time to defend the infant-baptism part of the Discipline.

He asks us to give the language of the Discipline that says infants are changed in water baptism. We did that before. "Wash him and sanctify him," etc., "that he being delivered from thy wrath." etc. Don't you know your own creed? And don't you know what Mr. Wesley wrote in the Doctrinal Tracts, "published by order of the General Conference?" We will quote it for you:

"If infants are guilty of original sin. then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism."

Does that suit you? It does not suit your argument, for that says the infant has already been made pure by the Holy Ghost through faith (as if an infant could have faith!) and water baptism is given as a token of it! So you again run over your own creed.

He says it was David, and not the Discipline, that said infants are conceived and born in sin. David never said it. David said his mother conceived him in sin, but he did not say all infants were so conceived. Don't run over David, as well as the Discipline. Next he gives us this text from David: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." If they go astray, they are not born astray. Eh? They "go astray, speaking lies." Does an infant speak lies? David says they are "estranged

from the womb." Weaver says they are estranged in the womb—conceived in sin. So he contradicts David.

Mr. W. holds on to the foolish idea that circumcision was not circumcision unless accompanied by heart purity. But he did not meet our objection that such idea forever blasted infant baptism and Jewish circumcision, for he could not show that a Jewish infant or a Methodist infant had purity of heart. He replied that it did not blast infant circumcision. No, for no such condition was required. All the condition required was that the infant be born of Abraham's flesh or bought with his money, and all the condition required of a Methodist child is that the mother or nurse shall hold it up to the preacher and "name this child." Why did not Mr. W. meet our challenge here, and try to show some proofs of heart purity or faith? Verily, he has a wonderful way of letting things alone. He ought to put out a sign: "How Not to Do It!" But he says Paul said. "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly." We showed that Paul had reference to a Christian Jew, under the gospel, for he uses the present tense. But under the old covenant he was a Jew who was one in the flesh, and circumcision was altogether in the flesh.

Mr. W. says we admit there was a church back there. Yes. With the broad meaning of the word church (a called-out body), there was a church in that day. The whole Jewish nation was in it, without any regard to faith or piety. But it was not a spiritual institution, like the church of the New Testament. A man did not have to be "born of water and of the Spirit" in order to enter into that church, as he is required today to enter the kingdom of God. Mr. Weaver says we take only a part of that text. Why doesn't he show it? We take the whole of it, and we will stake the whole issue on that one text. He knows; is well as he knows his name is Weaver that that text cuts out of the kingdom of God every person who is not born of water

and the Spirit, and he knows no such qualification was required to enter the Jewish church. Children entered that by natural birth, and there was no choice on their part. How then can the two churches be the same? He even tries to make Paul say he preached the same things Moses preached! Paul says he preached the things Moses and the prophets said "should come." Did Paul preach the law? Did Paul preach the Sabbath? Did Paul preach circumcision? Why did he say, "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified?" Why did he say that in Christ circumcision did not avail anything? Why did he say that "before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith that should afterwards be revealed?" Mr. Weaver says they had the faith back there, and "all who believed were saved and no others." Paul says the faith had not come. Weaver says it had. So it is Weaver versus Paul. We are sure Paul was right. Mr. Weaver says that old church is good enough for him. Yes. but he is not in it. and can not get in it without being circumcised. Has he been circumcised? He will not tell us, but we are sure he has not been, and he is outside of that old fleshly institution that he makes such a noise about.

If the two churches are the same, why did all the members of the Jewish church have to be baptized into the church of Christ, after it was established? The Methodist Discipline says baptism is the initiatory rite, and all the members of the Abrahamic church had to be initiated into the church of Christ! Mr. Weaver says they were already in. but the apostles did not know it, and took them all in again! It will be observed that we have not been able to get Mr. Weaver to notice this difficulty. He disposes of it by the let-alone process. If he will show us one Jew that did not have to be initiated into the church of Christ, we will give up the whole question! Nor has he noticed our quotation from Daniel, "The God of heaven

shall set up a kingdom." This is in the future tense, and was spoken thirteen hundred years after Abraham's church was set up. Say. Mr. Weave, was Abraham's church set up "in the days of these kings?" Nor has he noticed the statement of Christ. "Upon this rock I will build my church," nearly two thousand years after Abraham's church had been built. He says that was Christ's church back there, and Christ was in it, but Christ says in Mat. 16 that his church was then future. One or the other has made a mistake.

But the Israelites "drank of that spiritual rock," and had the gospel preached into them, and the gospel was preached to Abraham. Yes, the gospel in promise (not in fact) was preached to Abraham, and in types and shadows to the Israelites, and the rock was a type of Christ—nothing more. They did not know what it meant. It was only literal water to them. Paul says (Cor. 15) the gospel is the death and burial and resurrection of Christ. Was this preached to the Jews as a fact, and did they believe it and obey it?

Mr. Weaver says he convinced us by Acts 7:38 that there was a church in the wilderness, and Moses was in it, and received the lively oracles. We never doubted that, and never knew anybody that doubted it. Moses was in that called-out body, the Jewish nation, but that is not the body we enter by being born of water and the Spirit. Paul speaks in Hebrews of the church Moses was in. in contrast with the church of Christ, and says there were two. Listen: "For Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant . . . but Christ as a son over his own house, whose house are we." Here are two houses. Moses is a servant in his house, and Christ is a son over his house. Our Judaistic friend says he is in Moses' house, but we belong to the other establishment.

He says we wish to abolish the old church to get the babies out. It has been shown in a former speech that the babies are

not in the Methodist church. There is not a Methodist church in Texas that has the babies on its roll as members. Our friend will not dispute this, for he has been confronted with the charge in his own pulpit in his own church-house, and he could not help himself. Dr. Jacob Ditzler says there is not a baby in the M. E. Church South! Why does he quarrel at us for trying to get the babies out, when he hasn't got them in? If we believed they were members, we would have them on the roll. But you can not get a baby into the kingdom of God, for it can not be born of water and the Spirit.

It will be observed that Mr. W. has not yet begun to discuss infant baptism, though he has made four speeches.

MR. WEAVER'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Our friend says children were not circumcised into Abraham's church, but born in. I know nothing of Abraham's church. I know of God's church, organized in Abraham's family, and I know that no one of any age was ever born into God's church or family in Abraham's day, or any other day, by a natural birth. Our friend makes this statement several times, but gives no proof. I have shown that under the old dispensation they had to receive both circumcision in the flesh, which was a token of the covenant (therefore not the covenant), and that of the heart. I have also shown that circumcision in the flesh was not circumcision unless it be connected with heart circumcision by faith. So it took both the inward and outward circumcision to make the true circumcision. Then I have given Ezek. 44:7-9. which emphatically contradicts the statement that children were born by flesh into God's church in Abraham's day.

Our friend asks, "Did Paul preach the Sabbath? Did Paul preach circumcision?" I will not raise the Sabbath question

lure, but would be pleased to add that to our list of propositions to be discussed in the future. Our friend agrees to add the Discipline question; I therefore thank him, and let it rest until its proper time, and see the forty flaws in it. But to the question, "Did Paul preach circumcision." Yes. and practiced it long after Pentecost. So Paul could not have been in a new church.

Our friend says. "Paul says the faith had not come; Weaver says it had." Weaver did not say it: he only quoted texts of Scripture proving it. Then if there is a contradiction, it is Paul versus Scripture. I believe it was Paul who said of the ancient worthies that they "all died in faith." So, if Paul said they had no faith back there, it was Paul versus Paul. Our friend called the old church Judaism. Abraham's church. Now it is Moses' house or church. So Moses had one house and Christ one. So there are two houses—Moses' house and Christ's house. Then God was mistaken when he said. "My servant Moses is not so. who is faithful in all mine." And if Christ had a new one. he has one and God one. Of the old God says. "Israel is my people." And to show it is no new Israel, he said of them. "My people went down aforetime into Egypt." Israel is the called of God. "Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called." Israel is God's inheritance: "Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance." "He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root: Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit." Israel is God's chosen: "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen." Israel is God's elect: "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains; and mine elect shall inherit it. and my servant shall dwell there. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat; for as the days of a tree

are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." God said, "I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel forever." Of her he said: "This is my rest forever; here will I dwell, for I have desired it." Israel the true church of God. called by his name: "And all the people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord, and they shall be afraid of thee." "And he set a graven image of the grove that he had made in the house, of which the Lord said to David, and to Solomon his son. In this house, and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel, will I put my name forever." "But now, thus saith the Lord that created thee. O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel. Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by my name: thou art mine." God said when Israel and Judah turned from him that. "They set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to defile it." With these plain texts before me. I say again if you have a new church I don't want it.

Our friend says the gospel was preached to them, but not in fact—it was only in types—and that rock was a type of Christ, nothing more. Paul said about this: "And did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." That sounds to me kinder real, and was more than a type. Paul said that rock was Christ. Our friend said that rock was a type of Christ, nothing more. It seems to me that that is Paul versus our friend.

I have put in some time on this point, for it settles the question in dispute. If our friend can repeal this old church. I Surrender. So I go back to where I left it.

I had quoted Heb. 8:7-S. So J begin at v. 9: "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day When I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of

Egypt: because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying. Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." We note in the text that neither Abraham, Isaac nor Jacob is mentioned, yet we have the repealing of a covenant. But what covenant? The covenant made with Israel and Judah's fathers, while in Egypt, Moses said, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us." I read 1 Ki. 8:9: "There was nothing in the ark, save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt," This was the covenant that was repealed, and the new is made with Israel and Judah, and not with the apostles on Pentecost. The new covenant has reference to the re-union of Israel and Judah. The kingdom was divided after the death of King Solomon.

Dan. 2:44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." As we have proven this kingdom of God (Israel) was God's chosen, elect kingdom before it went into captivity, and it was his while in captivity, and it was still his when he brought it out of captivity, and the bringing it out

of captivity did not make it a new kingdom as contradistinguished from the old kingdom. So the words "set up" don't mean to build a new, but to rebuild or build again the old fallen kingdom. Hear Jeremiah: "At the same time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people. Thus saith the Lord, The people which were left of the sword found grace in the wilderness: even Israel, when I went to cause him to rest. The Lord hath appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee. Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel, thou shalt again be adorned with thy tablets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry." So the bringing them out did not make a new kingdom.

I read Dan. 4:3: "How great are his signs! and how mighty are his wonders! his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation." How could this text be true, and yet the kingdom did not exist prior to Pentecost?

I read Dan. 7:14: "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him. which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." How could this be given to Christ, if he made a new one? This was his kingdom, and he took it. and did not make a new one. He rather made this cm new by cleaning it. I read Ezek. 21:27: "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it. and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it to him." So it was Christ's kingdom, and when he came he rebuilt it.

MR. BURNETT'S FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver asserts that no person was born into Abraham's church, and calls for the proof. He may next call for proof that Abraham was the father of the twelve tribes! Was not Abraham's family the Abrahamic church? How did children get into Abraham's family? If the family was not the church, what was the church? We have time and again quoted from the circumcision covenant: "This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh." God Says this is the covenant. Mr. Weaver says it is not. He says it includes heart circumcision (even to a child), but furnishes no proof. God says. "My covenant shall be in your flesh." Mr. Weaver says that is a mistake—the covenant is in the heart, and the flesh is only the token. He is fearfully mistaken. Say, beloved: We will give up the whole question, if you will find one Jewish infant that had circumcision of the heart, or find such prerequisite to membership in the Abrahamic church. He says he found Ezek. 44:7, but that says not a word on the subject. We drove him into this foolishness by pressing him to defend his creed, which says infants do not enter the Methodist church like they enter the family of Abraham. He will not defend his creed (till some future time), and will not give up his foolish argument on circumcision. He knows that everybody in Texas knows that persons entered the Abrahamic or Jewish nation by natural birth, but they do not enter the church of Christ that way.

He says Paul preached circumcision, and practiced it, and hence did not belong to a new church. Why then did Paul say (Gal. 5:6) that in Christ Jesus circumcision did not avail any-

thing? And, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing?" Gal. 5:2. We called his attention to these statements, but he met them by the let-alone process. Paul circumcised Timothy as a Jew, but would not permit Titus to be circumcised. Gal. 2:3. Did Paul and Timothy belong to the old church, and Titus to the new? Oh, tut! tut! You might as well surrender.

Our friend still contradicts Paul, where he says, "Before faith came we were kept under the law," and says faith came in the days of the ancients, and they "all died in faith," according to Paul's own testimony. If the faith they had was the same faith Paul said had not come, then Paul told a flat falsehood. Do you see what a predicament you have got the apostle into? Some of the ancients had faith (not the infants), but it was not 'the faith' which Paul says had not come. The apostle says while the law stood they were "shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Mr. Weaver says it was revealed to Noah, and Abraham, and Moses, and all the Jews—even the babies! He is fearfully wrong.

He next wastes much valuable space in showing that Israel was God's elect, his chosen, his inheritance, etc., all of which has no bearing upon the subject, and cuts no figure in this controversy.

Mr. Weaver says, "If there is a new church, I don't want it." We are sure he is correct about that. If he wanted the church of Christ, he would not be in the Methodist church. That was established by Mr. John Wesley. Our friend is not in the Abrahamic church, for he has not been circumcised, and he is not in the church of Christ, for he has not been born of water and the Spirit. So he is in neither the old or the new. Bay, Mr. Weaver, if we loved that old thing as well as you do, we would go and join it. You might get some old rich Jew to

buy you with his money, and circumcise you, and then you would be in the Abrahamic church!

He quotes Heb. 8, where an old covenant was abolished, but says it was the Sinaitic, and not the Abrahamic. Our friend is again unfortunate. The Bible contradicts him. Listen: "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand *to lead* them out of the land of Egypt." That does not refer to the Sinaitic covenant, but to a covenant made in Egypt. The circumcision covenant, first made with Abraham, was made with the whole nation "when he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." Read Ex. 6. It was the circumcision-land covenant, first made with Abraham (Gen. 17), re-enacted to Isaac (Gen. 26), confirmed to Jacob (Gen. 28), and made with the whole nation (Ex. 6), when he took them by the hand "*to lead* them out." The Sinaitic law was added to this land covenant, and they both went out together.

Our wild friend shoots off the wildest theory on the "new covenant" of Heb. 8 that we have ever heard. He says it was a covenant made with the Jews after the captivity and the reunion of the tribes. Did the Lord put his law into their hearts after the captivity any more than before? Did they all know him, "from the least to the greatest," after the captivity? Paul, in Heb. 8, is talking about a change of the priesthood, which involved a change "also of the law," as well as a change of the covenant. Was the priesthood changed after the captivity? Paul says we have a new high priest under the new covenant. Who was the high priest of that new covenant made after the captivity? And what business had Paul quoting that covenant and applying it to the gospel age? He says a covenant or testament is of force after men are dead. Did Christ die at the return from captivity?

Mr. "Weaver says Dan. 2:44 does not mean a new kingdom

get up, but an old kingdom re-set. Why did not the Lord say that? The word re-set is not in the chapter. You had better not add words to the word of the Lord. There was a little stone cut out of the mountain after three of the kingdoms of Dan. 2 had passed away. Was that the Abrahamic stone? Oh, tut, tut! "Thou sawest *till that* a stone was cut out." That means he kept looking, after he saw three kingdoms pass away and the fourth appear, till he saw the kingdom of God appear. Mr. Weaver says the stone was cut out away back yonder in Mesopotamia when circumcision began, and Daniel was a near-sighted prophet and missed the vision about two thousand years! Daniel says, "And in the days of these kings (what kings?) the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom." Was the Abrahamic church set up "in the days of these kings?" In view of Daniel's prophecy, that the God of heaven would set up a kingdom in the days of the four empires, the Savior says in Mark 1:5: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." Was the Jewish nation just then making its appearance? Does "at hand" mean two thousand years ago? Everybody (except Rev. J. (. Weaver) knows that the Abrahamic nation had been "at hand" and "in hand" and "on hand" for twenty centuries when the Savior used that language.

Mr. Weaver is so certain the Jewish nation was the kingdom or church of Christ, we must overwhelm him with proof to the contrary. Christ spoke of a Jew who was "not far from the kingdom," yet he had been in the Jewish nation all his life. He told the scribes and Pharisees that they would not go into the kingdom themselves, and would not let others enter, and yet they were in the Jewish nation. At another time he told them the publicans and harlots "go into the kingdom before you," yet they were in the Jewish nation. On one occasion he said, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of

death till they see the kingdom of God," yet they had seen the Jewish nation all their lifetime. He told Nicodemus he had to be born of water and the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom of God, yet Nicodemus had been in the Jewish kingdom from the day of his birth. Christ told his disciples, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." If Mr. Weaver had been there, he would have corrected him and told him those men were already in the kingdom, and he ought to say it this way, "Except ye become as little children, ye shall be *turned out* of the kingdom!"

.Mr. Weaver says he dwells on this old church or Jewish nation, because it settles the whole question. We say it has no bearing upon the question. Everything he has said about the old church may be admitted, and yet it proves nothing for infant baptism. When the new dispensation began, faith was made a condition of baptism, and an infant can not have faith. The babies were in the old church, because it was a national affair, but they are not in the Methodist church! We have been trying hard to get Mr. Weaver to tell us why he leaves the babies out!

MR. WEAVER'S SIXTH SPEECH.

Our friend says I said Daniel did not mean a new kingdom set up, but an old kingdom re-set. He says the word re-set is not in the chapter. Nor is it in my speech. Our friend quotes at several texts to teach me a lesson. I believe all the texts referred to, but not his interpretation of them, for it contradicts other plain texts. He said the parties mentioned in the texts referred to were in the old. If he had said had been in the old, but when they rejected Christ were cut off because of unbelief, then he would have interpreted correctly. Paul says

they were cut off because of unbelief, but if they abide not still in unbelief God is able to graff them in again. They must have been in, and then out, to be graffed in again. Paul tells us that they would be graffed into their own olive tree.

I return to the fallen kingdom spoken of by Daniel. Our friend only referred to one text in Daniel. I gave him three. I read Acts 15:16: "After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." Now we have it in plain language—it was the tabernacle of David that had fallen, and God rebuilt it, or set it up. It was no new one. The rebuilding, or setting up, did not make it new.

I read Mat.:1:12: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." How could he thus purge a kingdom yet to come?" "Whose fan is in his hand," not will be in his hand.

I read Mat. 11:12: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. If the kingdom was not in John's day, then it suffered and was taken by force before it existed. How could that be? Matt. 11:11: "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." I think this text refers to the glorified kingdom in heaven. Of course the least in an immortal state or kingdom is greater than the greatest in a mortal or earthly kingdom. Luke 16:16: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." The law and the prophets until John, and from John the kingdom of God is preached, and John was before Pentecost, hence the kingdom of God was preached before Pentecost. This text refers to the

spiritual kingdom. They were being regenerated and pressing into it. So if the kingdom had no existence before Pentecost, people pressed into it before it existed.

I read Mat. 3:8: "Bring therefore fruits meet for repentance, and think not to say within yourselves. We have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." If there were to be a new church, why not raise up children for or unto it.'

Luke 1:67-79: "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began, that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us, to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life. And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us. to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace." Now, reader, was not that old man wild, to look into the face of modern wisdom and talk to his son, a little boy. about God raising up a horn of salvation for the Jews in the house of David, and to speak of mercy promised to their fathers, and worse, to remember that Abrahamic "old thing," and call it a holy covenant, and talk about remission of sins, holiness and righteousness, and their walking in

the same before God all the days of their life, when there was no Christ in it, no faith, no remission, no holiness or righteousness required, nothing required but simply to be born in Abraham's house or bought with an "old rich Jew's" money and be circumcised in his flesh! My, was he not 'wild?' This text teaches that John did not organize a new church, but he joined the "old thing," and brought all of his converts into it.

I read Isa. 56:3-8: "Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people, neither let the eunuch say, Behold I am a dry tree, for thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant, Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; Even them will I bring into my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people. The Lord God, which gathereth the outcasts of Israel, saith. Yet will I gather others to him. beside those that are gathered unto him." It is no trouble to locate this house. It is the house of Israel, and in this house there is an altar on which the sacrifice for sins is placed. In the supposed new one there is a tank, into which the sinner is to go for his remission. Quite a change. Christ, while on earth, went in this house of God and said of it: "It is written. My house shall be called the house of prayer." So the eunuch joined this "old thing," and no one doubts his having the everlasting name, when they hear the modern new

church man preach, for it is Philip and the eunuch and eunuch and the Philip, in every discourse.

I read Gal. 4:21-31: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh, but he of the free woman was by promise; which things are an allegory, for these are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. So, then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." We are contending for the covenant of promise made to Abraham and sworn to Isaac and confirmed to Jacob, which is the free woman with her children. And our friend is trying to destroy this old thing, and of course, as there are but two, he is for the other, and will at the final reckoning be cast out. Gen. 17:18-21: "And Abraham said unto God, Oh, that Ishmael might live before thee! And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him. And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee. Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly;

twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation. But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year."

MR. BURNETT'S SIXTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says the Jews mentioned by Christ, as not being in his kingdom, had been broken off (were broken off for unbelief, for rejecting Christ), but Paul says God is able to graff them in again. Were they broken off from the Jewish nation for unbelief? There was no such condition of standing in the Jewish nation as faith. Have we not called in vain for our friend to produce it? Did Paul say God would graff them back into the Jewish nation? Tut, tut! Is Mr. Weaver in the Jewish nation today? Christ said to his apostles, who had not rejected Christ, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." According to Mr. Weaver's position, every single member of the Abrahamic church had apostatized and been broken off. for they all had to be baptized into the church of Christ, and as there was none of the old body left, there was nothing to graff into, so Christ had to star! a new body! We offered to give up the question, if Mr. Weaver would find one holding-over member. Did he find it? But if they stood in the Abrahamic church by faith, that would let out all the babies! Mr. W. has not yet told us what broke the babies off from the Methodist church! Has ho? Did they lack faith?

He quotes Acts 15—"the tabernacle of David which is fallen"—and says it was no new one. But tabernacle does not mean church—it means house, the royal house of David which had fallen down, for no son of David was on the throne for awhile. As Christ was a son of David and a king, the bouse or tabernacle of David was lifted up again. He needs a text that says

"tabernacle of Abraham," or "church of David." Did David have a church?

"He will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner." That is all right. Christ purged the Jewish nation, and gathered the wheat into the garner, the new church. But according to Mr. Weaver's theory, the wheat was already in the garner—and the chaff too! But, "The kingdom suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force," and it must have been in existence. Yes, "from the days of John the Baptist"—not Abraham! Mr. Weaver's text all condemn him. The kingdom, in its preparatory state, did exist from the days of John. But John was not in it. for, "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." He was in the Abrahamic church, and was not broken off, for he was full of the Holy Ghost from his birth. Can a man full of the Holy Ghost every day of his life apostatize? To dodge this text, Mr. Weaver says "kingdom of heaven" in the 12th verse means the church, for it suffered violence, but "kingdom of heaven" in the 11th verse means the glorified kingdom! Ah, beloved, you scatter those texts terribly, to save a scattered doctrine!

"The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached." Yes. But it does not say the law and the prophets were until Abraham, and since that time the kingdom of God is preached and men press into it. According to our wild friend's theory, men pressed into the Abrahamic church (by natural birth) for nearly two thousand years before the days of John the Baptist—not "from the days of John." His texts help the Baptists, but do not help the Methodists. We teach that men pressed into the kingdom (in its formative state) from the days of John. But it sounds foolish to talk about men pressing into a thing they were born into, and have never been out of a single minute in their lives! Eh? Does Mr. Weaver think the seal of circumcision was

changed to the seal of baptism in the days of John? Or were both seals used at the same time, and on the same people? He has not yet told us when the old seal was changed for the new, and we predict he will not tell. When he does, we will trip him up. He says Paul used the old seal in his day. and put it on persons that had already received the new seal!

But Zacharias talked to his little boy John, and told him God would raise up a horn of salvation for the Jews in the house of David, and remember his oath and covenant to Abraham, and spoke of righteousness and holiness, etc., and Mr. W. thinks that is strong language to use about "the old Abrahamic thing." That has no reference to the old circumcision thing, but to the spiritual promise made in the 12th chapter of Genesis. Our benighted friend still has the veil over his face, and can not tell the fleshly from the spiritual, or the church of Christ from the Jewish nation! He says the text teaches that John did not build a new church, but joined "that old thing," and brought all his converts into it. John and all his converts were in "that old thing" from the day of their birth, and did not have to be brought in, according to Mr. Weaver's doctrine!

But Isa. 56 says God will gather the eunuchs to his house, such as keep his Sabbaths, etc.. and Mr. W. thinks that was fulfilled in the gospel age. especially in the days of "Philip and the eunuch, or eunuch and the Philip." Does he not know that the Sabbath is not kept in the gospel age? Even the Methodists, who do not know God's spiritual institution from the Jewish nation, keep a different day from that spoken of in Isa. 56. Mr. W. says he can locate God's house in that chapter (for it was the house of Israel), and can locate its altar, for it was not a tank of water. That is correct. It was the house of Israel, to which Mr. W. does not belong (because he was not born in the house nor bought with the money), and the altar was a brazen thing on which they offered burnt offerings (see

7th verse), and not a Methodist straw-pen or a bench from the saw-mill. The eunuchs were not such as Philip baptized, for Philip's eunuch was already in the Abrahamic church, and had just been to its altar and house of prayer, but when he became a believer in Christ he was baptized into the church of Christ. Nor did Philip say anything to him about the burnt offerings or Sabbaths of Isa. 56. nor even the Methodist straw-pen, but took him down into the tank of water!

Our friend quotes Gal. 4, where the two covenants are set forth in the form of an allegory, and as usual cuts his own head off. Paul condemns the Galatians for doing what Mr. Weaver has been doing ever since this debate commenced—mixing the fleshly and the spiritual. Abraham was the father of two families, the one fleshly or natural, the other spiritual or miraculous. Abraham was the father of two churches—one fleshly; the other spiritual—one the Jewish nation, the other the church of Christ. A covenant was made with respect to each of these institutions, one in the 17th and the other in the 12th chapter of Genesis. The 17th chapter covenant developed into the fleshly seed of Abraham, the law of Moses, and the Jewish nation. The 12th chapter covenant developed into the spiritual seed of Abraham. the gospel of Christ, and the church of Christ. Each of these peoples had its tabernacle, its priesthood, its Jerusalem, and its Canaan. In the allegory Agar represents "Jerusalem that now is in the Jewish nation, born after the flesh), and is in bondage with her children," with her law from Sinai in Arabia, which is to be cast out. Isaac represents the spiritual seed, born from above, and a Jerusalem which is above, and (not now is, but is yet future.

We are very anxious for Mr. Weaver to come up to the subject of infant baptism, and discuss the question in debate. He has made six speeches, and has not said a word on the subject. All we have to do is to follow along behind him, and show that

the texts he quotes have no bearing upon the issue. But we would rather be engaged in debate. Let him come to Christ's commission, or the households, or to some example of baptism in the New Testament, and try to show there were some infants baptized. The Jewish nation, in which there were infants, is not the church of Christ. Mr. Weaver does not belong to it. If he could get into it, by being bought with money, and circumcised, and find ten million infants there, it would not help his doctrine a particle. There are no infants in the Methodist church. Why is he making such a dying struggle over "that old thing," with which he has no connection, and whose membership is different from the membership of the Methodist church? Why does he labor so hard to prove there were infants in the Jewish church (which we admit without proof), and will not try to prove there are infants in the Methodist church? If there are no infants in the Methodist church, all his arguments on circumcision are wasted. His creed says baptism puts them in, but it doesn't put the babies into the Methodist church. Why then baptize them?

MR. WEAVER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

Now, reader, I ask you, after reading the last reply, to examine the first reply, and see if our friend does not tell us plainly that the gospel promise which contained Christ was in Gen. 12th chapter, and if he does not tell us that "that old thing" which had no Christ, no faith, no remission, but a natural birth, with circumcision, was in Gen. 17th chapter, and was twenty-four years after the first promise. Our friend calls me "wild." I ask you now to put Paul's oft-repeated statement down by our friend's statement, and see how we stand to this time. Paul: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." Our friend finds the first in Gen. 12,

with Christ in it, and twenty-four years before the second, in Gen. 17, with natural birth. So with the first, with Christ and gospel, gone, and the second, with natural birth, established.

Our friend talks of the royal tabernacle of David, and says it was rebuilt. Who calls it the royal tabernacle? Not the Book of God.

Our friend admits there were infants in what he calls the Jewish church. Our Bible calls it the church of God. So far, so good. Our friend says Abraham was the father of, two nations, churches, families, one fleshly and the other spiritual. A little proof would be nice just here. But grant it, for sake of argument. Then his first spiritual children were born to him after he and his wife had been dead some two thousand years, and he was the father of a church some two thousand years before it had an existence.

Our friend complains about my not coming to infant baptism. I will come slowly on until I reach it, if I keep on living. As to what he says about the Sabbath, I trust we will discuss that subject before we are through. As to the eunuch and his baptism, etc., we will attend to that when we come to the baptism part of our subject.

I now read, on the question of repeal, Gal. 1:11-24: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God and wasted it; and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers. But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and

blood. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ; but they had heard only that he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which he once destroyed; and they glorified God in me." This text is nearer what our friends want than any they can find. When the Jews rejected Christ, they rejected the life and light of the church, they being then broken off because of unbelief. Yet they claimed to be the people of God. This Christless religion Paul called the Jews' religion, and Paul was cut off with them. But when he found Christ to be the Savior of the world, and not an impostor, he was grafted back into the same good olive tree from which he was cut off, for he says God is able to graft them in again, if they abide not in unbelief. Hence his language: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers. Into which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." So Paul was in the church of God known as the twelve tribes. Paul addresses the church of God in the old familiar Bible lame. Hear him: "But I say, Did not Israel know?" "But to Israel he saith. All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." Why did he not address our friend's supposed new church? Then Paul asks: "Hath God cast away his people?" He answers: "God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." So the faith he once destroyed was that this Jesus is the Christ, whom the Jews in unbelief rejected and Bailed an impostor. So he now preacheth Christ as the Savior of the world, and not as an impostor, as he preached while in unbelief and while cut off.

I now read Eph. 2:10-22: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. Wherefore remember,

that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one. and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace. And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." This new man was made by breaking down the middle wall of partition that had been between the Jews and Gentiles. That did not make it a new one, as contradistinguished from the old church, but simply means that the Gentiles were brought into the church of God, as the prophets predicted.

I read Isa. 14:1: "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the stranger shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob." This new man is made by the reunion of Israel and Judah, and, as we have seen, the introduction of the Gentile among them. I read Jer. 33:14-16:

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called: The Lord Our Righteousness." I read 7-9 vs. of same chapter: "And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them as at the first; and I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby- they have transgressed against me. And it shall be to me a name of joy, a praise and an honor before all the nations of the earth, which shall hear all the good that I do unto them: and they shall fear and tremble for all the goodness and for all the prosperity that I procure unto it." This is strange language for an inspired writer, if our friend's statement be true, no Christ, faith, nor requirement, in "that old thing," nothing but to be born of Abraham or bought with a rich old Jew's money. How could they be charged with sinning against God? For where there is no law, there can be no transgression. If. (hen. they had no Christ, no faith, no law of grace, how could they break a law that had no existence, and by breaking it sin against God?

I read Ezek. 37:15-10: "The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying. Moreover, thou son of man. take thee one stick and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick and write upon it. For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions; and join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not

show what thou meanest by these? Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God. Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand."

MR. BURNETT'S SEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver thinks there is a discrepancy between our first reply and our sixth reply. We said the covenant of the 12th chapter of Genesis is the spiritual covenant, while that of the 17th chapter of Genesis is the fleshly covenant (although made last), while Paul says, "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." It was stated in a former speech that, the "covenant concerning Christ" in Gen. 12 did not go into effect till Christ came, while the circumcision covenant in Gen. IT went into immediate effect, and thereby became the "first covenant," though made last. The last became first, and the first last. and. as Paul says, the last or second (from time of its going into effect) was established. Mr. W. has these covenants jumbled in his head till he does not know one from the other, and thinks we have made a mistake!

lie says that if Abraham was the father of two churches or peoples (one fleshly and the other spiritual), he was the father of children two thousand years before they were born. That is correct. Paul says. "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Gal. 3. Is Mr. Weaver a son of Abraham by faith, or is he only a bastard? We know he is not a child by birth, or by circumcision, or by being bought with money. Paul says, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." What kind of seed?

Our friend says he is coming to the question of infant baptism, but he is coming slowly. We are afraid the infants will

be full-grown men and women before he gets to them! He reminds us of the orator who said: "I am speaking for future generations'." A bystander replied: "If you keep on much longer, your audience will be here!"

Mr. Weaver thinks Paul was broken off, but grafted in again., for he says he held to the promise to which "our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." The twelve tribes held the promise of a Messiah to come, and Paul found that Messiah in Jesus. He was not grafted back into the Jewish nation, and this text shows nothing about the Jewish nation being the church of Christ, but the very opposite. While Paul "profited in the Jews' religion," he "persecuted the church of God and wasted it." Did the church of God persecute the church of God? Mr. Weaver thinks the Jews' religion was what Paul had while he was broken off. Were there two kinds of Jews' religion? Paul had one kind from his youth, and he says he was "as touching the law blameless," and "lived in all good conscience" to the hour of his conversion to Christianity. How could such a man be broken off? The religion was broken off from Paul (abolished), but Paul was not broken off from the religion, or from the Jewish nation, or anything else. If Paul lost the hope of the promise held by the twelve tribes and found it again, and the twelve tribes held it "instantly day and night," then the twelve tribes remained in the church! But Mr. W. has not been able to find a single soul in all the tribes of Israel that did not have to come in by the new door of baptism! Has he? We offered to give up the question if he could find one holding-over member. Even John the Baptist, who was full of the Holy Ghost from his birth, was not a holding-over member, for the least one in the kingdom was greater than John. Our friend knows more about it than Paul or Christ. Paul told the Galatians that when they went back Under the law (into the Jewish nation), they were "fallen from

grace." Christ said it was wrong to put a new patch on an old garment. But that is what Mr. W. has been trying to do ever since this debate commenced. He has a piece of Judaism, and a piece of heathenism, and a piece of Romanism, and a piece of Christianity, all stitched together in a sort of crazy-quilt called Methodism! We should like to have him make some attempt to meet the score of texts we have given him, showing that the Jewish nation and the spiritual kingdom of God are two different institutions. The let-alone process will not do before the readers of this debate. The new covenant was made "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." and when they rejected it they were broken off—but not from the Jewish nation.

He next quotes Eph. 2. where the "middle wall of partition" between Jews and Gentiles was broken down, and God "made of twain one new man," and he thinks that shows it was the same old church. We don't think "one new man" means "one old church." That very word "new" shows it was not the old. The Methodist idea of Eph. 2 is about this: The Jews were in a house that had a partition in it, and the Gentiles were on the other side of the partition; after awhile the partition was taken down, and the house remained. If that be a correct idea, both Jews and Gentiles were in the house before the removal of the partition! Will that do? Also, there was no new house builded, although the Savior said. "Upon this rock I will build my church," after the Jewish house had stood nearly two thousand years. Moreover, all the Jews were in the house and remained, yet our opponent can not find one single Jew in the whole nation that was in the church of Christ except he came in by the new door of baptism! All were in, yet all had to come in by baptism, and the Methodist creed says baptism is the initiatory rite into the church! Until our friend meets this issue, he need not quote another text, for this knocks out his whole

foundation. Here is what Paul means in Eph. 2: The wall between Jews and Gentiles was destroyed by the cross, and both were placed on a common footing, and God took such Jews as accepted Christ and such Gentiles as accepted Christ and of the twain one new man or church, for both had to come in. Listen: "And came and preached peace to you which were afar off (Gentiles), and to them that were nigh (Jews), for through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Peace was preached to both alike, and both alike had access to the Father. But Mr. Weaver thinks the Jews already had access!

He quotes Jer. 33, where God promised good things to Israel after the captivity (it has no reference to the gospel age), and says this is strange language to apply to people who had no faith, no law, no requirement, etc. We have never said there was no faith or righteousness among the Jews, but faith was not a condition of membership in the nation. Certain individuals had faith (in God), but it was not the faith of the gospel, because Paul says it was "before faith came," and while they were "shut up unto the faith that should afterwards be revealed." If faith had been a condition of membership, it would have cut out all the infants, like they are cut out of the spiritual kingdom of God. The Savior said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." They are cut out of baptism in like manner, because they can not have faith, and baptism depends upon faith. Mark 16. Acts 8:36.

He says we admit there were infants in the Abrahamic church. and "so far so good." Yes, but the admission is not far enough nor good enough to reach the church of Christ, and that is the one we are debating about. The admission does not even reach the Methodist church, for there are no infants in that body. We have been trying very hard to get Mr. Weaver

to tell us why he has shut the babies out of the Methodist church! Is that any part of the Abrahamic body? From the way he fights and dies for "that old thing," you would think it is the mother, or grandmother, or great-grandmother, or mighty-grandmother, of Methodism, and that the Methodist church is full of babies! Not so! The babies have all been "broken off," but Mr. Weaver will not tell us what the little things have done to deserve so sad a fate! He has a so-called baptism, which his creed says brings them into "the ark of Christ's church," but it has proven a failure. It does not bring a single infant into the church. We know what we are talking about, for this scribe was once a Methodist, and tried earnestly to get his first-born babe into the Methodist church, and failed! Why, then, give an infant baptism, when it does not put it in, and is only a pretense and a mockery? Why contend for identity with the Abrahamic body, when you have a different style of members?

We are hungry for some debate on infant baptism. When can we get it?

MR. WEAVER'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

"And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all, and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all; neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions; but I will save them out of all their

dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them; so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd, they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children forever; and my servant David shall be their prince forever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them, and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them forever more. My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God. and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for ever more." Now, my friends, you only have to note this text closely, and it settles this question forever. Our friend said it has reference "to Israel after the captivity." and that "it has no reference to the gospel age." Every Bible student knows that the kingdom was not divided until after the death of Solomon. God took Israel and gave it to Jeroboam, because of Solomon's sin, and left Judah in Rehoboam's hands for David's sake, and for his promise to David. Yet the text says plainly that David should be king over the united kingdom. So David here refers to Christ. Christ said. "I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star." As I have shown you in these texts, the divided kingdom was reunited on Pentecost, and Christ is king, and this united kingdom is called Israel and Jacob. So God's people are dwelling in it still, and they and their children, and their children's children forever, and that is quite awhile.

Our friend says there are no infants in the Methodist church.

I suppose he knows. If that is true, then the Methodist church is that much unlike the church of God, and is that much like the hot country, for it is sure I here are none down there. This text tells us that God put his sanctuary or tabernacle in the midst of this reunited nation of Israel for ever more. Let's see how this interpretation accords with God's promise to David. I read Ps. 89:1-5: "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever, with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said. Mercy shall be built up forever, thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations. And the heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Lord, thy faithfulness also in the congregation of the saints." I read v. 20-37: "I have found David my servant, with my holy oil have I anointed him, with whom my hand shall be established, mine arm also shall strengthen him; the enemy shall not exact upon him, nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him; but my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him. and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers; he shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for ever more, and my covenant shall stand fast with him; his seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven; if his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes, nevertheless *my* loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not

break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not die unto David. His seed shall endure forever and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." This text is too plain and emphatic to need any comment. If you believe it, the question is settled.

I read Mat. 16:18: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," What is the foundation of the church here spoken of? I read 1 Cor. 3:11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." I will ask if Christ was not the foundation of the spiritual church of God under the old dispensation? I read 1 Cor. 10:4: "And did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ."

Our friend said that first covenant "did not go into effect till Christ came." Why make that dodge? Why did he not say till Pentecost? You see, my friends, Christ has been here a long time. He was with his people in the wilderness, they drank of him, and he was with them. He said, "Before Abraham was I am." That was a fine dodge, yet the facts are against him still.

It is clearly taught in the Bible that our spiritual man enters the spiritual kingdom of God by the baptism of the Spirit. I read 1 Cor. 12:13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." I read John 3:5: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." So if the Savior teaches correctly, the baptism of both water and Spirit is an entering, and not a homing principle. One must be born before he can

be baptized, or enter either the visible or spiritual kingdom. It is also clearly taught that the physical man enters the visible kingdom by water baptism. I read Mat. 28:19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Our friend takes Baptist baptism, because he claims it as believer's baptism. So he puts himself into the Baptist pen, and he ought to accept their fate on this text. The Baptists teach that a believer is in Christ, "is not condemned," "is passed from death unto life," "hath everlasting life," and "hath the witness in himself." Our friend says this believer is all right. So this believer has no sins to remit; he has passed repentance and testifies to the fact. Our Baptist friends admit that we poor Methodists who have this faith are in Christ, not condemned, passed from death unto life, have everlasting life, and have the witness in ourselves. So they admit we are on this rock in Christ, that is. in the spiritual kingdom of God. Yet we are not in the Baptist church, nor in the supposed new church of our friend. Then, according to their teaching, neither the Baptist church nor its daughter is the kingdom of God. One can get into the spiritual kingdom of God without immersion, therefore neither of these is the kingdom of God. Our friend has been teaching that this text teaches that Christ organized a new church, contradistinguished from the Abrahamic covenant, which, as we have seen, developed into the church of God. To this date he has given no text that mentions a new church in the sense mentioned above, and I predict that when this question is closed there will be none given except by presumption. On an important issue like this, we want a plain text.

I read Heb. 10:9: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." We will let Paul explain. Heb. 9:1: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine

service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made, the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread. which is called the sanctuary." Note the contents of this covenant, or tabernacle.

MR. BURNETT'S EIGHTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver commences his speech by again quoting the text about the "sticks," in Ezek. 37, where God said he would unite Israel and Judah after he had gathered them out of captivity, That was spoken 587 years before Christ, while the Jews were in captivity. and was fulfilled when they returned to Canaan. It needs only an honest reading of the passage to convince any unprejudiced mind that it has no possible reference to the church of Christ or the gospel age. The prophecy begins in the 36th chapter, with the following statement: "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land; *then* will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." There was not an idolater in Israel on the day of Pentecost, and had not been for hundreds of years, and the Jews who heard Peter's sermon at Jerusalem were "devout men out of every nation under heaven," and they were not in captivity. The 30th verse of the prophecy says. "And I will multiply the fruit of the tree, and the increase of the field, that ye receive no more reproach of famine among the heathen." A famine commenced immediately after Pentecost, and lasted forty years. The prosperity promised in this chapter came after the captivity, but not after Pentecost. The prophecy is continued in the 37th chapter with the following statement: "I will take the children of Israel (that doesn't include Mr. Weaver) from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on

every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel." Has this been fulfilled in the gospel age? Is Mr. Weaver on the mountains of Israel? Is he "in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt?" He knows he is not. How did you happen to overlook that item, Mr. Weaver? And how did you happen to overlook the fact that Israel and Judah were unified hundreds of years before the day of Pentecost, and that there has" been no unification of tribes since Christ was born? You were so busy hunting for what is not in the text, that you overlooked what the text plainly contains! Well, well, that is bad! This text, like every other one he has quoted since the discussion began, has no bearing upon the question in debate. But it says, "David my servant shall be king over them," and Mr. Weaver says David is Christ. He gives no proof. The word is used symbolically, and means a ruler after God's own heart, like David. The word "forever" is used here as it is used in the circumcision covenant. The Jews prevented the fulfillment of all the promise by violating God's law and forfeiting their rights under the covenant.

He says, "Our friend says there are no infants in the Methodist church; if that be true, the Methodist church is that much unlike the church of God, and is that much like the hot country." Why did he not say yes or no to our assertion? He disliked to admit it, and he was afraid to deny it, so he said *if!* Say, Mr. Weaver: If we thought the Methodist church was unlike the church of God, we would get out of it. But you have not yet shown us any infants in the church of God. have you? You have not been in a thousand miles of the church of God since this debate began. You say there are no infants in the "hot country." Don't be too certain about that. If the Methodist doctrine be true, that all infants are "con-

ceived and born in sin," and under the wrath of God, and they are "delivered" from that wrath by water baptism (as the Discipline says), the unbaptized infant stands a good change to go to the "hot country!" Eh?

He quotes 1 Cor. 3, where Paul says Christ is the foundation of the church, and he asks if Christ is not the foundation of the spiritual church of God under the old dispensation?" There was no spiritual church under the old dispensation. There were spiritual men back there, but they were not called out into a body by themselves, as in the gospel age. The only called out body was the Jewish nation (called out from other nations), and its foundation was the flesh and blood of Abraham—not Christ. But did not Paul say they "did all drink of that spiritual rock?" Yes. and in type they did, but not in any other sense. If Christ was the foundation of the church they were in, then his church was built in the days of Abraham, but he old Peter Mat. 16) it was not built till nearly two thousand years after Abraham. He said, "Upon this rock I *will build* my church," and used the future tense. How did you happen to overlook that point in your text. Mr. Weaver? According to your theory, the church was built before the foundation was laid, and the future tense points backward! And why did you not try to explain why all the Jews had to be baptized into the church of Christ, in order to become members of it? He wants a text that says a new church was set up. We gave him a goodly number, which he has not noticed. Why did you not attend to Paul, where he said God made of twain "one new man?" Does one new man mean one old church?

He tries to get the Jews into the church of Christ, by saying there is a spiritual church or invisible kingdom into which the souls of men are baptized by the Holy Spirit (Cor. 12), while their bodies go into the visible church by water baptism. So he gets a man's soul into one kingdom and his body into an-

other, yet his soul is in his body! That might be termed the *argumentum ad scatterum!* Say, Mr. Weaver: The babies are not in the spiritual church, because they have not been baptized by the Spirit, and they are not in the Methodist church (that is the visible thing), because you will not let them in, so they are not in anything! Please tell us where to locate the babies? You say they are born sinners, and your creed says the wrath of God is washed off of them by water baptism, but an unbaptized baby has not been washed by either water or Spirit, and is in neither the visible nor invisible church, while the wrath of God abides upon it! Where is it.? You think Cor. 12:13 refers to Spirit baptism. John Wesley does not agree with you. He says the baptism of that text is water baptism. The word "by" doesn't indicate element. By one Spirit (in the element water) we are baptized into one body, the church. But you have two bodies, a visible and an invisible body. Paul says, "There is one body." You do not agree with Paul. The Savior says. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God"—not kingdoms. You have two kingdoms. You do not agree with the Savior. He said "born again." You say "born again and again." Too many births, too many kingdoms, too many bodies!

But we should like to have Mr. AY. tell us where to locate the babies. He says there are no infants in the "hot country" (though that is uncertain), and he knows there are none in the "Methodist church, and can not prove there are any in the invisible church (for he never saw that thing), and if he can ever get him to the New Testament we will show him there are no infants in the church of Christ.

Mr. Weaver leaves the subject, near the latter part of his speech, and runs off after the Baptists. And he misrepresents the Baptists. The Baptists do not admit that the Methodists are in the spiritual kingdom of God, for no sensible Baptist

believes there is any spiritual kingdom of God except the visible church of Christ. Nor do we admit that any believer "hath everlasting life" or is "in Christ" before baptism. Paul says we are "baptized into Christ." Gal. 3:27. How then can a man be "in Christ" before he is baptized into Christ? And how can a man have eternal life while out of Christ? But this belongs to the next proposition, and we will let it wait till Mr. Weaver gets through with infant baptism. He has not even commenced on it yet. and we are afraid he will never get through. He ought not to say that we accept Baptist baptism, or that we are in the Baptist pen. He has been a subscriber to our paper long enough to know better than that. We accept the baptism of believers (for that is scriptural, not Baptist), and we oppose the Baptist pen. There is no more authority for a Baptist pen than for a Methodist pen, and there is no more authority for the Methodist pen than for Beelzebub's pen, or for infant baptism!

We trust our friend will give us something in his next speech on the subject in debate.

MR. WEAVER'S NINTH SPEECH.

Our friend asks how I overlooked the fact that Israel and Judah were unified hundreds of years before Pentecost. I overlooked it because the Bible teaches to the contrary, as I have shown. Our friend says, "Mr. Weaver says David is Christ." I did not say that. My speech is before the reader. Our friend says my creed says the wrath of God is washed off them (the babes) by water baptism. I say the statement can't be found in the Discipline. He says John Wesley does not agree with me. Let him quote Mr. Wesley fully, and we will see. He says there was no spiritual church under the old dispensation. He grants there were spiritual men back there.

In his former speeches he tells us there was no Christ, nor faith. Then how could men be spiritual.'

Our friend says we have too many kingdoms. We have one kingdom, with the external and internal apartments. Every man is two. the outward and the inward man, yet one man. The natural man can not discern spiritual things; it is one too many for him to see.

Our friend says I misrepresent the Baptists. He takes immersion performed by Baptists, yet no Baptist preacher can legally immerse one until he by his faith professes to be in Christ. Yet he says no man can be in Christ until he is immersed into Christ, and no one can have everlasting life before immersion. Hence, according to our friend's standpoint the Baptist believer is a lying believer, yet he will take him. How is that for a Baptist pen? Eh?

I closed last speech with Heb. 9:1-2. I read v. 3-5: "And after the second veil the tabernacle, which is called the holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant: And over it the cherubims of glory, shadowing the mercy seat, of which we can not now speak particularly." Note the contents of this covenant or tabernacle, called the second. I read v. 6: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God." So in the first they ordinarily worshiped. I read v. 7: "But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people." Here then we have two tabernacles, the first or outward, the second or inward. The people came regularly into the first with their priests to worship, but into the second the high priest alone went once a year to represent himself and the people before

God. The first tabernacle was taken away, and the second established. This second one was prior to Pentecost, and therefore could not be a new one, contradistinguished from the old one, for it was the inward part of the old tabernacle of David, which had fallen down, as we have shown. And the future tense in Mat. 16:18, as we have shown, referred to the rebuilding of the tabernacle of David, and not to the building of a new one nearly two thousand years after Abraham. I read v. 8-10: "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." This first tabernacle with its ordinances was a figure for that time pointing to Christ. Si when Christ accomplished his work, the first tabernacle with its ordinances pointing to Christ's coming was to be taken away, in order for the establishment of the second. I read v. 11: "But Christ being come, an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say not of this building, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Christ, our high priest, enters into this second, called the holiest of all. with the sins of the whole world. So the Second was the greater or more perfect tabernacle, it not being

made with hands. The first was made with hands, and its blood was that of bulls and goats, which typified the blood of the second, which was the blood of Christ. I said the first was made by man. I read Ex. 25:8: "And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them." The second the Lord made. Ex. 15:17-18: "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place. O Lord, which thou hast made to dwell in; in the sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established. The Lord shall reign forever and ever." So this second sanctuary was the most holy place where God dwells. The high priest went in once a year. Ex. 28:29-30: "And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the breast plate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth into the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually. And thou shalt put in the breast plate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim, and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth before the Lord, and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." So the inward sanctuary located in the second tabernacle was where God dwelt among his people. To show you that God was there, I read Ex. 24:10: "And they saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone. as it were the body of heaven in his clearness." So you see, my friends, that Paul, when he said he taketh away the first that he may establish the second, has no reference to the covenant of Abraham. That first tabernacle served just as the scaffolding the carpenter uses in building the house, and when it has served its purpose he takes it down, and the building is permanently established. So the bloody ordinances looking to the crucifixion of Christ were taken away or nailed to the cross.

Now, my friends, to show you that the covenant with Abra-

ham was not repealed, I read Acts 3:24-25: "Yea. and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed." This text mentions the covenant made with the fathers, and it is after Pentecost. They ought to have been children of the new.

I read Isa. 9:6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful. Counsellor, the Mighty God. the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end: upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it. with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." I read Jer. 33:17-26: "For thus saith the Lord: David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. And the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah saying. Thus saith the Lord: If ye can break my covenant of the day. and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season, then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites. the priests, my ministers. As the hosts of heaven can not be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me. Moreover, the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying. Considerest thou not what this people have Spoken, saying. The two families which the Lord hath chosen. he hath even cast them off? Thus they have despised my peo-

ple, that they should be no more a nation before them. Thus saith the Lord: If my covenant be not with day and night, and I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham. Isaac and Jacob, for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them."

MR. BURNETT'S NINTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver has made another speech (the ninth), and has not said a word on the subject of infant baptism. We guess the Methodist readers of this discussion are saying: "Bro. Weaver, if you have got anything to say for our sinking cause, for the Lord's sake bring it on, or we are gone forever!"

Be says we charged him with misrepresenting the Baptists. We did so. in his statement that Baptists admit that Methodists are in the spiritual kingdom of God. Baptists teach that the only spiritual kingdom of God is the visible church of Christ, and Methodists are not in that. But he says we receive Baptists, who think they are saved before baptism, and if they are believers they are lying believers. We do not receive Baptists, nor Methodists for the errors they hold, but because they are believers in Christ. If they believe in Christ when they are baptized, they receive valid baptism, although they are in error in regard to the place of pardon. Mr. Weaver receives Baptists also, although they believe a falsehood about the doctrine of "once in grace always in grace." Does he receive them as "lying believers?"

He says we misrepresented him. in saying that he said David is Christ. God said of the re-united kingdom of Israel and Judah (after the captivity). "David my servant shall be king over them," meaning a king like David. Mr. Weaver said:

"David here refers to Christ." A man ought not to forget his own words! He also says we misrepresented the Discipline, in saying that it teaches that "the wrath of God is washed off of them (the babies) by water baptism." He says, "The statement can't be found in the Discipline." Listen here at the baptismal prayer:

"Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water, and also didst safely lead the children of Israel thy people through the Red sea, figuring thereby thy holy baptism: we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon this child; wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's church," etc.

Does Mr. Weaver pray the prayer, and not believe it? Now listen again, at the introductory speech of the minister:

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God, I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this child that which by nature he can not have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church."

Mr. Weaver used to think there were infants in the Methodist church, till we taught him better. And now we will teach him that this little book says the wrath of God is washed off of the babes in baptism, and that they are outside the kingdom of God till baptized, and in danger of damnation! It is in the book, beloved, and there is no need to make a fuss about it. A presiding elder ought to know his own creed, but Mr. W. will have to be taught a few lessons.

In a former speech he said a man's soul entered the invisible

kingdom, and his body the visible kingdom. We called that the *argumentum ad scatterum*. A man's soul is in his body, and they can not be in two different kingdoms. He got up this double-kingdom concern to make a place for the babies. We showed they were not in the Methodist church (that is the visible), and hence they must be in the invisible. But they can not enter the invisible without a birth of the Spirit, and it can not be shown that any babe was ever born of the Spirit. Hence the babies are nowhere!

To save this double-kingdom invention, Mr. Weaver goes to the old Jewish tabernacle, which had two departments. He thinks this represents the two rooms in God's church, one for the soul and the other for the body! A presiding elder ought to know it typifies the church and heaven. But the Jewish babies did not enter the tabernacle at all! What will you do with that, beloved? Next he tries to show that God made one part of the tabernacle and man the other, and the part that man made was abolished, but the part God made is yet standing! If he will read the 25th and 26th chapters of Exodus he will find that man made all parts of the tabernacle, and that Paul says in Heb. 9 that the entire tabernacle was a "figure" of "a greater and more perfect tabernacle" in which Christ should be high priest. We have seen some pretty wild capers cut by wild presiding elders, but this tabernacle caper out-capers all the capers that we have seen caper since the world began! Then he caps the caper by calling it "the tabernacle of David!" It was not David's tabernacle, and David could not enter either department of it. The tabernacle of David, mentioned in Acts 1."). was the royal house of David, and had no relation to the Mosaic tabernacle, or to the Abrahamic church. Say, Mr. Weaver: If the most holy place of that old tabernacle yet exists, we should like for you to tell us where it can be seen? Where is the ark? and where is the mercy-seat? and

where are the tables of stone, and the pot of manna? Even a wild presiding elder ought to know that the tabernacle (the entire tabernacle) was superseded by the reality, the true tabernacle, and has no more existence than the law of Moses or the church of Abraham. The Levitical priesthood, the Abrahamic church, the law, the land covenant, circumcision, infant membership—all died together. Our zealous friend, alas, has the veil over his face, and can not see the end of that which is abolished! He still struggles for membership in that old "Abrahamic thing," and yearns for his "forty acres and a mule" in the land of Canaan, but we tell him kindly he is too late! He had better change the Methodist church into a church of Christ, turn from Levi to Jesus, from the law to the gospel, and begin to attend to the things written in the New Testament. Then the veil will be removed from his heart!

He says the Bible teaches that there was no unification of Israel and Judah before the day of Pentecost. A presiding elder ought to be better posted in the Bible than that. The prophecy of Ezekiel (36th and 37th chapters) said this unification should take place on the return from captivity. Did the prophecy tell a falsehood? The proclamation of Cyrus permitted all Israelites to return to their own land, and many thousands of them did so. There were representatives of all the tribes in Canaan at the birth of Christ, and there had been but one nation since the captivity. The great prosperity foretold in the prophecy did come, as we learn from the speech of Herod, made when he raised the collection to build his great temple, and recorded by Josephus. But neither prosperity to the Jewish nation, nor any unification of tribes, came after Pentecost, but famine and pestilence and war and utter destruction.

Mr. Weaver thinks there could be no spiritual people in the old time, unless Christ was there and faith in Christ was there.

Paul says the law was added "till the seed should come," and says that "before faith came we were kept under the law." Our wild friend says the seed came and faith came in the days of Abraham and Moses, and contradicts Paul.

He quotes Acts 3 to show that the "covenant with Abraham was not repealed." Yes, *but* there were two covenants made with Abraham, and this one in Acts 3 is the gospel covenant, made twenty-four years before the circumcision-land covenant. If the circumcision covenant was not repealed, why has not Mr. W. been circumcised?

He closes his speech by again quoting Jer. 33, to show that the Levies should never want a man to "offer burnt offerings and to kindle meat offerings." hence Abraham's church still stands. Dors Mr. Weaver think the Levies are offering burnt offerings and kindling meat offerings on the earth today? Did he ever see a meat offering kindled? Where? That covenant, which was as inviolate with God as his covenant with regard to day and night, was broken by the Levites. and became null and void. There are no Levies now. Did our wild friend never hear Paul say. "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law?" And did he never hear Peter say. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood?" A slight reading of the New Testament would drive those wild notions out of our wild friend's head.

MR. WEAVER'S TENTH SPEECH.

Our friend says in the text given, saying, "David my servant shall be king over them." means a king like David. I would have to have proof before I believed that.

We are called to the Discipline again. In a former speech he said. "Your creed says the wrath of God is washed off of them in water baptism." I believe the statement in the Disci-

pline, and will be glad to defend it at the proper time. as he agreed to take it in proposition form.

Our friend says the tabernacle of David "had no relation to the Mosaic tabernacle, or to the Abrahamic church." I see no proof of the statement. He tells us "the church of Abraham, the Levitical priesthood, the law. circumcision and infant membership all died together." A little proof there would be better than a mere statement, to the thoughtful. We will see about the land of Canaan later on. Also we will have something to say about the tribes later.

We are told there were two covenants made with Abraham. I would like the proof. The one, our friend says, was made twenty-four years before the land covenant. Paul says, "He taketh away the first," etc. So the second, or land covenant, is established, our friend being judge.

I read 1 Chron. 17:11 "And it shall come to pass, when the days be expired that thou must go to be with thy fathers, that I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons: and I will establish his throne forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son; and I will not take my mercy away from him, as I took it from him that was before thee. But I will settle him in mine house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established for evermore."

I read in Lu. 1:30-33: "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb. and bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Verses 67-70: "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people; and hath raised up an horn of salvation

for us, in the house of his servant David: As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began." It would have suited our friend if the prophet had said. "I will settle him in mine house and in my kingdom until after the captivity." Then said. "He hath visited and killed the church, law, priesthood and babe membership all together, and hath raised up a new church for us."

I read 1 Chron. 22:10: "He shall build an house for my name; and he shall be my son, and I will be his father; and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel forever." I read Zech. 12:9-10: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all nations that come against Jerusalem; and I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplications, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadad-rimmon in the valley of Megiddon." Verses 12-1-1 tells us that "the land shall mourn, every family apart" and "their wives apart."

I read Zech. 13:1: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." "In that day," in these texts, refers to Pentecost, the opening up of the new dispensation. There was great mourning and giving up of sin on that day, for about three thousand were added to the "seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to Baal." If that was the first day, there would have been nothing to add to. We learn from Acts 3 that this revival was held in the temple. Verse 11 tells us "all the people ran together unto them, in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly wondering." David said of God's church: "They that trust in the Lord shall be

as mount Zion, which can not be removed, but abideth forever."

I read Isa. 4:5:1: "But now, thus saith the Lord that created thee. O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel. Fear not, for I have redeemed thee. I have called thee by thy name: thou art mine." If there be a new one contradistinguished from this one. God did not form or organize it, nor redeem it nor name it. unless he has two brides. Verse 3: It is said of this one Israel: "I am the Lord thy God, the Holy one of Israel, thy Savior." The new one has no God. no Savior. This one is said to be precious in God's sight. God loved it, and is with it. Its children are sons and daughters of God. It is called by his name. God created it for his glory. The blind, the deaf, and all nations are to be gathered into it. and it is to be the light and witness to all nations, for God formed it for himself, and is king over it forever.

I read Rom. 9:1-5: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises: whose are the fathers, and of whom according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever."

I read Acts 13:26: "Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent." I think no one can believe these texts and entertain the idea that God has cast away or destroyed his chosen people Israel. Hear Paul: "Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." No one can believe the Bible and believe there is a new church contra-

distinguished from the church of God. organized in the house of Abraham.

We now note the church under the similitude of a family. Our proposition is the family of today is the Adamic family perpetuated. I read Gen. 12:3: "And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The whole earth peopled through this family. I read Gen. 9:9: "These are the three sons of Noah, and of them was the whole earth overspread." In Luke 3:23-38 we have the genealogy from Christ back to Adam, who was the son of God. All families of same blood. Acts 17:26: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." The whole of this family was redeemed by Christ. Rev. 5:9: "And they sang a new song, saying. Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and people, and nation." I will ask who compose a family? I will say it is composed of father, mother, and their children regardless of age or size. How is the family perpetuated? By the increase of its own offspring, and not by proselyting. You say it is well said. Suppose a person were now to attempt to persuade you that we are not of the old Adamic family. Would you believe him? You would say no, for the Bible is too plain on the subject for any one to be mistaken. So the Bible is just as plain as to the family of Abraham. As Adam is the father or head of the natural seed, or families of the earth, so Abraham is the father or head of the spiritual family. Paul says, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ." He says of those who are baptized into Christ, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female." He says, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Then why will you believe any one

trying to prove there is a new church contradistinguished from the church of God organized in the family of Abraham? A child must be born into the family, and it is recognized at its birth as a member of the family, and is entitled to the token of membership. Jno. 3:3 "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God."

MR. BURNETT'S TENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says he will defend the Discipline at the proper time. The proper time to defend the Discipline on infant baptism is when we are debating infant baptism. We have shown that his creed contradicts his speeches, and he should make some effort to harmonize the two. The Discipline says that baptism is the initiatory rite into the church of Christ, and Mr. W. says the Abrahamic church is the church of Christ, yet all the members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized to get into the church of Christ. He ought to fix this up somehow, or he ought to repudiate his Discipline. Then he ought to tell us why he has no infants in the Methodist church. It is foolish to strain himself as he does to prove that the Abrahamic thing is the thing, because there are babies in it, when there are no babies in the Methodist thing! If we were a Methodist, and reading this debate, we would demand that the gentleman do something for his cause, or that he throw up the sponge and quit the field.

Our friend wants proof of the statement that the Abrahamic church, circumcision, the law, the Levitical priesthood and infant membership all died together. We can give it. It has already been shown that no member of the Abrahamic church was a member of Christ's church without initiation, viz., baptism. Also Christ said, nearly two thousand years after the establishment of the Abrahamic church. "Upon this rock I

will build my church." and used the future tense. That ends the Abrahamic concern. Paul said, "But now we are delivered from the law. that being dead wherein we were held." Rom. 7:6. That ends the law. Paul also said. "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. 7:12. That ends the Levitical priesthood. Wonder how many Levites there are in the Methodist church? The same apostle said. "If ye be circumcised. Christ shall profit you nothing." Gal. 5:2. That ends circumcision. And as our friend can not find one infant member of the church of Christ in the New Testament (and can not be induced to try to find it), that ends infant membership. So we have furnished the proof of our statement.

He still wants proof that there were two covenants made with Abraham, one when he was seventy-five years old, and the other when he was ninety-nine years old. We gave all the proof that was needed when we were on that part of the subject, and he did not refute it. He thinks if the land covenant was made last, or second, it was established, because Paul says. "He taketh away the first." etc. We explained that fully, and he did not controvert it. The second or land covenant went into immediate effect, while the gospel covenant was only a promise for over nineteen hundred years. Hence, the last or land covenant became the first in operation, and was taken away when the gospel covenant became operative. Mr. Weaver wants the land covenant established, because it contains circumcision and infants, though he has neither one in the Methodist church. And to show that he does not believe his own statements, he has never tried to obtain his "forty acres and a mule" under that land covenant, and he has never been circumcised!

He quotes a text from 1 Chron. 17. about Solomon and the house he would build, which has no bearing. Then he quotes

what the angel said to Mary about Christ sitting on the throne of his father David. Yes. but the angel did not say "his father Abraham"—did he I Abraham had no throne, and David had no church, hence these texts have no bearing upon the church question. Christ is a son of David, and reigns over spiritual Israel as David reigned over fleshly Israel, and in that sense he is a successor of David. There are two Israels, as there are two covenants and two churches, but our slow friend has never made the discovery. He is so stuck on that old "Abrahamic thing" that he is about two thousand years behind date. Say, Mr. Weaver: Is Christ reigning over the Jewish nation today? Please tell us where that nation can be found.'

But, we could admit everything that he has tried to prove since the debate began—that there is only one covenant god one Israel, and that the Abrahamic church is the church of Christ—and it does not establish infant baptism. When the new dispensation began, and baptism was instituted. Christ made faith a condition of baptism, and an infant can not have faith. This will be shown fully, when Mr. Weaver comes to the question in debate. So far he has not done a solitary thing for his proposition, but has wasted all his sweetness on the desert air. We now advise him, that if he will find one case of ,baptism without faith, in the New Testament, we will give up the question.

He says "in that day," in his prophetic texts, means the day of Pentecost, and they had much mourning, and a great revival. Yes, and the mourners were told, to be "baptized for remission of sins" and they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost! Rather strange Methodist revival, eh? It would take six years to get three thousand converts through, by the modern workbench system! Our wild friend thinks the three thousand were added to the "seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." Where did he learn that?

The Book says they were added "unto them." The pronoun "them" refers to some noun that has been mentioned. What noun has been mentioned? The hundred and twenty have been mentioned, but the seven thousand have not been mentioned. Mr. Weaver is as poor a grammarian as he is a theologian. But he thinks if Pentecost was the first day, there was nothing to add to. He counts the hundred and twenty nothing. They were there before Pentecost, but the Spirit was put into the body that day, and it is called the beginning day. But see what a predicament our friend gets himself into: He thinks the three thousand were added to the Abrahamic church, in which they had been members since the day of their birth, therefore they were added to themselves! That is a nice mess of logic! Paul says there was a "remnant" that "obtained it," and the rest of Israel were blinded, because "they sought it not by faith." yet Mr. Weaver thinks that remnant (the seven thousand) obtained it by being hold-over members of the Abrahamic church! Say, beloved: If you will find one single man of the seven thousand that did not have to come into the church of Christ by baptism, we will give up the question. Membership in that old Abrahamic thing amounted to nothing when it came to entrance into the church of Christ. Paul says in the same passage: "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Rom. 9. That knocks out all the texts he has quoted about fleshly Israel, and the natural seed of Jacob, and all the grand things he has read you about the Abrahamic people. They are not worth a button to this controversy. What if God did name Israel, and was married to Israel, Christ was never married to the Jewish nation, and was never the head of the Jewish nation. Paul told the Roman Jews that they had "become dead to the law" (of the Jewish nation) "by the body of Christ." that they "should be mar-

ried to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." Rom. 7:5. Here is a second marriage. Mr. Weaver thinks Adam was the father of the fleshly family and Abraham the father of the spiritual family. Paul says, "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit," and he says the last Adam is "the Lord from heaven." not Abraham. In Gal. 3 he says believers are the children of Abraham, but that cuts out all the infants. Listen: "Know ye therefore that they which be of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Is the infant "of faith?" We challenge Mr. Weaver to get an infant into the spiritual family of Abraham!

.Mr. Weaver's last text overthrows all he has said in his whole speech. A person can not enter the kingdom or family of God without birth—a birth of water and Spirit—and no infant was ever so born. Hence an infant can not be a member of the church or kingdom of God. It could enter the old fleshly family by a fleshly birth (which our valiant friend tries so hard to prove is the true church), but it can not enter the spiritual family without a spiritual birth. This shows the two institutions are not the same. Mr. W. admits there must be a birth, and we challenge him to show that an infant has anything but a fleshly birth.

MR. WEAVER'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

We have mention of the Discipline again—mere statements as to what it says. Why can't we have the language of the Discipline, and the page?

It is claimed that we have the proof that "no member of the Abrahamic church was a member of Christ's church without baptism." I failed to see anything but a statement to that effect. We are referred to, "Upon this rock I will build my

church." We have shown that the church that was built was the tabernacle of David. See Amos 9:8-11, Acts 15:13-18. If these texts can be relied on, that is the church Christ built in the future.

We have the law. priesthood and circumcision ended short. Yet Paul preached and practiced that law and its teaching many years after Pentecost. We will come to the infant member later.

He says the covenant was made, but did not go into operation until Pentecost. Then Abraham's and Sarah's first children were born to them some two thousand years after they were both dead. Two Israels—Mr. W. slow to discover that fact. I don't see it yet. "Our friend thinks the three thousand were added to the seven thousand." I thought Pentecost was the first day. If Pentecost was the first day, how could there be some to add to on that day? I will ask. Has Christ more than one kingdom on earth? Is any one a legal member of Christ's church who has never been immersed into it for remission of sins? Has any person who is not a member of Christ's church authority to baptize one into Christ's church? Is salvation in or out of Christ's church? Has any one salvation and scriptural evidence of it who has never been immersed for remission? I trust our friend will answer each of these questions frankly and plainly.

"All children of God by faith. That knocks Abrahamic people and babes out." Our friend admitted in a former speech that God had some spiritual people in the old dispensation, but now they are all gone, all out. I have given you chapter and verse proving that there never was a person scripturally in the church of God in that dispensation simply by the natural birth, but God's true Israel were circumcised in heart, and why any man will continue to affirm such a statement is a puzzle to me. We are asked: "What if God did

name Israel, Christ was never married to the Jewish nation," etc. Do I understand him to mean that God was the God of old Israel, and that Christ is the God of the supposed new Israel? I will ask my friend the plain straight question, Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the very and eternal God? I would be glad to have the answer yes or no.

I invite your attention to Mark 12th chapter, where the church of God is presented to us under the similitude of a vineyard. "And he began to speak unto them by parables. A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine vat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country." We first notice the vineyard was planted by its owner. This teaches me that God organized his own church. So, as we have shown, he did it in the family of Abraham. And the owner hedged it in, and prepared the place for the fruit. Then he let it out to husbandmen, and at the proper time he sent a servant to receive his part of the fruit from the husbandmen, and they beat him, and sent him away empty. So he sent another servant, and they wounded him with stones, and sent him away shamefully handled. And he sent another servant, and they killed him. And he sent many others, and they beat some of them, and killed some. He then sent his only son. thinking they would reverence him. But they said among themselves. "This is the heir, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours." So they killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard. Now the question is. What will the lord of the vineyard do? The way our friend has been arguing, he will destroy the "old thing," the vineyard, and will build a brand new one. But the way it really is: "He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others." So these Jews, who were in possession of the vineyard, rejected Christ and so apostatized as to lose the light and life of the gospel, and therefore

brought no fruit, and God said unto them, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." That was the right thing to do. So, instead of destroying the vineyard, he destroyed the wicked husbandmen, and let the vineyard out to others. I will ask, What was the vineyard? I read Isa. 5:7: "For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant; and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry." So the Lord's vineyard is the house of Israel. I will ask, Where did his vineyard come from? I read Ps. 80:8: "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt, thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it." God planted it. Verse 15: "The vineyard which thy right hand hath planted." What composes the true vineyard? The old and young vines. How is the vineyard to be perpetuated? By the transplanting of the young or babe vines, and not by capturing our neighbor's old ones.

I next call attention to the church of God presented to us under the similitude of the olive tree. I read Jer. 11:16-17: "The Lord called thy name A green olive tree, fair and of goodly fruit: With the noise of a great tumult he hath kindled fire upon it, and the branches of it are broken. For the Lord of hosts, that planted thee, hath pronounced evil against thee, for the evil of the house of Israel and of the house of Judah, which they have done against themselves to provoke me to anger in offering incense unto Baal." We learn from this text that the Lord named and planted this tree, and pronounced evil against it, because of its sins. It is the house of Israel and Judah.

Our friend tells us that this old thing was destroyed, or ended, when Christ came. He or Paul one is mistaken, for Paul asked (Rom. 11), "Hath God cast away his people?" He answers: "God forbid." He then tells us he was "an Israelite, of the

seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." Paul, in talking of the Gentiles, said. "And if some of the branches be broken off. and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast. thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say. The branches were broken off. that I might be grafted in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: On them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in, for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree." If these Jews who were natural branches were broken off because of unbelief, and if none but true believers could be in, or grafted in, and remain, how were they except as believers to be broken off! You see from the text that none but true believers could get in, or remain in. And if these Jews were not true believers, how could they fall? What had a sinner to fall from? If they were not believers, they were sinners, then how could they fall? Then, if these were not in the old olive tree, how could the Gentiles be any more of the wild olive tree, and be contrary to nature grafted into this good olive tree? In other words, why would not the Gentiles be as much the natural branches of this new good olive tree as the Jews who had never been in it? Again, if this was a new olive tree, and the Jews had never been in it. how could they be grafted in "again?" And if they had not been the natural

branches of it. and in possession of it. how could they be "grafted into their own olive tree?" I will ask, If the old church was destroyed, as our friend says, how can we account for this prophecy: Isa. 14:1: "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob." We have the fulfillment of that prophecy in the figure we note here. The Gentiles, the strangers, were grafted contrary to nature in that good olive tree.

MR. BURNETT'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says we made "mere statements" of what the Discipline says, and he calls for the language and the page. We gave the exact words of the Discipline, in quotation marks, and showed that the creed contradicts his speeches. The creed says persons are baptized into the church, and as all members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized, they were not in the church of Christ before baptism. Hence the Abrahamic church is not the church of Christ. This one point upsets all that he has said on identity. No wonder he does not try to defend the Discipline!

He says the statement of the Savior, "I will build my church." (Mat. 16), refers to the "tabernacle of David" that had "fallen down." and which God said he would "build again," as quoted by Peter in Acts 15. The word used in Acts 15, is *anoikodomeso*, and means to rebuild, while the word used in Mat. 16 is *oikodomeso*, and means to build—not rebuild. Did not Mr. W. notice that prefix to the verb in Acts 15? The tabernacle of David (royal house) had fallen down, and was to be rebuilt. but not so the church. Hence inspiration used two words to express the two acts. Mr. Weaver is again in conflict with the Bible.

He says Paul practiced the law after Pentecost. Not as a part of Christianity. Paul says at Rom. 7:6, "But now we are delivered from the law." The laws and customs of the Jews were national as well as religious, and some of these were observed as long as the nation stood, but they were not commanded of Christians.

Our friend thinks if the gospel covenant was not in operation till Pentecost, Abraham's spiritual children were born two thousand years after his death. That is correct. Children are being born to Abraham today. Paul says. "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. 3), but he says in the same chapter, "Before faith came we were kept under the law. shut up unto the faith." Did Abraham have spiritual children (by faith) before faith, came? He says he "don't see it yet"—two Israels. We have heard of the man who didn't see the rats—because he shut his eyes. All Christians are children of Abraham, not by flesh but by faith, and everybody who has read the Bible i except our wild friend) knows there are two sorts of Israelites. But being a member of the fleshly family does not give one the privilege of being a member of the spiritual family. Even Nicodemus had to be born again in order to enter the spiritual kingdom of God.

Our friend asks whether Christ is the very and eternal God, and whether he has more than one kingdom on earth, and whether salvation is in the church, and who is a lawful administrator of baptism? When he shows what bearing these questions have on the subject in debate, they will be answered. At present we prefer that he shall discuss infant baptism. He has made eleven speeches, and has not yet touched the subject! Why does he not answer our question, why all the members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized into the church of Christ? Also, why are there no infants in the Methodist church?

He says he has "given proof that no person was in the church of the old dispensation simply by natural birth. We did not see the proof, but if he gave it he knocked all the babies out for they had nothing but the natural birth! There are no babies in the Methodist church, and now he has knocked them all out of the old Abrahamic thing! Where are the babies, Mr. Weaver? You are too awkward a man to handle babies!

He comes next to the parable of the vineyard, and says God did not destroy the vineyard and plant another, but let it out to other husbandmen. That is correct. His mistake is in thinking the old Abrahamic church is the vineyard. He has got the parable jumbled in his head till he doesn't know the husbandmen from the vineyard! The men that stoned the servants and killed the son and heir were the husbandmen—not the vineyard. Your old Abrahamic church is represented in this parable as the husbandmen. Who stoned the prophets that God sent in the olden time? The Jews. Who killed the Son of God when he was sent into the world? The Jews. Who are the Jews that killed the Son of God? Mr. Weaver's old Abrahamic church! What does the Book say shall become of those wicked husbandmen that killed the son and heir? Listen: "He will miserably destroy those wicked men!" That is what became of your old Abrahamic church—it was "miserably destroyed!" He thinks the Jewish nation was the vineyard. Then who were the husbandmen? Was the Jewish nation let out to husbandmen? Was the Jewish nation taken away from the Jewish nation, and given to another nation? Oh, tut, tut! The vineyard represents the privileges that God gave the Jew (the Abrahamic church), and which have been taken away and given to another people, while the husbandmen (who had those privileges) have been "miserably destroyed." The quotation from Isa. 5, where God calls the house of Israel a vineyard, proves nothing. That is not the vineyard of the parable. Nor

does Paul's statement, that God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew, have any bearing. They are dead as a nation, and as an elect people, but they have a promise in Christ just like the Gentiles.

He next comes to the olive tree. Some of the branches were broken off, and wild branches were grafted in. He thinks the Jewish branches were broken off from the Jewish nation, and the Gentile branches were grafted into the Jewish nation. What then were the unbroken Jewish branches (that accepted Christ) grafted into? They were baptized (all of them), and the Methodist creed says baptism is the initiatory rite into the church of Christ. Hence they were not in till they were baptized. They were not broken off from the Abrahamic church "because of unbelief," for they were never unbelievers, yet they were baptized into the church of Christ. Here is work for our unfortunate friend. Mr. W. claims to be a Gentile branch—is he in the Jewish nation today? The natural branches were broken off because of unbelief, but we know that no person was ever broken off from the Jewish nation because of unbelief, and that no Gentile stands in that nation by faith. But if the olive tree is the Abrahamic church, how much will that help infant baptism? "Because of unbelief they were broken off." Will that apply to an infant? "Thou standest by faith." Will that apply to an infant? Can you graff an infant into anything by faith? Mr. Weaver says a branch is composed of large and small limbs. There are no small limbs in the Methodist church! What broke the babies off from the Methodist church—unbelief? And when are you going to graff them back into their good olive tree? Now, Mr. Weaver, we have a plain demand: If the Jewish church is the olive tree, and some branches were not broken off. but continued in the tree (and were therefore members of the church of Christ), just show us one branch that did not have to be grafted into the church of

Christ by baptism, and we will give up the question! When you have fixed up these difficulties, or admitted you can not do it. we will tell you what the olive tree is. It is certain that at the present time you do not know anything about it.

Now that our opponent has reached the New Testament, we trust he will stay within that hook, and in his next speech will begin the discussion of infant baptism. Eleven speeches have been made, and not a word has yet been said in defense of infant baptism. The proposition stands at the head of this page, but we can not persuade our friend to discuss it. "All he has said in his eleven speeches can be admitted, and yet there is no proof of infant baptism. There were infants in the Abrahamic church, but there are none in the church of Christ, and there are none in the Methodist church. Let him show where Christ or the apostles baptized infants, or commanded it to be done. or said a word on the subject. We are fully prepared to discuss the subject, if our valiant opponent will just grant us a little of that pleasant pastime. John's disciples were baptized "confessing their sins." the three thousand on Pentecost "gladly received his word." the Samaritans "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" and were baptized "both men and women." and so (if all that were baptized. They all had faith, and there were no infants. Let the gentleman put us to the test. Faith always preceded baptism.

SIR. WEAVER'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

Our attention is called to the word in Acts 15 and in Mat. 16. One means to rebuild, the other "means to build, not rebuild." Will our friend give us the meaning of the word in Mat. 16 from a New Testament lexicon? If he will, we will consider it. He must show that the word means to build a

new church, contradistinguished from the covenant with Abraham.

Where does our friend get authority to call the church of God the royal house of David? Our friend concedes that Abraham's spiritual or first children were born to him two thousand years after his death. Then that proves that there was never a spiritual person in our world until two thousand years after Abraham's death. Yet our friend has admitted that there were some spiritual persons in the church of God under the old dispensation—a manifest contradiction. That concession proves, second, that the spiritual persona of today are Abraham's children, hence of that covenant. How then can there be a true church contradistinguished from that covenant?

Our friend refuses to answer our questions. Any one can read the questions, and know why the answer was not given. He wants to know why I don't answer his question. "Why all the members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized into the church of Christ?" That is only an assumption of our friend; has he given us a text stating that all the members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized before they entered the church of Christ? He is by that like he is by the Discipline, and by the Methodist church having no babes in it. All these are mere statements of our friend's own make.

Our friend says the old Abrahamic church is represented in the parable as the husbandmen. That is only a statement of our friend. I gave the text plainly stating the vineyard (not the husbandmen) of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel. Our friend makes a weak tight on this vineyard, and on the olive tree. He says I think the Jewish nation was the vineyard. No, I don't. I believe what the Bible says about it. He says I think the Jewish branches were broken off from the Jewish nation. No, I don't. I think they were broken off from the

church of God. UP also says I think the Gentiles were grafted into the Jewish nation. No, I think they were grafted into the church of God. He says the Jews were never unbelievers. I leave him and Paul to settle that point. He says these Jews were all baptized. I will believe that when I see the text that proves it. He says all I have said in my eleven speeches can be admitted and yet there is no proof of infant baptism; he admits that there were infants in the Abrahamic church. Why does our friend admit all this? I answer, because he must believe it or disbelieve our Bible.

He wants a positive command or a positive example of infant baptism by Christ or the apostles. I frankly admit that neither a positive command nor a positive example from Christ or the apostles is "riven in our Bible. For such a command or example settles all question without dispute. And yet I am glad to know that infant baptism, or infant membership, is made so plain by figure that our friend can see it.

I now call attention to the church of God under the similitude of the sheepfold. I read Acts 20:28: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." I read John 10:11-14: "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is a hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not. seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth, and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is a hireling, and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine." I read 1 Pet. 5:2: "Feed the flock of God which is among you. taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock; and when the chief

shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." Did this flock, or church, begin with the new dispensation? I read Ps. 77:20: "Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron." This is he that was in the "church in the wilderness." I read Ps. 79:3: "So we thy people and sheep of thy pasture will give thee thanks forever, we will show forth thy praises to all generations." I read Ps. 80:1: "Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leddest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth." If we believe these plain texts, we believe the flock or church of God prior to the new dispensation. To show more definitely if possible that the church of God, called a flock by the New Testament texts quoted, is the church of God spoken of by David. I read Acts 7:37-38: "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me: him shall ye hear. This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Moses and the fathers were in this church, and received the lively oracles to give unto us. So the church of God under the new dispensation is not a separate or distinctly new church contradistinguished from the church of God under the old dispensation.

I will ask what composes a flock of sheep? I will answer both the young and old sheep. How is the flock to be perpetuated? I answer by the increase of its own offspring, and not by proselyting, or unlawful taking of our neighbor's sheep. So the shepherd is to feed or care for the lambs of the flock, or it will soon pass away. The owner of the flock brands his lambs, not to make them his, but because they are his. So the true minister of God, as he is God's shepherd, feeds or cares for the lambs of God's flock, not to make them God's but be-

cause they are God's. All of God's flock. the young as well as the old, have equal rights to the tokens of membership in God's fold or family, regardless of age or nationality.

I will ask why does God compare his people to a flock of sheep? I think because of the innocent nature of the sheep, and again because the sheep is so easy to get lost, and when lost it never finds its way back to the fold, so it must be hunted and brought back to the fold; also, because the sheep won't take water.

Our friend says that Isa. 14:1. and the text I gave in Rom. 11th chapter, have nothing to do with this subject. Isaiah said. "The Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel and set them in their own land, and the strangers shall be joined with them." etc. We note a fulfillment of the text in the olive tree figure. The stranger or Gentile being a wild branch was contrary to nature grafted in with the Jews who were the natural branches. So the stranger was joined with them. The green tree is composed of large or grown limbs and small or babe limbs. The old dead tree has no small limbs; they have rotted off. So the church of God, according to this figure, has its pure men and women, and its babes.

Our friend admits that the old church had infants in it. Now if this old church was a type of the new, as our immersionist friends claim it to be, and if the type and the antitype must agree, where is there anything to agree to the babe membership of the old church, in the new?

I will ask if the old church was destroyed, and the new was not a continuation of it, how can this text be true? Isa. 60: "Arise and shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes about, and see; all they gather themselves together, they come to thee; thy sons shall come from far. and thy daughters

shall be nursed at thy side; then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thy heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day or night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of thy sanctuary."

MR. BURNETT'S TWELFTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver asks for a definition of the word *oikodomeso* (will build) in Mat. 16. Here is Thayer's definition: "To build a house, erect a building; properly to build up from the foundation." Metaphorically, he says it means, "*to found*," and gives Matt. 16:18 as an example! Will that do you? The verb in that text is in the future tense, and means literally *anil found*. The same word is used in Acts 15, to rebuild the tabernacle of David, but in that text the particle on (re) is prefixed to the verb, which shows that the tabernacle (David's house) was to be re-built, while the church was only builded. Do you see? Well, keep your eyes open, and you will learn something. Why did inspiration put "re" before this verb in one text and not in the other, if both tabernacle and church were re-built? We did not call the church of God the royal house of David (as charged), but so called the tabernacle of David. David had no church, but he had a tabernacle or house, that had fallen down, and was re-built.

He says the admission that there were spiritual people in the old dispensation proves that Abraham had spiritual chil-

dren back there. There were spiritual people before Abraham was born. Did he have children before he was born? Did the Abrahamic church commence before the birth of Abraham? In the old dispensation the spiritual people were not gathered into a body by themselves, as in the Christian age, hence there was no spiritual body or church. The whole nation constituted the Abrahamic church. Not so now. A person must be born of water and the Spirit to enter the kingdom of God. Jno. 3:5. That keeps out wicked men and babies. A child of Abraham now is one who believes in Christ. Gal. 3:7.

He says the statement that all members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized in order to enter the church of Christ is a mere assertion, like the statement about the Discipline, and the assertion that there are no infants in the Methodist church. We gave the exact words of the Discipline, that persons are by baptism "received into the ark of Christ's church," and that an infant is delivered from God's wrath, and receives "that which by nature he can not have," etc. Why did he not try to disprove it? You know he would not discuss the Discipline. As to infants in the church, if Mr. Weaver will produce one class-book in the whole state of Texas that has the names of the infants on the roll of members, we will give up the debate! He has been confronted with this proposition three times in oral debate, but he has never produced a class-book. At Farmersville, Texas, he admitted that infants are not "bona-fide members." That means "in good faith." Are they members in had faith? Do you call them members, when you do not believe they are members? Dr. Jacob Ditzler says in his book that there is not an infant in the M. E. Church, South. Is that a mere assertion? This scribe is not in the habit of making assertions that can not be proved, and he knows about as much about Methodism as Mr. Weaver. So. what goes with all he has said about the big limbs and little twigs, the old

sheep and the little lambs? There is not a twig on the Methodist tree, and not a lamb in the Methodist fold! He says a dead tree has no little limbs—all rotted off. Is that what is the matter with the Methodist church? Got the dry rot? Better get closer the water!

He says it is the duty of the shepherd to enfold and feed and care for the little lambs as well as the old sheep. This Methodist shepherd is not attending to his duty. He has not put the lambs in the fold, and then he never feeds them a bite! A poet says:

But when the people go to church,
They leave the babies in the lurch;
No matter how they fret and whine.
They give them neither bread nor wine!

Our observation of the dietary performances of a Methodist sheep-pen is about as follows: The presiding elder and the other bell-wethers of the flock eat at the high table, the old sheep eat at the second table, and the little lambs do not eat at all! We never knew a Methodist shepherd to give a lamb anything except a spoonful of water, and that is very poor diet, seeing a sheep does not love water! Mr. Weaver, did you ever give a baby lamb anything religiously except water? The lambs that the Lord told Peter to feed [Jno. 21:15) were big enough to eat. as they are in all Christian folds. A lamb is a new-born sheep—a person born of water and the Spirit—a young convert— and a Christian shepherd puts it in the fold and nurtures it with the old sheep. A Methodist shepherd does not know a Christian lamb from a baby in the flesh, and then leaves all the babies outside the pen! Oh, tut, tut!

Our friend has a novel idea of how a Christian flock is to be perpetuated. He says it is "by the increase of its own off-

spring!" Then you must not take anybody into the Methodist fold except children of Methodist parents! Is that the reason the church made no increase in its membership for four years—the old sheep did not do their duty in perpetuating the flock? He thinks it quite bad to take a neighbor's sheep, and once called the writer a sheep stealer because he baptized some Methodists. We told him we did not steal his sheep, but found some of the Lord's lambs shut up in a Methodist pen and let down the fence and let them go home! Mr. Weaver says a sheep will not take water, but we know some Methodist sheep in Texas that went into the water of North Sulphur creek and pulled the shepherd in with them! The shepherd was Rev. J. C. Weaver! It may be they were Baptist sheep that he had captured for the Methodist fold. In the apostolic day all the Lord's sheep took water. One said, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" They went to rivers, and to "much water," and "went down into the water," and were "born of water." A Christian is not like a sheep in all respects. He has no wool on his back, and he is not born of another sheep. Do you see?

Israel is called a flock, and the New Testament church is called a flock, but that does not prove that they are the same flock. Both are called a vineyard, but they are not the same vineyard. He says in his last speech that he does not hold (as we charged) that the Jewish nation is the church of God, for he says the wild olive branches were not grafted into the Jewish nation, but into the church of God. What then is the church of God? He has here surrendered the entire question! Why quote, "Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron?" Whom did Moses and Aaron lead but the nation of Israel? We showed that, in the parable, the husbandmen represent the nation of Israel, for it was Israel that stoned the servants (or prophets) and killed the Son of God,

and Christ says he will "miserably destroy those wicked men." So that ends the old Abrahamic church. And as our friend has already surrendered the olive tree, by admitting that it is not the Jewish nation, we need not press the matter further.

He says a shepherd does not brand sheep to make them his sheep. But the Discipline says that infants are brought into the fold by the branding process. In whose fold are the babies before baptism? Are they in the devil's goat-pen? They are not in Wesley's fold even after baptism, and our friend can not tell us where they are either before or after they are branded! If they are "conceived and born in sin," and under the wrath of God till baptized, as the creed says, they must be in the devil's fold.

He quotes Acts 7, to show there was a "church in the wilderness." Yes, the word church (ekklesia) means a called out body, and there was a called out body in the wilderness, but it was not the ecclesia of Christ. Paul says (Heb. 3) that Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant, but Christ is a son over his own house, "whose house are we." Here are two houses. The house that Moses was a servant in was the ecclesia in the wilderness, the Jewish nation, but we are not that house.

As to the statement that all members of the Abrahamic church had to be baptized into the church of Christ, we will stake the whole issue upon it. Let him find one Israelite that got in without, and we will give up the debate. The multitudes that John baptized were all Israelites. The apostles were all members of the Abrahamic church, and they were baptized. Acts 1:4-5. Paul was an Israelite, and he was baptized. Acts 22:16. The three thousand Pentecostans were Israelites, and they were baptized. Lydia was baptized. Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue in Abraham's church, was baptized. Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrim of the Abrahamic

church, had to be born of water and the Spirit to enter God's spiritual kingdom. We have all the proof. He has none.

MR. WEAVER'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.

If David's house or tabernacle had fallen down, and was re-built. then how could it have been destroyed? So if Christ re-built David's, and took his place in it as we have seen, then built a new one he must have two.

He says a Christian is not like a sheep in all respects. Then Christ was unfortunate in selecting the figure. A Christian and a sheep are alike in the points I mentioned, and that settles those points in this controversy. Our friend makes a lame fight on these figures, so he prefers to leave them alone and try to blind the reader's eyes by springing a new subject, that of communion. I am not debating communion now, but if we live long enough I would like to discuss that subject, but can't stop here to do it. I will simply say that water baptism is neither a prerequisite nor bar to communion. The only scriptural qualification for communion is faith in God. The Scripture saith, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." If it had said. "Eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not being baptized with water." then our friend's argument would have been in place, if we had been discussing communion.

Our friend gives us part of Mr. Thayer's definition of Mat. 16. If Mr. Thayer means to say it means build or found a new church, contradistinguished from the Abrahamic covenant, then he contradicts the Bible, and that renders him a false prophet. But our friend just quoted a word or two more than he needed to serve his purpose. "Properly to build up from the foundation." And that was what was done. The house or tabernacle had fallen, but the foundation was not destroyed, hence Christ re-built on that foundation.

So I will now call attention to the church of God under the similitude of the tabernacle. In Ex. 33:7-11 we have this statement: "And Moses took the tabernacle, and pitched it without the camp afar off from the camp, and called it the tabernacle of the congregation. And it came to pass, that every one which sought the Lord went out unto the tabernacle of the congregation, which was without the camp. And it came to pass, when Moses went out unto the tabernacle, that all the people rose up. and stood every man at his tent door, and looked after Moses, until he was gone into the tabernacle. And it came to pass, as Moses entered the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses. And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle door; and all the people rose up and worshiped, every man in his tent door. And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend." This seems like a spiritual church or people.

In Ex. 40:35 we read: "And he set the laver between the tent of the congregation and the altar, and put water there, to wash withal. And Moses, and Aaron and his sons, washed their hands and their feet thereat: When they went into the tent of the congregation, and when they came near unto the altar, they washed, as the Lord commanded Moses. And he reared up the court round about the tabernacle and the altar, and set up the hanging of the court gate. So Moses finished the work. Then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle." This looks as if these people were spiritual. So the Lord commanded to wash at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. The Lord said: "And thus shalt thou do unto them; to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." This

washing at the door looks like baptism. This church had its altar. The Lord met Moses and Joshua in this tabernacle. This tabernacle was the house of God's people. David said, "I will abide in thy temple forever." So when he died out of the one on earth, he enters it in heaven. David said it was the Lord's tabernacle. Joshua said to the people, "If the land of your possession be unclean, then pass ye over unto the land of the possession of the Lord, wherein the Lord's tabernacle dwelleth, and take possession among us; but rebel not against the Lord, nor rebel against us, in building you an altar besides the altar of the Lord our God." But they did rebel, and as we have seen from Amos 9:8-11, and Acts 15:13-18, they fell and were raised up, or builded again, or set upon the same foundation. Amos tells us the Lord would raise up the tabernacle of David that was fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and raise its ruins, and "build it as in the days of old." It has babes and good men and women in it, as we have shown. Now, how could it be built as in the days of old, and leave the babes out? Our friend has admitted that it has babes in it.

Isaiah said, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." Joel said, "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breast." Looks like a spiritual church, yet it had babes in it.

Jeremiah said: "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling places, and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall remain after the manner thereof; and out of them shall proceed thanksgiving, and the voice of them that make merry, and I will multiply them, and they shall not be few: I will glorify them, and they shall not be small.

Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them."

God will settle with those would-be shepherds who, by their unscriptural legislation, put his lambs out of his fold.

This tabernacle was a portable habitation. It could be taken down, destroyed, and re-built. Hence was a fit comparison of the church of God. This tabernacle was a place of worship for the people of God. David said, "We will go into his tabernacles, we will worship at his footstool." This tabernacle was not utterly destroyed, but was brought into the new dispensation. Acts 7:44-46: "Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking with Moses, that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen. Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles." So this was no new, one.

I read Rev. 21:1-3: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." This text settles the question. So the tabernacle has two apartments, its visible and its spiritual. And good men and women and babes were in it under the old dispensation, and they are in it under the new dispensation, and they are to be in it in heaven.

These texts teach us beyond doubt that the church of God under the old dispensation is the church of God under the new dispensation, for it was brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles. It had its washing at its door, a fit type

of water baptism at the door or entrance into it now. and that washing was by sprinkling. Also, it had its altar, and its babes, oven to them that sucked the breast. They are mentioned in the service where the people were to be in solemn assembly, and were to be sanctified to the Lord. And these texts trace this church of God, with its pure men and women and babes, through the new dispensation with Christ connected with it and lands it in heaven. We should be grateful to God for a church on earth like heaven, with a place for babes.

MR. BURNETT'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.

.Mr. Weaver has wasted another speech, and has not touched the subject of infant baptism. If he does not intend to debate the issue in controversy, we think he might as well stop the discussion.

He says we have sprung the question of communion. Not at all—only so far as it relates to the feeding of the lambs of the Hock. Christ told Peter. "Feed my lambs." but Methodist shepherds do not feed the lambs. We challenge Mr. Weaver to show that he ever gave an infant anything save a spoonful of water. He neither nourishes it nor puts it in the fold! He says water baptism is not a bar to communion. But your baby members do not commune on either side of the bar!

He says if Christ re-built the tabernacle of David, and took his place in it. and then builded a new one, there must have been two. Christ did not build a new tabernacle of David, but he builded a new church, The church is not the tabernacle of David. Here is where our friend is confused. The tabernacle of David (or royal house of David) did not exist till the days of David. The Abrahamic church commenced in the days of Abraham. Christ's church began after he said. "Upon this rock I will build my church."

Our friend called for a definition of *oikodomeso* (will build), in Mat. 16, and we gave him Thayer. Now he says Thayer contradicts the Bible. No, he doesn't—he contradicts Weaver. He says it means to build or found, to build up from the foundation. Our wild friend says that shows the foundation was there, but the house was gone. What about your "house of Jacob," which you said was there, and your "flock," and your "vineyard," and your "olive tree." and your "seven thousand." All gone but the foundation! To build or found does not show that the foundation was already there, but the very opposite. Mr. Weaver is as lame in English as he is in Greek. The foundation of the Abrahamic church was the flesh and blood of Abraham; the foundation of the church of Christ is Christ the Son of God. Mat. 16, Cor. 3.

He next goes back to the tabernacle in the wilderness, and learns that the Levites had the "water of purifying" sprinkled upon them, and says that looks like baptism. We taught him in a former proposition that the "water of purifying" was not water itself, but ashes of a red heifer mixed with water, and the word sprinkle there is from *raino* and not *baptizo*. Our friend has a short memory. He finds the word "tabernacle" there, and confounds it with the "tabernacle of David" that was re-built (the words being the same), and jumps at the conclusion that the old Mosaic thing of the wilderness was re-built in the Christian age! Such nonsense! One refers to David's royal house, the other to the tent-house which the Levites bore through the wilderness. Does Mr. W. think that Sinaitic tabernacle is now in existence? Where is it located? Does he look to it for redemption? Paul says Christ. "By a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands. . . . entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9:11. Also, "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, . . . but

into heaven itself." Heb. 9:24. Our wild friend thinks the old sheep-skin concern of the wilderness has been transferred to the gospel age, and rebuilt, and is now a part of the Christian system! Verily, he must have a sheep-skin over his face, so that he can not see to the end of that which is abolished. But what does he want with that old Levitical tabernacle "made with hands," when he has no high priest to enter into it?

He next finds that the tabernacle was to be "built as in the days of old" (a mistake), and says it had babes in it then, and should have them now. Our friend is beside himself. That tabernacle was not to be re-built, and there were no babes in it when it was in existence. No person but a priest could enter into it. Does Mr. W. think a babe is a priest? Why are there no babes in the Methodist tabernacle? Why have you not "built it as in the days of old?" Eh?

He reads Joel, where that prophet says, "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the children, and those that suck the breast," etc. Joel refers to a great calamity, but our wild friend thinks he means to gather the children into the church to be baptized! Now that's a stunner! Why don't you blow a trumpet in the Methodist Zion, and gather those that suck the breast into your institution, if you want to fulfill Joel's prophecy? You know that there is not a babe in the entire South End of John Wesley's Zion!

He next quotes Jeremiah, where God says he will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and build the city on its heap, and the children shall be as aforesaid. All of which was fulfilled in the return from captivity. Then he says, "God will settle with those shepherds who put the lambs out of his fold." That applies to the Methodist shepherds, for they say a babe is a lamb, and they have left all the babe-lambs out of the church! We offered to give up the debate, if our friend would

show an infant in the Methodist church, but he does not attempt to do it. A Christian shepherd knows that a lamb is a new-born sheep, a new convert—a person who has been born of water and the Spirit—and he puts them all in the fold, and feeds them with the old sheep.

He quotes Acts 7:45, where Stephen says of the "tabernacle of witness" in the wilderness: "Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers." Mr. Weaver stops his quotation at the word Gentiles, and tries to make the impression that the tabernacle of the wilderness was put in possession of the Gentiles by Jesus Christ in the gospel age! That is the worst blunder he has ever made, that is, if it be a blunder and not a fraud. The tabernacle was brought into the possession (the country) of the Gentiles with Jesus (Joshua) when the fathers entered, but the Gentiles God "drove out before the face of our fathers." The word Jesus is the Greek form of the word Joshua. The Methodists ought to get our friend a Bible, and send him to Sunday school!

Our wild friend next sees the New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, and because it is said "the tabernacle of God shall be with men," he jumps at the idea that this tabernacle is the same old thing that Moses built at Sinai! Now, no man has known for two thousand years what became of that tabernacle, but Mr. Weaver has made the discovery. It has been up in heaven all these centuries, and John saw it coming down again! Well, that does beat the band! Then he says there were good men and women and babes in the tabernacle in the wilderness, and they should be in now. We have shown that there were no babes in the tabernacle in the wilderness, and there are no babes in the Methodist church, so that knocks the bottom out of all this tabernacle nonsense.

He next says there are babes in heaven, and "we should be

grateful to God for a church on earth like heaven, with a place for babes." Well, we will have to go beyond the Methodist body to find that church. There is no place in that institution for babes, and there is not a baby member in the body. Why doesn't Mr. Weaver produce his class-book, with the names of the infants, on the roll of members.? We once made this challenge while standing in Mr. W.'s own pulpit, in the church of which he was pastor. The class-book was not produced. We know something about Methodism. In early life, while a zealous Methodist, and an ardent believer in infant membership, the writer took his first-born child to the preacher-in-charge and requested him to baptize it into the church and enroll its name on the list of members. He agreed to sprinkle it, but would not put its name on the roll of members. "We do not consider them bona-fide members." What a confession! Ah, beloved, you are like the old Pharisees—you "say and do not." You preach it. and print it, and debate it, but you don't practice it. We suggest that you bear lightly on the shepherds that leave the little lambs out of the fold! In the words of the celebrated Rev. J. C. Weaver, "God will settle with them!" It does not follow that because there are infants in heaven they should be in the church. John saw horses in heaven, and beasts, and angels, and vials, and thunders and lightnings, and trees, and golden streets, and other things that we do not have in the church.

MR. WEAVER'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend says that I wasted another speech, and did not touch the issue. He wants me to come to the New Testament. I have been giving both Testaments. Our friend can't have much to do with either. So he follows his oil trail of getting after me and the Discipline, and the Methodist church. The

truth is, my friends, it is not IMP nor the Methodist church that troubles him, but the plain texts of Scripture I have given him.

I will invite your kind attention to the church of God under the similitude of the twelve tribes of Israel, and see if it will prove to be "nonsense" also. I read Gen. 42:27-28: "And he said unto him. What is thy name.? And he said, Jacob. And he said. Thy name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and men, and hast prevailed." This man had twelve sons, and they head the twelve tribes of Israel. I read Ps. 122:3-4: "Jerusalem is built as a city that is compact together: Whither the tribes go up. the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord." Here the church of God under the name of the tribes go up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord, hence it is a spiritual church. I read Isa. 51: 1-4: "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you; for I called him alone, and blessed him. and increased him. For the Lord shall comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places, and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord: joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody. Hearken unto me, my people, and give ear unto me. O my nation: for a law shall proceed from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people." This text gives the truth; those who seek the Lord, and follow after righteousness. Being born of Abraham's blood doesn't make persons righteous. So the spiritual seed of Abraham, and not his natural seed, are the children of God. "Abraham your father and Sarah that bare you" locates this church; it is not a new one. That it is called Zion,

and joy, gladness, thanksgiving and melody shall be found in her, and she is called, by the Almighty God, his people.

But our friend wants to come to the New Testament, and to it I come. I will ask if the church of God known as the twelve tribes under the old dispensation was the church of God under the new dispensation? I will let Paul answer the question for us. I read Acts 26:4-7: "My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews, which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee. And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." This was some twenty-eight or thirty years after Pentecost. If there was a new church Paul certainly did not know it, for he claims membership in this. He says, "Our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." This seems to be a spiritual church, and the members were constant in their worship.

I read Isa. 49:6-7: "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth. Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee." We learn from this text that God raised up the tribes of Jacob, or the preserved of Israel, to be a light to the Gentiles. God is their redeemer, and his salvation is with them,

and through them to all the world; and there is no salvation to any except through this line.

Back to the New Testament. I read Mat. 19:28: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the generation, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." I will simply ask how can this text be true and that church or kingdom or throne of God be destroyed?

I read Jas. 1:1-4: "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting: My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience. But let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing." If there had been a new church, James should have written to it. Now, who composed this church of God, known as the twelve tribes? As we have seen, men and women who seek God and follow righteousness, with their babes. It is the family of Abraham, and was under the old dispensation, and continued through the new, and according to the teaching of these texts will be God's church or throne in heaven.

As additional proof of this, I read Ezek. 48:29-35: "This is the land which ye shall divide by lot unto the tribes of Israel for inheritance, and these are the portions, saith the Lord God. And these are the goings out of the city on the north side, four thousand measures. And the gates of the city shall be after the names of the tribes of Israel; three gates northward, one gate of Reuben, one gate of Judah, one gate of Levi. And at the east side four thousand and five hundred, and three gates; one gate of Joseph, one gate of Benjamin, one gate of Dan. And at the south side four thousand and five hundred measures, and three gates; one gate of Simeon, one gate of Issachar, one gate

of Zebulon. At the west side four thousand and five hundred, with their three gates; one gate of Gad, one gate of Asher, one gate of Naphtali. It was round about eighteen thousand measures; and the name of the city from that day shall be. The Lord in Thee." Now, my friends, you note as I told you that the land promised in Gen. 17, where we have the word everlasting connected with it. was the spiritual land of Canaan, and was also mentioned in 1 Chron. 16, and that the literal land promised was in the 12th chapter of Genesis. Now you see this land is to them in heaven. I read Rev. 21:12-14: "And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel; on the east three gates, on the north three gates, on the south three gates, and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." This text is in perfect accord with the prophet we have quoted, and with the promise of Christ to the apostles as we read from Matthew's gospel. Now, my friends, if you believe these texts you can't believe the new church theory.

So you see I have with God's word established beyond doubt the church of God of the old dispensation with its membership to be the church of God under the new dispensation, and to be finally the church of God in heaven, and that of itself with the thoughtful establishes my proposition.

The church of God, as we have seen, had its circumcision of the heart, which was the work of God and which purified the heart, and was a true type of the Spirit baptism which purifies the heart, and is the work of God. It also had its circumcision of the flesh, as a token or symbol of heart purity, or righteousness, and was a true type of water baptism, and as infants scripturally received circumcision under the old dispensation so they can scripturally receive water baptism under the new dis-

penation. And as circumcision in the flesh was a token or symbol of righteousness under the old, so water baptism is a token or symbol of righteousness under the new dispensation.

MR. BURNETT'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver says we call his arguments and quotations "nonsense," and urge him to come to the New Testament, and also twit him about his Discipline, and about having no babies in the Methodist church. That is what we do. Baptism is a New Testament ordinance, and the man who discusses it should quote from the book that contains it. His quotations are nonsense, because they have no bearing upon the question at issue, and his arguments contradict his creed. The Discipline says that persons enter the church by baptism, and he continually asserts that the Israelites were in the church (in fact composed the church) when he knows that every one of them had to be baptized in order to enter the church of Christ. Then he has spent fourteen speeches trying to prove that the Abrahamic church is the church of Christ (because there were babies in the Abrahamic church), when there is not a single baby in the Methodist church! He has vehemently condemned the shepherds who enfold the old sheep and leave out the lambs, when Methodist shepherds are the very fellows that do what he condemns! What ought to be done with a debater like this? We think he should throw away his Discipline, change his quotations, reform the practice of the Methodist church, or else quit debating.

He comes to the New Testament, misapplies two passages, and then jumps back into the jungles of prophecy. He hardly tarried long enough to let us know he had arrived. Paul says he was judged "for the hope of the promise made to God unto our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." Does that text

say anything about infant baptism, or the identity of the church? Not a word. The Jews hoped for a Messiah, and Paul found that hope in Jesus of Nazareth, and was accused for the hope which the Jews themselves entertained. But Paul had hope of a Messiah (like all the Jews) while he "persecuted the church of God and wasted it," and was the "chief of sinners." Was he then a Christian, and in the church of Christ? Why then was he afterwards baptized? You know the Discipline (ah, that Discipline!) says persons enter the church by baptism. If the twelve tribes were in when they held the hope, Paul was in likewise, for he held the same hope and belonged to the tribe of Benjamin. Why then was he baptized in? Ah, beloved, you will have to throw away that passage, or throw away the Discipline. Mr. Weaver's texts are like the fellow's bed-quilt that didn't fit the bed. When his head was under his feet stuck out, and when his feet were under his head stuck out!

He next quotes Mat. 19:28, where Christ says to his apostles that "in the regeneration" they shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Anything there about baptizing babies, or about the identity of the church? Not a syllable. We have tried to teach our friend that there is a spiritual Israel, as well as a fleshly Israel. In the regeneration, or the gospel age, the apostles are on their thrones, and all questions are appealed to their decision. If fleshly Israel is referred to, it does not change the principle. The apostles and their inspired writings judge all things that pertain to life and godliness, for Jew and Gentile, saint and sinner.

He next quotes James 1:1-4, where that writer addresses the "twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," and he thinks the epistle was written to the Jewish nation! Mr. Weaver is a very badly posted man. If he had profited by his lessons in Sunday school when a child, he would not have made this

blunder. Or, if he had consulted a Bible dictionary, he would have saved himself from this exposure. The epistle of James was addressed to the Christian Jews that were scattered abroad, and it contains many statements that will not apply to persons who are not Christians. Smith's Bible Dictionary (an Episcopal work) says: "Those for whom he wrote were the Jewish Christians." And he says the purpose of the epistle was to comfort the disciples in the persecutions that followed them as Christians. But Mr. Weaver himself does not believe his own statements about the twelve tribes constituting the church. In this last speech he says, "So the spiritual seed of Abraham, and not his natural seed, are the children of God." Which one of his assertions does he expect us to accept? It is a sort of a katy-did-katy-didn't affair. After giving a big bucketful of pedo-baptist blue-john, he kicks it over! But an empty bucket is better than his blue-john. Who is a spiritual seed of Abraham? A baby? Listen: "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Gal. 3:7.

The next quotation is from Ezek. 48:29-35, where it speaks of the division of the land to the children of Israel, and of their city that should have twelve gates. Then he finds that the heavenly city has twelve gates (Rev. 21:12-14), and concludes (what?) that the old land of Canaan has been translated to heaven! He remembers that the covenant of circumcision, in Gen. 17, is called an "everlasting covenant," and if he can by some kind of theological hocus-pocus get that land transferred to the everlasting regions, he may yet be able to perpetuate his old fleshly-Israel church! But that proves nothing for infant baptism in the gospel age, for he skips the gospel age entirely, and jumps from the twelve tribes to eternity. We showed our wild friend that the circumcision covenant of Gen. 17 applied only to the land of Canaan and the fleshly seed of Abraham, and was everlasting or unending to that people, but they for-

feited their rights and the covenant was abolished. No uncircumcised person could share in that covenant, and as Mr. Weaver is uncircumcised he has no part in that land. So now if he transfers that covenant and country to heaven, he cuts himself out of heaven! He would not claim his "forty acres and a mule" in the old Canaan, and now he can not claim standing room on the golden streets of glory! Surely our wild friend never opens his mouth that he doesn't put his foot in it: The old Canaan may be a type of the new, and the old Jerusalem a type of the new, and fleshly Israel may be a type of spiritual Israel, but they are not the same. And here is where Mr. Weaver makes all of his blunder. An Israelite in the gospel is a person who has been "born of water and of the Spirit." and not of Abraham's flesh. Paul says, "We are the circumcision who worship God in spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh." Phil. 3. Also, "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Gal. 3. There are no fleshly infants in this Israel. A new-born Israelite (now) is a new convert. A babe is not "of faith," and can not "worship God in spirit," hence can not belong to this circumcision. Persons were born into the old Israel (not circumcised in), and persons are born into the new Israel; but the births are not the same. One is fleshly, the other spiritual. An infant can not be born spiritually, hence can not enter this spiritual family. Mr. W. does not know one birth from the other, and goes blundering along in his Judaizing logic and make a mess of the whole business.

He says the old church "had its circumcision of the flesh, as a token of heart purity or righteousness, and was a type of water baptism." Two big mistakes in that sentence. Circumcision was given to all male Jews, without regard to heart purity, and when they were too small to have any righteousness whatever; and you give baptism to infants that (your creed

says) are "conceived and born in sin" and have had no heart change of any kind! Why do you give the token, when the reality does not exist? Circumcision is not a type of baptism. for Abraham's babes were not circumcised in, but born in; yet your creed says infants are brought by baptism into the ark of Christ's church. Your cover doesn't fit your bed, and you can't make it fit. There are sixteen differences between circumcision and baptism. They are as much alike as the fellow's steers. He said: "They are just alike—one is a right black ox with a light white ear, and the other is a right white ox with a right black ear!"

It would give us great pleasure to discuss infant baptism with Mr. Weaver, if he would come to that part of the Bible where baptism is mentioned, and try to show that Christ or his apostles baptized babies, or authorized anybody to do it. Thus far he has done nothing to support his proposition.

MR. WEAVER'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend charges on me the misapplication of New Testament scriptures. I only ask the readers to read the texts given. I think they have so far, and will take care of themselves. He thinks, because infant baptism is not mentioned in these texts, they have nothing to do with it. I have stated plainly in a former speech that there is neither expressed command nor an expressed example for infant baptism in the New Testament. My position affirms authority for it in the word of God.

Our friend has said continuously that every Jew had to be baptized to enter Christ's church. In his last speech he goes further and says that. I know that every one of them had to be baptized in order to enter the church of Christ. I will say I know no such thing. I flatly deny the statement, and demand the proof.

He says Abraham had a spiritual and a fleshly seed. That is what I said at the beginning. He says the old Israel was the fleshly. I have shown texts both in the Old and New Testaments teaching that to be untrue. And on the representation of these texts our friend has admitted that there were spiritual people under the old dispensation.

I now read St. John 1:13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This text tells us of three ways persons are not born into the family or church of God. "Not of blood"—that is, not of Abraham's blood, but of God. I read in Deut. 32:6: "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? Is not he thy father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?" Then the race was bought back to God by his own blood. Then it is the precious blood of God our Redeemer that makes us children of God, and not the blood of Abraham.

I read St. John 3:3: "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." So a person must be born before he can see, or enter, the kingdom or family of God.

I read 1 Cor. 15:22: "For, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." We learn from this text that the human race died in Adam, and that they were made alive in Christ. So we died in Adam before we were born into the world, hence without our knowledge or consent. We were made alive in Christ before we were born, hence without our knowledge or consent. This was the work of God, and this atonement was complete. This work brought from death to life in Christ. Now what does this death and life mean? I read Rom. 5:19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." So then in our dying in Adam we were made sinners. Sinners are

dead. The dead can not see, feel or hear anything, until they are brought to life by our God, and we were brought to life or righteousness by our God in Christ's death. The righteous are live and in Christ. Under the old dispensation circumcision in the flesh was a sign and seal of righteousness. If a person received circumcision of the flesh, whose heart had not been circumcised, that is purified or made righteous, that is brought from death to life by the power or blood of our God, his circumcision was made uncircumcision. So circumcision in the flesh did not profit the person unless he kept God's law. Now take Deut. 36:6: "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Our friend would say the babe can't love God with all the heart, hence can't be in the family of God nor be circumcised. I read Gen. 17:24: "And Abraham was ninety years old and nine when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin." Now Abraham was an adult when he received circumcision in the flesh. He was brought from the death he died in Adam to the life or righteous state in Christ before he was born, hence came into the world in this state, but he had drifted from it by personal transgression; hence, before he could receive circumcision in the flesh, the token of righteousness, he must repent and believe and receive circumcision of the heart. So we see that God demanded him to be perfect, for God said to him, "Walk before me and be thou perfect." And it is said of him. "Abraham fell on his face," a good position to be in to be made perfect. In Gen. 17:25 we have: "And Ishmael his son was thirteen years old when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin." We don't read of this boy falling down before God. nor of his repentance or faith, but this we know, he died or was made a sinner in Adam's fall and was made alive or righteous in Christ, and as circumcision was a token of

righteousness, he could be circumcised, but not as an adult sinner. Hence the logical inference is that he received circumcision as a babe received it. Gen. 21:4: "And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac, being eight days old, as God had commanded him." We know this little fellow did not repent, for he had no personal sin to repent for. God demands repentance only of the sinner. He was not an unbeliever, hence there could be no demand for faith. We know also he died or was made a sinner in Adam's fall, and that he was brought to life or righteousness by the atoning blood of our God and Redeemer, hence being in that state of life or righteousness, and circumcision being a token of righteousness, he could without repentance or faith receive circumcision in the flesh. So we have three persons—Abraham, ninety and nine, having drifted from this state of life or righteousness in Christ by personal transgression, and having returned to this state by repentance and faith, was entitled to circumcision in the flesh, the sign and seal of righteousness—the other two we have no statement of their departure from the state of life or righteousness. So they, being in it, are entitled to circumcision in the flesh. Our friend has been wanting some infant baptism. Here it is. under the figure of circumcision. Let him try his hand on this ease. You note it was commanded of God. This is the key to infant baptism. Understand this, and you understand the other.

I read St. John 3:5: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily. I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." A person must be born before he can see. Verse 3. He must be born before he can be baptized also. Nicodemus died in Adam, and was made righteous in Christ; then when he drifted by personal sin from this state of life or righteousness into a state of sin or death, his heart had to be circumcised or purified by Almighty God. Then when he. with the Jews, rejected Christ, he was cut

off from the family or church of God because of unbelief in Christ. Hence the appropriateness of Christ's plain, uncompromising statement to him, "Ye must be born again." How can one be born again, except to be in that state once and depart from it? Or, how can one enter a house again, except he has been in the house first and gone from it? Christ expresses astonishment that he knew not these things. So Christ did not consider that he was preaching a new doctrine. He was preaching the old doctrine, regeneration by the blood of God our Redeemer, hence his question to him. "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" If to be born of water means water baptism, then to be born of the Spirit means Spirit baptism. Then how say some there is no Spirit baptism in this day? Some tell us that Christ here refers to water baptism; others tell us he refers to the spiritual water mentioned in the fourth chapter. This we know, that if he referred to water baptism as a Christian ordinance, it was a prophetic reference, for it is a fact that water baptism as a Christian ordinance had no existence at this time. If he refers to it in the future, he refers to it as an entrance, and not as a borning ordinance, for he said. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The person must be born before he can be baptized with water or Spirit. He was born in generation. Generation means to beget, to procreate, to bring from death to life. This is to be "born of God." Then the person thus born of God may receive water baptism, to enter or recognize him as a member of the visible apartment of the church of God, and the baptism of the Spirit not only recognizes the person as a child of God but also to give power to do the work God wants him to do. This baptism or being born of God is for remission of sins. As we have seen. the Adamic sin was washed or taken away by the atoning blood. Hence the statement. "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

MR. BURNETT'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.

Another speech wasted, and not a word on the subject of infant baptism! Our friend ought never to undertake to debate this question again. He has nothing to offer, and it is a waste of time and space to make the effort.

He admits that the texts he quotes do not say a word about infant baptism, and he says he admitted in a former speech that there was neither expressed command for it, nor expressed example of it, in the New Testament. Well, it seems there is very poor authority for a thing that was neither commanded nor practiced! When God wanted Abraham to circumcise his offspring, he said in plain words, "Every man child among you shall be circumcised." When he wanted us to baptize our babies, he said not a word about it! And the best proof Mr. Weaver has is the utter silence of the Bible on the subject! No wonder our friend has to career all over creation, and talk about every thing under heaven except infant baptism. We have examples of circumcision in the New Testament, even after the rite had been abolished, but no example of infant baptism at any time.

Mr. Weaver says he flatly denies that every Jew had to be baptized to enter the church of Christ, and calls for the proof. He is the man that ought to prove. He should find some holding-over member—some person that was allowed membership in the church of Christ (without baptism) by virtue of membership in the Abrahamic church. We gave him thousands of examples against his position—all John's converts, all the apostles of Christ, the three thousand Pentecostans, Paul, Lydia, Crispus and Gaius and Stephanas, the eunuch, the Samaritans (a circumcised people),—and we gave him the Methodist Discipline, which says baptism is the initiatory rite into the church of Christ. Then we challenged him to produce one single Jew

that was allowed membership without baptism. Did he produce one? Did he try to produce one? We are ready now to stake the whole issue on his finding one holding-over member.

He says he has shown that there were spiritual persons in the Abrahamic church. Well, what does that prove? There were spiritual persons before the Abrahamic church was born. Were the infants spiritual in Abraham's day? Were the spiritual persons gathered into a body by themselves, as they are in the gospel age? Everybody (except Mr. Weaver) knows that the Abrahamic church was composed of the Abrahamic nation—the whole flesh of Abraham—without regard to piety. He thinks he showed (but did not) that circumcision was a seal of faith or righteousness to the person that received it. He knows (or ought to know) that every male Jew in the nation received it, without regard to faith or righteousness, and before the child was old enough to have either. It was a seal of Abraham's faith (for he had faith before he received it), but to a Jewish child it was a seal of the flesh of Abraham. Why should the seal (of righteousness) be put upon a person that was not righteous, and when there was no evidence that it ever would be righteous? That would be nonsense.

He quotes Jno. 1:13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God." He says persons can not be born of blood or lineage. That is true—under the new covenant. But all were born of blood in Abraham's church, for that is the way they entered it, and that is how the infants got into it. Not so now. Jno. 1:13 refers to Jews who "received him" (by believing on his name) after Jesus came to his own people or nation.

He next quotes John 3, where the Savior says a person can not enter the kingdom of God without being born again. That is a good text, and shows there are no infants in the kingdom of God—they can not be born again. Did Mr. Weaver ever

see an infant that had been born again? If he will produce one, we will give up the question. And bear in mind the Methodist Discipline says the kingdom is the church. But our friend has made a wonderful discovery—he has discovered that infants are regenerated before birth, and come into this world ready for entrance into the kingdom of God! True his creed says. "All men are conceived and born in sin." and he said the same thing in a former speech, and quoted David as authority! Now he says all men are born in salvation! Which one of his statements does he expect us to believe? In his wild jump he kicks over his creed, and kicks over J. C. Weaver, and leaps clean out of the hounds of common sense. Verily he is a theological acrobat of wonderful agility. His Discipline says the infant is delivered from God's wrath in baptism (and Mr. W. will pray that prayer out of the little book over the next infant he rantizes). but now he says it is delivered from God's wrath away back yonder before birth! But he quotes 1 Cor. 15:22 as proof of his position: "As in Adam all die. even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Paul has reference to physical death and physical resurrection, and not to sin and salvation. He uses the present tense *die* (not died in the garden of Eden), and the future tense *shall be made* (not were made alive before they were born), as Mr. W. has it. So he kicks over Paul and English grammar, as well as Weaver and the Discipline. More than that, he makes Christ a sinner in Adam and a saint in Christ, for Paul says. "Christ the first fruits, and they that are Christ's at his coming." Paul says we shall be made alive in Christ "at his coming," not before our natural birth as Mr. W. supposes. Our friend ought to be labeled the "Great Methodist Mistake!" He misinterprets nearly every text he quotes. This pre-natal regeneration is a preposterous humbug, invented to save infant baptism, because there is no Scripture to save it.

He finds that Abraham circumcised Ishmael and Isaac, and asks us to try our hand on these two cases. We are not debating circumcision, and these cases need no trial. Abraham was commanded to circumcise the boys, and he did it. Now let him find where Weaver is commanded to baptize two babies, and we will try the case. He says that ease was a figure of infant baptism. We think not. "Figures won't lie," but that figure lies if it was designed to teach infant baptism. You don't baptize babies because they are in the Methodist church, but to bring them in (and then you don't get them in), but those boys were already in Abraham's family. He says circumcision was a seal of faith, but as little Isaac had never become an unbeliever he needed no faith. Why then give him the seal of faith? What did it seal in his ease? If baptism is a seal of faith, you should baptize no one but a believer. Our friend's doctrine is awfully ragged. He has persons born again before they are born at all, and born holy when his creed says they are born in sin, and gives them the seal of righteousness when they have no righteousness! Isn't that a mess? He thinks Ishmael and Isaac must have been righteous (although there is nothing said about it), else they would not have received the seal. What about the servants that were bought with Abraham's money? Were they religious? Were they born again before they were born at all. or born before they were bought with the money? They had a sort of financial righteousness, we guess, and Ishmael and Isaac a flesh-and-blood righteousness! How will that dot Abraham "fell on his face" when God told him to be perfect, and Mr. W. thinks that was a good way to get perfect. We fear our friend has been attending a Holiness meeting. Paul says, "Let us go on to perfection," and a man can not go anywhere on his face. Besides. God told Abraham. "*Walk* before me. and be thou perfect," not fall on your face and get perfect. I We have pressed our friend to tell us when the new seal of bap-

tism took the place of the old seal of circumcision, and tell us why the new seal was put on persons who bore the old seal? But he will not answer.

He takes a new twist on Jno. 3:5. He says a person must be born again before he can be baptized. That knocks out infant baptism, for no infant can be born again. He thinks Nicodemus could not be born again unless he had been born once, as a man can not re-enter a house unless he has once been in it; hence Nicodemus must have been in the kingdom and sinned out. The Savior speaks of the second birth in contrast with the first or natural birth, and not about two religious births. But no matter how many times Nicodemus had been born, this Spirit-water birth stood between him and the kingdom of God.

MR. WEAVER'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.

Our friend still affirms, in the face of the texts given him, that all were born of blood into Abraham's church. Yet no proof offered. I gave Nicodemus as one who must be born again, He had been born of God, as shown in John 1:13 and John 3:3, and had fallen in rejecting Christ.

Our friend says 1 Cor. 15:22 refers to physical death and physical resurrection. Then we have the race of mankind both physically dead and raised to life before they were born. How is that? Let's note that text: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." God is not "a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." So the race died in Adam, and were brought back to him in Christ's death. So in Christ is life, a new creature. The babe has life in Christ.

Hear Paul again: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The race were made sinners in Adam. God

is not the God of the sinner. The sinner is without God and without hope in the world. But they were made righteous in Christ, and God is the God of the righteous. And as water baptism is a symbol or token of life or righteousness, and the babe being brought from death to life, or from sin to righteousness, by the blood of Christ, it is entitled to water baptism. It is a fact that the Adamic sin was washed, or taken away, in generation. Generate means to beget, to bring from death to life, and actual sins of men are washed or taken away in regeneration. Regeneration means begotten again. Now hear Christ. Mat. 18:1-6: "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily, I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." These disciples had backslidden, they had vain desires and worldly ambitions. James says, "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." John says, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." Hence the Savior's important and timely lesson to them. Christ took a little child as his object lesson to them. He said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the the kingdom of heaven." Question: If it takes conversion to make a worldly minded sinner like a little child, then is not a little child like a converted person? If not, why not? Question: If the sinner's entrance into the kingdom of heaven depends on

his being converted, and becoming as a little child, which is evident from the Savior's teaching, then would it not prove without a doubt that the little child who is like the converted man was in the kingdom of heaven? Besides, the question is, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? not out of it. If one were to ask, Who is the greatest man in this country? Then one could refer to any man living in the country, but would have no right to go out of the country to get the man. Note, the question is a specific one, referring to membership in the kingdom of heaven. If the little child was not a member of the kingdom of heaven, the Savior could not have taken him as the model for membership in the kingdom. Question: If the sinner must be converted and become as a little child before he can enter the kingdom, and if his being converted and becoming a member of the kingdom entitles him to water baptism, as a token of his membership in the kingdom, then would not the little child, who is like the converted man, and who is held up as a model member, be entitled to water baptism for the same reason? If not, why not?

Note: As we have seen the Adamic sin was taken away by the atoning blood of Christ; generate or begotten state, born of God; then it can receive baptism as a token of the fact; not to make it a child of God, but because it is a child of God. And the backslider's, or personal or actual sins, are washed away in regeneration, or when "begotten again unto a lively hope," etc. Then, if he has never been baptized, can be baptized as a token of the fact that he is born again and is a child of God and not to make him a child of God. One does not brand a sheep to make it his, but because it is his.

Our friend says I admitted that the texts I quoted did not say a word about infant baptism. I said there was neither an expressed command to baptize a babe, nor an expressed example of where an infant was baptized. The truth is, every text

I have given him, and especially every figure given, proves it without a doubt to an impartial reader. I will now say there is no express command to baptize a man as a man, or a woman as a woman. There is no express command to baptize an adult believer only. The express command is to baptize the nations. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." So under this commission there is as much authority to baptize the babe as there is *to* baptize men or women, for they are members of the nations. I will next state that there is no authority given to his ministers to baptize any but babes, and there is no scriptural baptism but infant baptism. Ask a Baptist minister if he would baptize an unconverted man or woman? He will answer no, they must be converted. What does conversion do for them? It makes them babes in Christ. Who are to be baptized? Babes in Christ, and none else. Then it is an infantile ordinance, the Baptist being judge. Look at the case. Here is a babe redeemed by the atoning blood of Christ, therefore begotten or born of God, a child of God, in the generate state. He won't baptize it. But here is an old sinner, converted, that is regenerated, begotten again or born again, and is a child of God. He will baptize him. He is inconsistent, in that he refuses to baptize the model as given by Christ.

I will state that a believer, according to Baptist teaching, is a scriptural subject for baptism, because he is a babe in Christ, a child of God, and is entitled to baptism as a token of his heirship with God. But according to the teaching of our friend, a believer is not a scriptural subject for baptism, for he is yet a sinner and has yet to repent and confess. A Bible believer is one "not condemned," one "born of God," one that has "passed from death unto life," one that "hath everlasting life." So, if this believer has never been baptized, he is entitled to it.

There are two characters in our world, the dead and the liv-

ing, or the righteous and the unrighteous. God is the God of the living, and the righteous are his. There are two families, God's family and the devil's family. Christ said to some wicked Jews. "Ye are of your father the devil." There are two conditions of membership in these two families, faith and non-belief. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." "He that believeth not shall be damned." There are two destinies, heaven and hell. The pure in heart see God, and have peace with him. The wicked are driven away in their wickedness. Now it only remains for our friend to locate the babes by his teaching, and that will settle the teaching as to whether it be of God. Now our system, as seen, locates them in the family of God. bought by the precious blood of Christ, therefore made righteous in Christ's death. So they are born of God, or are the generate portion of his family, while we teach that the regenerate are regenerated by the same blood, and are the regenerate part of God's family.

Now under this system of teaching, that demands an expressed statement in the word of God, I proceed to give our friend some hold-over members, that is, believing Jews with no expressed statement of their baptism. I give as the first case Acts 4:4: "Howbeit. many of them which heard the word believed, and the number of men was about five thousand." Verse 32: Multitude believed. Acts 5:15: Believers men and women were added. Acts 9:42: "And many believed in the Lord." Acts 17:4: Some believed. Verse 12: Many believed. Acts 19:8: Many believed and confessed. Acts 21: 20: "Many thousand Jews believe and are zealous of the law." Now let our friend prove that these were baptized, or give up. as he has been saying he would do.

MR. BURNETT'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.

We are exceedingly happy that Mr. Weaver has come to the New Testament, and now if we can keep him there till he completes his four remaining speeches, we shall be happier still. True, what he has said in his last speech does not contain a word of proof for infant baptism, yet we give the gentleman credit for *trying* to discuss the question.

He makes an effort to defend his course of debate, by saying that while the texts he has quoted do not command infant baptism, nor give an express example of it, yet it is to be inferred from their teaching. We have followed him all the way through, and shown that no such inference could be deduced from any of his texts. His inferences remind us of the Dutchman. The Methodist minister requested his members each to quote a text, from which he inferred infant baptism. One quoted, "Suffer little children to come unto me," he inferred, to be baptized. One quoted circumcision, and inferred. When he came to the Dutchman, he quoted. "Balaam rose up in the morning and saddled his ass." He inferred he saddled up to take his baby to the preacher to be baptized! We infer the Dutchman's inference was as good as Weaver's.

Our friend makes an effort to save his pre-natal regeneration theory, based on 1 Cor. 15:22, by saying that if it refers to physical death and resurrection we have all the race dead and raised before birth. By no means. The grammar forbids. Listen: "As in Adam all die" (present tense, die now, not in the garden of Eden), "even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (future tense), not back before birth. We find it impossible to teach Mr. Weaver either Scripture or grammar. Paul says this making alive is "at his coming." That knocks out all the pre-natal generation, or pre-natal nonsense.

But he quotes Rom. 5:19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall

many be made righteous." That text also refers to physical death and resurrection. By Adam's disobedience many were made (or accounted) sinners, and now suffer death, so through Christ many shall be made (or accounted) righteous, and be raised from the dead. Paul shows this by saying, "The free gift came upon all men unto the justification of life."

Our friend makes his best effort on Mat. 18:3. As this is all the real point he has made in sixteen speeches, we will notice it fully. The text reads: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." (Observe they were already in the Abrahamic church.) Mr. Weaver says the Savior presents a child as a "model member," but that is a mistake—a wonderful mistake. The fourth verse explains it. "Whosoever shall humble himself as *this Utile child*, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." The little child is not a model member, and not a member at all, but the man who humbles himself "as this little child" is the model member. Suppose that to be a great Freemason a person must have an humble, trustful, confiding, inoffensive and governable nature like a little child, and you were asked who is the greatest Freemason, and you should present a child as a model of those qualities, and say, "A person of spirit and qualities like this child." would anybody (except a Methodist preacher) suppose that the Masonic lodge is composed of little babies, or that a baby is a model member? Dr. Lyman Abbott, one of the greatest pedo-baptists in America, says in his commentary that this text teaches in what respect we are to become "as little children" in order to enter the kingdom. He says of the fifth verse, "And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me," does not mean that we receive it to baptism, but we "receive into our hearts for Christ's sake those who need the hospitality of our sympathies."

Mr. Weaver asks some very pointed questions, and we will

give him some very pointed answers. 1. "If it takes conversion to make a sinner like a little child, is not a little child like a converted person?" Yes, in humility and trustfulness, but not in intelligence and *avoirduois*. 2. "If the sinner's entrance into the kingdom of heaven depends upon his becoming like a little child, does it not follow that the little child is in the kingdom?" Not at all. The sinner must become like a little child in certain qualities, but he does not have to *become a little child* in order to enter the kingdom. If he should become a little child, he could not enter, because he then would not have intelligence to exercise faith in Christ. "Why is it there are no infants in the Methodist kingdom? They baptize them in (so they say), but they invariably grow up outside, and they stay outside till they are converted in, like all other sinners.

Mr. Weaver says Baptists teach the baptism of babes in Christ, and they ought to baptize infants, because it is an infantile ordinance according to their own teaching. He can apply that to the Baptists, but not to his present opponent. The babes that Baptists baptize are not babes in *avoirduois* and wisdom, like the babes of Methodism. But we deny that the Scriptures teach the baptism of babes in Christ, anywhere from Matthew to Revelation. They teach plainly that persons are "baptized into Christ" (Rom. 6:3, Gal. 3:27), hence when a person is in Christ he is beyond baptism. But Mr. Weaver says a believer is "born of God" and "hath passed from death unto life." and that we baptize believers. There are two kinds of believers, the obedient and the non-obedient. The non-obedient or unbaptized believer is not born of God, for he is out of Christ, and Paul says, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature"—a child.

Mr. Weaver says, "Now if our friend will locate the babes, it will settle the question." He says, "Our system, as seen,

locates them in the family of God." Well, that depends on where you see "our system." If you see it in the Methodist Discipline, it locates the babes under "the wrath of God," "conceived and born in sin," to be "delivered" therefrom in water baptism! Our friend said in a former speech (and tried to prove it by David) that babes were all born in sin, but now he says they are regenerated before birth, and "model" members of the church! When he makes two contradictory statements, he ought to tell us which statement he wishes us to believe! He knows old John Wesley did not place infants in the family of God at birth. Listen at what he says:

"If infants are guilty of original sin they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism."

He scarcely thought the babes were in the family of God at birth—not by a good deal. No, sir! He thought, they had original sin, and were "guilty of it," and destined to be damned if it were not washed away in baptism! Now, where shall we look for "our system?" To Wesley and the Discipline, or to J. C. Weaver's contradictory speeches? As to our locating the babes, that is easy. They are not "conceived and born in sin" (as the Discipline says), and "liable to eternal damnation" (as Wesley says), nor are they regenerated before birth, as Weaver says. They need no baptism, and no church membership.

Our friend says there is no express command to baptize a man or woman, as such. There is command to baptize believers, and "men and women were believers. Then there is example of the baptism of "both men and women" by inspired preachers (Acts 8). but no example of the baptism of a baby. He says the commission says baptize the *nations*, and there were infants in the nations. Yes, but the commission puts teach before baptize, and you can not teach an infant. The word *matheteuo* has the teach idea in it, and you can not apply *matheteuo* to an

infant. The apostles taught, and then baptized; Weaver would baptize, and then teach. The apostles had it backwards, or Weaver has it backwards.

Our friend says he has found some hold-over members, but he is woefully mistaken. He has found some Jews who believed, and their baptism is not mentioned. Does that prove they were in the church of Christ without baptism? By no means. We can find some where baptism is mentioned, and faith not mentioned; and some whose repentance is mentioned, and faith and baptism not mentioned. He must show that his hold-over members were in without baptism. He has shown nothing on the subject, except non-mention. He is like the Irishman in the court, when two men testified that they saw him steal the horse. "Judge, I can find a hundred men that didn't see me take him!"

MR. WEAVER'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

In the replies of our friend he still insists that he can not teach me grammar nor theology. His favorite grammar text is, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build," etc. I have asked for a lexicon's definition in full on that text, but have failed to get it, so I will give one. I quote from T. H. Green's pocket lexicon: "To build a house; to build, Mat. 7:24, et. al.; to repair, embellish, and amplify a building. Mat. 23:29, et. al.; to construct, establish. Mat. 16:18; met. to contribute to advancement in religious knowledge, to edify, 1 Cor. 14:4, 17; to advance a person's spiritual condition, to edify, 1 Cor. 8:1, et. al.; pass, to make spiritual advancement, be edified, Acts 9:31; to advance in presumption, be emboldened." Now our friend's presumption is that Christ has no church, and that he is yet to build it. Now turn to Mat. 18:15-17. We are instructed as to how we are to deal with a stubborn brother, and if he will

not hear we are told to "tell it to the church." Now if there is no church in Mat. 16, and no one presumes to organize a new one in Mat. 18, how came one here to tell to?

Our friend says the Scriptures "teach plainly that persons are baptized into Christ." That is true, but what we object to is our friend's inferring that when the person is dipped into a pond of water by a self-called preacher he is baptized into Christ. We think there is a vast deal of difference between Christ and a pond of water. How. can our friend prove that baptism to be water baptism, when Paul does not mention water in the entire book of Romans, except by his wise Dutchman riding on his mule to find the pond of water?

Our friend says, "There are two kinds of believers." Where is the text expressly stating that, except by the inference of his wise D.?

Our friend says again that the Discipline teaches that the child is "under the wrath of God, conceived, and horn in sin, to be delivered therefrom in water baptism." I have never seen the Discipline to this good day that says that. David did say. "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." I think that is true. Our friend's plain contradiction does not convince me of David's mistake, and if the Discipline is with David it is in good company. I did not say the babe was regenerated before birth. I quoted texts proving it was generated by the blood of our God, that is, brought back from the death all die in Adam to life in Christ.

Our friend says there is a command to baptize believers. In a former speech he said there is no command that is not expressed. Where is that command? Our friend says we must prove that the believers we gave (as hold-over members) were not baptized. By this rule I can, and have. Note his rule: You must have expressed command, or an expressed example. Then where there is no expressed statement there is no bap-

tism, except by inference of his, Dutchman on his mule to ride to see them baptized.

I now present to you Miss Lydia, the old maid, which you can not show had a husband, "or ever had a beau." I read Acts 16:14, 15: "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there. And she constrained us." Before I examine the teaching of this text I will present the teaching of God's word in contrast with the theory of our friend on this subject, and then you can decide for yourself which is correct. Our Bible lays, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Paul tells us what this death and life means. He says. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." So then all were made sinners, that is died in Adam, and all. made righteous, that is alive in Christ. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. Paul says, "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." So then all were dead. How did God get the fallen race back? There are two ways to get one who does not belong to you. One is to proselyte or steal him, the other is to buy him. God condemns the first way. and adopts the second. Our Book says, "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? Is not he thy father that hath bought thee? Hath he not made thee, and established thee.¹" How did the Lord buy them? Paul says. "For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God [in your body and your spirit, which are God's." Once more

Paul: "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men."

You ask, Did God buy sinners or false teachers? Peter says, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." John 1:13 we read: "Who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Not born of Abraham's blood, but of God. This is the generation state. No repentance or faith required, because there was no sin but Adam's, and this atoning blood took that away. John said, referring to Christ, "Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." All come into the world in this generate state, and as it is a state of life from death, or a state of righteousness, and as the righteous are entitled to water baptism, the symbol of life or righteousness, these may be scripturally baptized without repentance. When one crosses the line of accountability, and departs from God, then he is a personal transgressor, and is dead in trespasses and in sins. So God is not his God, as he is not the God of the dead. Hence, as he went into sin for himself, he must repent and turn to God. He must be regenerated. Nicodemus was in this sad condition, because he had rejected Christ. Then how appropriate Christ's words to him, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." One must be born of God. One must be born of God, or from above, before he can see or enter the kingdom of God. One must be born before he can be baptized. This way of baptizing an unborn person to born him is what I can't see. The sinner is not born of God, has no spiritual existence, how can he be baptized, or enter God's kingdom?

Now to our text. Lydia was a woman, a sinner dead in sin,

hence not a child of God. God is not the God of the dead. Hence she must repent and turn to God. Our text says of her, "Which worshiped God, heard us." The heart of the wicked must be changed. God said, "A new heart will I give you, and a new, spirit will I put within you." Our text says of her, "Whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." Question: How many women were converted on this occasion? One. How many worshiped God? One. How many heard? One. How many hearts were opened? One. How many attended to the things spoken of Paul? One. How many baptisms? More than one. Our friend's theory, to be true, must find as many believers as there are baptisms. Tell me, please, where it is stated in God's word that any one of Lydia's household ever heard a word spoken by Paul, or had the heart opened or believed. The natural, un-get-over-able inference from the texts given is that Lydia's household were infants that were in the generate, or righteous state, brought there by the atoning blood, so they were not required to repent, etc., and Lydia the woman, the sinner, who had departed from this state, had to be born again, or regenerated, before Paul would baptize her. So Paul, being consistent, baptized her after God had opened or regenerated her heart, because she had by repentance returned to the generate state, and was then like her children, who were generated by the same blood that regenerated her. Then Paul baptized her children who were in this generate state and were like her after God had regenerated her. So Paul, like his God, cares nothing about the "avoidupois," but he baptizes the pure-dupois, regardless of sex, nation or age. Our friend speaks of "the brethren" that were in Lydia's house, verse 40. There were no brethren there when this baptizing was done. Paul, on the Sabbath, with Timothy, went out of the city by a river side, and they sat and spake to the women which resorted

thither. No men except Paul and Timothy in that meeting, and the baptizing was then.

MR. BURNETT'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver again tries his hand on "will build," and gives the definition in Green's little lexicon. But Green contradicts him. Weaver wants it to mean "edify" or amplify" in Matt. 16:18. but Green says in that text it means to construct or establish. All the lexicons say the same. How- would it sound to read, "Upon this rock I will edify my church," or, "Upon this rock I will amplify my church?" The Lord never talked nonsense, and Mr. Weaver ought not to put nonsense in his mouth. In that text it means (as Thayer says) to "build from the foundation." According to the Weaver idea it lacked two thousand years of being builded "from the foundation." So he misses the lexicons two thousand years. But that is a close shave for our wild friend.

He thinks the words "tell it to the church" show there was a church then in existence. By no means. Jesus taught his disciples many things in anticipation. He told them the Holy Spirit would bring to their remembrance all things that he had said unto them. That shows he said things while with them that had application after his ascension.

Mr. Weaver objects to our statement that persons are "baptized into Christ." That is Paul's statement, and he must settle with Paul. But he thinks we can not show that Rom. 6:3 refers to water baptism. Yes, we can. We can show it by John Wesley, Adam Clark, Dr. Wall, Martin Luther, Albert Barnes, Richard Baxter, Dr. Lightfoot, Philip Schaff, Macknight, Doddridge, Bloomfield, Chalmers, Meyer, Knapp, and all the scholars of the world for eighteen hundred years. These men were all sprinklers, yet they said the baptism of Rom. 6:3 is

immersion, and baptized persons into Christ. Paul deceived them, or J. C. Weaver is wrong. Was Paul a deceiver? But our friend thinks there is a difference between being baptized into Christ and into a pond of water. Yes, there is a difference, and it is well he spoke of it, for we might never have made the discovery. John Wesley and Adam Clark and Dr. Wall and all those great men overlooked that point entirely! We baptize *in* a pond of water, and *into* Christ. Mr. Weaver once (in Fannin county, Texas,) baptized some Methodist converts in a pond, and into the Methodist church. Is the Methodist church a pond, or is there a difference? He sometimes solemnizes the rites of matrimony in a house, but the ceremony inducts into the married state. Is the married state a house? Our friend ought to talk sense, not nonsense. And if we were in his place, we would not speak of a "self-called preacher." If we had had the hands of an un-baptized, un-born, un-authorized 'bishop' (who is not in the kingdom of God) laid on us, and that was all the right we had to baptize, we would speak softly of "self-called preachers."

Our friend says he has never seen the Discipline that says a child is conceived and born in sin, and delivered therefrom in water baptism. Well, let him turn to the baptismal service, page 159, and read: "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God," etc. The prayer that follows says: "Look upon this child, wash him, and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he being delivered from thy wrath may be received into the ark of Christ's church." Mr. Weaver doesn't know his own Discipline. It says all men are conceived and born in sin, and the child is under the wrath of God till delivered in water baptism. Mr. Wesley, who wrote the Discipline, says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are

proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism." See *Doct. Tracts*, p. 251. Mr. Weaver runs headlong over Wesley and the Discipline, and says, "All come into the world in this generate state, and as it is a state of life from death, or a state of righteousness, and as the righteous are entitled to water baptism, the symbol of righteousness, these may be scripturally baptized!" Now you are in a mess! The Discipline says they are born in sin, and can not be delivered from God's wrath and enter God's kingdom without baptism, and Wesley says they are guilty of original sin and can not be saved without baptism, but Weaver says they are saved and made righteous before birth (and perhaps before conception) and come into this world ready for baptism! Then he turns round and says the Discipline is in company with David, for David says, "In sin did my mother conceive me!" Did you ever? David says he (not all men) was conceived in sin, the Discipline says all men are conceived and born in sin, and Weaver says no man is conceived and born in sin!

Our friend denies that there is any command to baptize believers, and calls for the text. Here is the text: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." *Mk. 16:15-16*. Here is another: "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said. If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." *Acts 8:36-37*. An example is equivalent to a command, and there are many examples of the baptism of believers, but no example of the baptism of infants.

Our friend makes an artful dodge on Lydia. He says only one person heard Paul (expressly stated), and only one heart opened, but several baptized. As it is not stated that the hearts of the "household" were opened, he assumes (from silence of the record) that they were infants and too young to have their

hearts opened. But the record is silent about Lydia's infants, hence the silence excludes the infants from the case! So Weaver cuts his head off with his own sword! There is M much silence about the infants as there is about the opening of the hearts of the household. He tries to make out that out-rule is that every item must be expressly mentioned, but we have no such rule. We said an ordinance like infant baptism must be mentioned by command or example, and that if a man affirmed that Jews were allowed membership in Christ's church without baptism he must prove it. It will not do to show there were Jews in the church, and, as the record is silent about how they got in, assume (as our friend did) that they got in without baptism. That is to beg the question. We know there was not one untaught person baptized in Lydia's household, not because of the mention or silence, but because Christ's commission says, "Go ye. therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." The teaching comes before the baptizing, and Paul did not get it backwards, like Methodist preachers do.

It is amusing to see Mr. Weaver's efforts to prove that Lydia's children were born righteous (contrary to the Discipline and John Wesley), before he has proved that Lydia had any children! He is like the old maid that was sitting on the bank of a creek weeping, and when asked what the trouble was, said she was just thinking that if she was married and had a little baby and it should fall into that creek, what a calamity it would be! Our friend is too previous. Let him prove that old Miss Lydia was married, and had children, and we will help him down John Wesley and the Discipline (and David, too), and prove that the children were born all right. He has commenced at the wrong end of his job. Here is what he has to prove: 1. That Lydia was married. 2. That she had children. 3. That she had them with her in a foreign city. 4. That they were too young to have faith. 5. That they were baptized

without faith. Now, here is work for him to do, and he has not struck a lick on it yet. If he intends to prove it all by his imagination, let him take the whole story, viz.: "Lydia and her husband and her twin babies were baptized by Paul by sprinkling, but Lydia's red-headed daughter Sophia, who married a wooden-legged shoemaker (who was a Dutchman), preferred to receive the ordinance by immersion—the church allowing candidates their choice of mode. So she mounted a mule, named Maude, behind her husband, and they rode three miles to a deep hole in the Gangites river, and were dipped by Silas, after he had read a suitable selection from the Apostolic Discipline!"—*Vol. I., Chap. X., Methodist Imagination*. The word *oikos* (household) doesn't necessarily include infants. The lexicons show that it applies to a man and his wife and grown-up servants, and to a general and his staff. There are thousands of households in Texas that have no infants. Our friend makes a bad break on the "brethren" that were in Lydia's house, and transforms Silas into Timothy! He also gets the fortieth verse at the baptism, when it was after Paul came out of prison!

MR. WEAVER'S EIGHTEENTH SPEECH.

As to Mat. 16:18, all I ask of the reader is to examine the lexicons given, for yourself, in connection with the texts I have given locating Christ in Zion or Israel, God's church.

He says "tell it to the church" rather means the anticipated church. How is that? He says Mr. "Weaver once baptized some Methodist converts in a pond, and into the Methodist church. If a convert is baptized into the Methodist church, would not a babe baptized by the same preacher be in the church? Yet our friend has been telling his readers that there are no babies in the Methodist church.

He says he can prove that Rom. 6:3-4 is water baptism, and

is immersion, by Mr. Wesley. Adam Clark, et. al.. with all tilt scholars of the world for eighteen hundred years. I deny the statement, and challenge my friend for the proof. I ask for the quotations to be fair, full, complete. I challenge my friend to show mention of water in the entire book of Romans, or in any book written by Paul where he refers to baptism as a burial, or where Paul ever connected water and baptism.

Our friend has said time and again that our Discipline says that the child is delivered from sin by water baptism. He quotes, "Look upon this child, wash him, and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he being delivered from thy wrath may be received into the ark of Christ's church," etc. Now, my friends, is water baptism mentioned in this quotation? Is not the washing and sanctifying done by the Holy Ghost? Mr. Weaver knows a little about the Discipline, and believes the doctrine taught in it, and stands ready to defend it, and only asks for an opportune time and time enough to do it.

Our friend says I must prove that Lydia was married, and that she had children, etc. No, I don't have to prove that. I only have to show that she had a household. It does not matter with me who composed it, whether her father and mother, brothers and sisters, or servants. I am simply to stand by the record, and see that there is no mention of faith or repentance, or hearing or heart opening of any member of her household, except by presumption. A careful reading of the text will show that Lydia and her household were baptized at the first meeting, and the verses before the text will show that there were no men there but the preachers. Paul and Timotheus, and a few women, and the text mentions one conversion and more than one baptism. So the text suits us, as it is, without an inference. Our friend is the one that must prove all these things for it is his theory that demands faith and repentance in every case before baptism. Then let him prove, with an expressed

thus-saith-the-Lord, that every member of this household heard and believed before baptism, and I will yield to him the text, otherwise the text is with us to this day.

Our friend gives Mark 16:15-16 as an expressed command to baptize believers only. You will remember the demand I made of him was to give an expressed command from God to baptize believers only, and he gave Mark 16:15-16. Let us note it carefully. "He that believeth not shall be damned." We find two characters mentioned in the text, the believer and the non-believer. Christ places the babe on the believer's platform, or with the saved. He said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." As we have shown, the child was brought from its death to life or righteousness in Christ, by his atoning blood. So the child, being washed from original sin or Adam's sin by the blood of Christ, is like the converted child of God, who is also washed from actual sin by the same blood. And as the child of God has a new name written in the stone, so has the babe this white stone. It is his passport from the world into the church of God. and from the church of God into heaven. This is a washing of the heart from sin, the babe from the Adamic, and the adult from personal guilt; one called begotten or born or generate state, the other begotten again or born again or regenerate state. Rev. 1:5: "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." How is the heart washed or baptized? Paul: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." Peter: "Through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Then as the regenerate believer is entitled to water baptism, so is the generate.

Christ said: "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me." How can we receive any one into the family of God except by baptizing them in his name? The

true minister, when he sprinkles clean water on the forehead of the person, writes the Father's name on the forehead, while the Spirit writes the new name with God's name and the name of the city of God on the heart. The white stone is the emblem of his election. So if the babe has not the white stone, or heart, how can it enter heaven? Our doctrine, as Christ does, locates the babe with the saved, or with the white stone crowd. Christ said: "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me." So Christ counted the generate state the believer's state. One asks if this one was not big enough to believe? Let's note it. In verses 2-5 the word for little is not used. It is understood, for no one will call in question the child mentioned there being anything else than little. Note in verse 6, where the little ones are called believers, the word is put in. The word means little, small. Robinson's lexicon defines the word used in the text to mean a little child, either male or female, a child or children recently born, a babe, infant, So you can see how big it was. Mark, speaking of this same occurrence, tells that Christ took the child in his arms. So that is better than the lexicon.

We note next the text says, "He that believeth and is baptized." To suit the teaching of our friend's theory the text should read, "He that believeth and will repent, confess, and will be baptized." Unless he puts "is" in his anticipated future tense. So the text is against our friend's theory, and besides there is no expressed command to baptize believers only, as his theory teaches. Neither is there an expressed mention of a new church contradistinguished from the Abrahamic covenant, or church of God. If our friend will give the text that expressly states it, I will pledge myself to give one hundred texts that expressly contradict it.

Let us note, "They were baptized, both men and women." We are told that this was a good place to put in the babes, and

asked why they were left out. I will state first, that the babe's right to baptism had never been disputed to that date, so it was not necessary to make express mention of their baptism. The woman under the old dispensation could not enter into positive covenant relationship with God, to bind her soul to the service of God. without the permission of her father or husband, therefore she could not be circumcised, as circumcision was the token of positive oath relationship with God. Read Num. 30. and you will have positive proof. This curse was put on her because she led in the great transgression that involved the race in ruin. If that law were in force now. she could not be baptized, as baptism is a token of positive oath relationship to God. That curse was taken away because of her fidelity shown at Christ's resurrection. She told the story of the resurrection first. Read Mat. 28. and you have the proof. Then it was necessary to mention her in connection with baptism. Then, how do we know how big those women were? Suppose we examine into that part of the text a little. As a student of God's word, and for the classification of kindred texts on subjects. I take Young's Analytical Concordance and find the word woman, and note the texts given under the word *gune*. Then I take a New Testament lexicon ('Robinson') and find the word to mean first: "A woman, female, one of the female sex, e. g., without respect of age." Then as an honest student I could not tell whether the women baptized were three days or one hundred years old. So much for the woman part of the text. Then suppose I wanted to know the truth about the man part? I note in reading the New Testament in more than one place that Christ calls a new-horn babe a man. So I don't know just how- old the men were. Then with the light before me I can't for the life of me rob the babe of its blood-bought right on that text.

I have some questions to ask about the church, its organization and membership, but have not space in this address.

MR. BURNETT'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.

Our friend thinks "if Mr. Weaver could baptize converts into the Methodist church," he could baptize infants into the Methodist church, yet Burnett says there are no infants in that church. Burnett says so, because Methodist preachers do not consider infants as members, and do not put their names on the roll of members in the class-book. Have we not challenged him to produce his class-book and show one infant's name on the roll of members? Who deprives the babes of this blood-bought right in the Methodist church?

He wants us to prove that Wesley, Clark and other scholars said Rom. 6:4 refers to water baptism. That was done on a former proposition, and need not be repeated. Wesley says it refers "to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Notes on New Test., Rom. 6:4. Adam Clarke says: "It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion." Com., Rom. 6:4. Dr. Albert Barnes, the great Presbyterian commentator, says: "It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Com., Rom. 6:4. Philip Schaff, the great Presbyterian scholar, says: "All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied." Dr. Wall (Mr. Weaver's great author) says: "St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way, call baptism a burial." Hist., Vol. 2, p. 452. We have the writings of these men before us, and know what they say. Mr. Weaver knows they say it, too, if he knows enough to be a one-horse Methodist preacher. So it is water baptism, and Paul says it baptizes us into Christ. Hence a person is not in Christ and a new creature before baptism. Yet our friend says he can not find water in the entire book of

Romans! We are sorry he falls so far behind the eminent pedo-baptist fathers. He even challenges us to show where Paul "ever connected water and baptism." Our friend has a short memory. He himself, in the present debate, quoted Heb. 10: 22 to prove affusion!

Mr. Weaver makes a slight effort to defend his Discipline against our charge that it teaches that the infant is delivered from God's wrath and from original sin in water baptism. He says the washing and sanctifying is done by the Holy Ghost. Yes, but it is done in the act of baptism, and not before the birth of the child, as you teach. Who wrote the Discipline? John Wesley. Does Mr. Weaver know more about the Discipline than the man that wrote it? Listen to what Wesley says:

"If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism."

Listen some more:

"Agreeably to this, our church prays in the baptismal office that the person to be baptized may be 'washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost,' and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing."

Our friend, who doesn't know his own father and his own creed, says the infant receives the heavenly washing before it is born! He ought to quit debating and study the Discipline.

He says he does not have to prove that there were infants in Lydia's household. Well, it is very certain that if he can not prove there were infants there, he can not prove there was infant baptism there. So he has lost the only case he has tried to find since the debate commenced. He thinks the negative must prove that all the members of the household were old enough to have faith, and the record is silent about the faith. Yes, and the record is silent about the infants, too! The nega-

tive is not required to prove anything. We find faith required in the law of salvation, and find it mentioned in thousands of cases, and it is necessarily inferred here. If our friend will find infants baptized elsewhere (even a few cases), or anything said about it, we will admit there may have been something of the kind here. But so far he has not made an attempt.

We quoted Mark 16:16 as authority for the baptism of believers. Our friend tries to make it apply to babies, by showing that Christ considered a baby equivalent to a believer. Christ did not do so. He said a converted person was like a little child (in some respects), but did not say a child is a believer, or fit for baptism. The text, "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me," does not have reference to a babe. Christ passes from the little child in his arms to the little disciple that believes in him. John, in his First Epistle, calls the mature saints to whom he wrote "my little children." Paul says, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Can a babe get faith by the word of God? If Mr. Weaver will find one babe in the whole world that believes, we will give up the question. He knows the babe can not believe, and knows also that if Mark 16:16 be applied to a babe it damns the babe, for it says, "He that believeth not shall be damned." That text also places salvation after baptism, and not before the birth of the child, as Weaver teaches. So it knocks him out in two directions. The Discipline knocks him, and Wesley knocks him, and the commission knocks him! It is time the foolishness was all knocked out of him! Weaver damns infants that do not believe, and Wesley damns infants that are not baptized! Bad doctrine!

He quotes, "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me," and asks, "How can we receive any one into the family of God except by baptizing it?" In his last speech he said the child was in the family of God before birth;

now he says it is received in baptism. The unbaptized child then is in the devil's family, and the pre-natal generation is worthless. If baptism takes the infant into the church or family of God, it is time you were getting some of them into the Methodist church—that is, if that institution is any part of God's family. Dr. Lyman Abbott, the great pedo-baptist commentator, says that to receive a child in the name of Christ is to receive it to our hearts for Christ's sake, or give it the "hospitality of our sympathies"—not give it baptism.

Our friend jumps over into Revelation, and says the infant receives a white stone, and the white stone is its passport, and the white stone is received before birth! Indeed! Wesley and the Discipline say the infant is under the wrath of God till baptized, and with the black stone crowd! As usual, Mr. Weaver gets his texts backwards. The Lord says the white stone is given "to him that overcometh." Does an unborn babe overcome anything? We have known some infants after birth to overcome the tired parent that walked the floor with them at midnight, but we never knew a white stone given for that performance!

Mr. Weaver perpetrates a big joke on the "men and women" of Acts 8:12. He says he can not tell whether they were three days old or one hundred years old. A lexicon is quoted to show that *gune* means "one of the female sex, without respect of age." And he concludes it might apply to a girl baby. The word is used over two hundred times in the New Testament, and the King James translators rendered it "wife" and "wives" and "woman" and "women" every time, and did not render it girl baby a single time! So we have a majority of two hundred to nothing! The word "men" in the text is used over two hundred times in the New Testament, and the King James translators never rendered it "boy baby" or "man child" a single time! So we have a majority of two hundred to nothing on

this word! Then we have a better thing still. The inspired penman who wrote Acts of Apostles says the "men and women" of Acts 8:12 were old enough to believe. Listen: "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Mr. Weaver was so anxious to find what was not in the text, that he overlooked the plain thing that was in it! So he is forever gone on this passage. His explanation of why the women are mentioned and the infants are not mentioned in the baptism (though he tries to show both men and women are infants) is unique but not sensible. He ought to take out a patent on it. He says that up to that date nobody questioned a babe's right to baptism (though there had never been a babe baptized on the earth), yet a woman could not make a covenant without consent of her husband or father. It is clear that a three-days-old infant could make a covenant without consent! The consent is not mentioned, and the infants are not mentioned, and (like Lydia's babies) the only way we know they were baptized is, the Bible says nothing about it! Our friend proves his doctrine by the silence of the Scriptures! He ought to send for Balaam's Dutchman! The Dutchman could beat him a little!

MR. WEAVER'S NINETEENTH SPEECH.

The readers now have the way our friend proves things. He said Mr. Wesley, Clark and the scholars of the world for eighteen hundred years show that Rom. 6:3 is water baptism. How does he prove it? He says Wesley says it refers "to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." A short quotation. Will our friend please quote Mr. Wesley in full on that text? I would, if I were in his place, or let Mr. Wesley rest. There is one reason for his not quoting Mr. W. fairly or fully, and

that is, the quotation would be against our friend's position. He says Adam Clark says, "It is probable that the apostle he"re alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion." I wonder why our friend stopped just there? Why did he not give the statement of Mr. Clark in full? Note his statement, that all scholars said it was water baptism, and immersion. Now he quotes that it is probable. Will our friend quote Clark in full on Rom. 6:3-4? Note his reference to Mr. Wesley saying Paul was alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion. What baptism is referred to an ancient immersion? It could not have been Christian baptism, for it was not the ancient baptism but the present baptism of Paul's day. We will let Mr. Wall tell us. Introductory, Vol. 1, p. 17: "The whole body of the Jews, men, women and children, were in Moses' time baptized." Note, p. 4, "Therefore the Judges received no proselyte all the days of David and Solomon. Not in David's days, lest they should come of fear; nor in Solomon's, lest they should have come because of the kingdom and great prosperity which Israel then had." I now read on p. 539: "As exact as the anti-pedo-baptists are in imitating the primitive way in the hot countries, they do not baptize naked, which those ancient Christians always did, when they baptized by immersion, as I show in the next chapter. They usually spoke of the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh, as a thing signified by the unclothing of the person to be baptized. I suppose it is for preserving modesty that they dispense with that custom. So it seems in some cases they can allow of dispensing with the primitive custom."

I read on p. 591: "What was just now mentioned of the Muscovites baptizing stark naked, and dipping three times, is perfectly agreeable to the ancient practice in both the usages. The ancient Christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were all baptized naked, whether they were men, women or

children." I read on p. 592: "The way of trine immersion, or plunging the head of the person three times into the water, was the general practice of all antiquity." Now, if our friend had given a fair quotation from Wesley, Clark and others referred to, it would have saved this space. Now, suppose this ancient immersion was water baptism, does that prove Rom. 6:3 to be water baptism? Has our friend found water in the book of Romans, or where Paul mentions baptism as a burial, or where Paul mentions water and baptism together, to-wit, water baptism? Has he found a text that makes express mention of a new church as contradistinguished from the covenant with Abraham? Can or will he give us one?

Our friend says Christ passes from the little child in his arms to the little disciple that believes. I see no proof. The child mentioned in the 6th verse is the same mentioned in verse 2-5. Why did not our friend note the case given by Mark, and the lexicon argument given?

He thinks he can handle Wesley better, so he passes from the Scriptures to Mr. Wesley. Note, v. 6, in the sense of a disciple, an actual believer, and we would have, "Except you old believing disciples be converted, and become as little believing disciples, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." I have asked our friend to locate the child with his theory. I have stated this truth: There are two characters, the righteous and the unrighteous, the believer and the non-believer, and I have shown you that our teaching locates the babe with the righteous, made such by the atoning blood of Christ, and because of this redemptive work the babe was placed on the believer's platform. So then, when one becomes a sinner by actual transgression, or sin, he must be regenerated because of his own and not Adam's sin. Our friend says Christ said a converted person is like a little child "in some respects." Christ did not so say.

Our friend has some funny things to say about the "men and

women" of Acts 8. Yet the argument stands until answered fairly. Christ said to the Jews: "Ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man." How old or big was this man? If a Jew, he was an eight-days-old man; if a Gentile proselyte, he might be eight days old. or a hundred years old.

I now come to present an important issue—the teaching or training of the child. I read Deut. 31:9: "And Moses wrote this law. and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel. And Moses commanded them saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men and women and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law. And that their children, which have not known anything, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it." Israel was God's church, and children were members, and had to be taught to hear, fear and to observe and do as the law directed. Note that the children "which have not known anything" are to be taught. They compose the teachable class. No need to teach those who know. It is folly to try to teach those who think they know and don't know, for they are not teachable. I have been trying to teach my friend some things I think he ought to know, and you see I have made slow progress to date. And he admits that I am so dull a student that he can't teach me grammar, much less theology.

We are asked if children were in the spiritual church. I read Joel 2:15: "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast,

call a solemn assembly, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare Un-people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them. Wherefore should they say among the people, Where is their God?" This is the spiritual Zion, and it had its babes that "suck the breasts."

I read Ps. 78:4: "We will not hide them from their children, showing to the generation to come the praises of the Lord, and his strength, and his wonderful works that he hath done. For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a testimony in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children, that the generations to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children, that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments."

I read Isa. 28:9: "Whom shall he teach knowledge, and whom shall he make understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts." So Christ was to embrace the little ones in his teachings, and was to teach them to know the law, or doctrine.

I read Isa. 51:3: "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children." Our friend says John called mature saints "my little children." I deny the statement, and demand the proof. This word will apply to grown persons in age who are just converted, and are babes in Christ in the sense of endearment, but to say it will refer to matured saints I must emphatically deny and call for the proof.

Our friend says the word "men" in Acts 8:12 is never used

as boy baby or man child. Our friend must prove that the word could not include in its meaning a babe. So of the women. I gave text which says, "Ye on the Sabbath circumcise a man." It doesn't say a boy babe or man child, but man. If that was a Jew man, it was an eight-days-old man; if a Gentile, it might have been an eight-days-old man or a hundred-years-old man. I gave you good authority that the women of that text might have been old or young, married or unmarried. The lexicon gives the meaning "a woman regardless of age."

MR. BURNETT'S NINETEENTH REPLY.

Mr. "Weaver has virtually abandoned the subject of infant baptism, and gone back to the former proposition, viz., immersion. He devotes one-third of his speech to that subject. He leaves old Miss Lydia (the only case he has found in the New Testament) without showing that she had a husband, or ever had a beau! After ridiculing immersion, through his friend Dr. Wall I who admits that Jesus was immersed), he jumps back to Moses and the prophets, where baptism is not mentioned.

He asks us to quote Wesley in full, and tries to make the impression that if we would do so it would damage our doctrine. We gave all that Wesley said on the burial in baptism in Rom. 6:4 (every word of it), and any reader of this debate can prove the truth of our assertion by referring to a book called "Wesley's Notes." Mr. Weaver has hot the book, and is ignorant of what Wesley says, just as he was ignorant of what his Discipline contains. Wesley adds a few words about the resurrection, and they are directly antagonistic to Weaver's position. Listen: "That as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory (glorious power) of the Father, so we also, by the same power, should rise again; and as he lives a new life in

heaven, so we should walk in newness of life. This, says the apostle, our very baptism represents to us." Our wild friend tries to twist it around and make out that Wesley thought that Paul had reference to some ancient baptism (before his day), because Wesley (not Paul) used the word ancient. Paul had reference to the baptism of his day, for he says, "We are buried"—not some ancient proselytes. The baptism of Paul's day was "ancient" to John Wesley. Our friend knows as little about history as he knows about Wesley and the Discipline, else he would know that proselyte baptism did not commence till long after Paul's day. He would also know that nude baptism and three dips did not commence in the apostolic day. Nude baptism was not practiced except by some fanatical persons, and the three dips did not originate till the rise of the Trinitarian controversy. Baptism represents the burial and resurrection of Christ, and we know the Savior was not buried naked, and that he was not put in the grave three times. But if the ancient Christians were baptized naked, and dipped three times, would that show they practiced sprinkling? Eh? It would show they believed in immersion, and a good deal of it! If they practiced nude baptism, it shows they had a high regard for the Lord's ordinance. If they had been Methodists, they would have changed the mode! It is a pity to waste all this space discussing a matter that is not in the proposition. Our friend says it was because we did not quote Wesley fairly, but you have seen that is not true. We will now make our friend a proposition: If he will quote one word from Wesley's or Clark's commentary on Rom. 6:4 that antagonizes what we have quoted from them, we will give up the whole question of infant baptism and join the Methodist church!

Mr. Weaver is still unable to find water in the book of Romans. It is a pity that he is such a poor finder. Philip Schaff, the great Presbyterian scholar, says all commentators of note in

all the world and in all ages (except two) found water and immersion in Rom. 6:4!

He asks us to locate the babes, and says. "I have shown you that our teaching locates the babe with the righteous." You have shown it by your assumption (without any proof) that there is a pre-natal conversion of the child, while your teaching (in the Methodist Discipline) locates the babe with the unrighteous, under the wrath of God, till it is delivered in water baptism! Quite a difference.

Mr. Weaver makes another effort to show that the word "men" in Acts 8:12 might refer to a man child. He quotes. "Ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man," and asks us to meet the lexical argument. There is no lexical argument to meet. The word defined by your lexicon is not the word used in Acts 8:12! Better wipe your spectacles, and try again! The Greek word for "men" in Acts 8:12 is used over two hundred times in the New Testament, and King James' translators did not render it "boy" or "man child" a single time. But we showed that the "men and women" of Acts 8:12 "believed" before they were baptized. Why did not Mr. W. notice that point?

He next goes back to Moses and the law, and quotes several texts to show that children should be taught. Yes, but we are not debating about teaching children. We can find authority for teaching children in the New Testament, without going to Moses. But that has nothing to do with infant baptism. Can you instruct an unconscious babe by putting a few drops of water on its face? We are commanded to raise up our children in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord," but who would be so foolish as to try to nurture a child with water? He says the children they taught back there did not know anything. That is a mistake. The text says "which have not known anything."

He next "blows the trumpet in Zion" (his same old trum-

pet), and "gathers the children that suck the breasts." That has nothing to do with infant baptism, unless you have a Methodist Dutchman who infers that they saddled their asses and brought the sucking children to Joel to be baptized! But Joel says, "Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar." Is that the way Methodist ministers do when they have a great many sucking babes to baptize? The text in Joel has reference to a national calamity, that demanded national sorrow. But Mr. Weaver says, "This is the spiritual Zion, and it had its babes." The Methodist church has no babes. Is it any part of spiritual Zion? Dr. Jacob Ditzler says in his book that there is not an infant in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South! What a poor spiritual Zion it must be! You ought to "blow the trumpet in Zion," and "weep between the porch and the altar!" If we believed that infants were any part of spiritual Zion. we would not only put water on their faces, but would put their names on the class-book and count them members. You know we can not induce Mr. Weaver to show us his class-book. The infants of Joel's day were a part of the fleshly Zion, for everything that had Abraham's flesh belonged to it. How much spirituality did a sucking babe possess? Oh, tut, tut!

Our friend asks us to give a text that shows a new church was established. We gave many at the first of this debate, and he has not met them, except to dispute what they say. At Dan. 2:44 we read: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." This is future, yet when this language was spoken the Abrahamic church had been in existence thirteen hundred years. Daniel also says he spoke of "what shall come to pass hereafter." John the Baptist said, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand"—not that it has been here nineteen hundred years. The Savior said, "Upon this rock I *will build* my church." and used the future tense. Of

course he did not mean that he had built it two thousand years ago. He said to the Jews, members of the Abrahamic church, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death. till they see the kingdom of God." They had seen the old Abrahamic thing ever since the day of their birth. Paul said that Christ destroyed the enmity between Jew and Gentile, "to make in himself of twain one *new man*"—not one old man. If Mr. Weaver will take hold of these texts, and show that a single one of them does not mean what it says, we will give up the entire controversy. He should have been attending to this business before now, instead of careering all over the Bible and quoting texts that had no possible connection with the subject in debate. But he has only one more speech, and of course he can not do this big work in so short a time.

We have also shown that no member of the Abrahamic church was allowed membership in the church of Christ without initiation. There were no holding-over members. This shows the churches are not the same.

Our friend has not made a point for infant baptism since the debate commenced, and we shall see that he does not make one till the close.

MR. WEAVER'S TWENTIETH SPEECH.

Our friend says he quoted Mr. Wesley, all he said, on Rom. 6:4, and says I haven't the book, and am ignorant of what Wesley said, and also of what the Discipline contains. I think I know what I am talking about. He has made the unqualified statement more than once that the Methodist Discipline locates the babe with the unrighteous, under the wrath of God, till it is delivered in water baptism. I have denied the statement, and challenged him for that statement in the Discipline. Have you seen it?

Our statement about the men in Acts 8 will take care of itself with the thoughtful.

Our friend thinks the teaching of children has nothing to do with infant baptism. He won't believe in infant baptism because there is no expressed command for it. Then, to be consistent, he would not believe in the baptism of men as such, nor in women taking the sacrament, nor in immersion, for the same reason.

Our friend thinks I am ignorant of history also. He should have said Mr. Wall was ignorant. I quoted him full and fair. Our friend can't meet or refute his statements with any authentic history. I have read some history, and I am willing to leave the historic facts I gave from Mr. Wall with Mr. Armitage. Our friend says, "Schaff says all commentators of note in all the world and in all ages except two found water and immersion in Rom. 6:4." They found water there like our friend finds all of Miss Lydia's household to be believers, by presumption. If water was there, why did not the two find it? If Paul had mentioned water in the book of Romans, our friend could find it now, and would not have to depend on Mr. S.'s presumption.

Our friend charges me with saying "the children they taught back there did not know anything," and says, "That is a mistake." Now, friends, read my article and see if I made that statement. Note if I did not give the Scripture word for word.

Our friend keeps saying no babes in the Methodist church, no record of their names on the class-book. Mr. Weaver can't be induced to show his class-book. Now, my friends, you can find a Methodist church record, by going to any Methodist pastor that observes the law of his church, and can see for yourself that the statement is not true.

Our friend comes again to his main text, "Upon this rock I will build my church." I will say again if you will examine

closely the many texts I have given, with the lexicon I gave, that point will take care of itself also.

Now, my friends, take the statement of a text given in a former speech: "Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord." "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and will build it as in the days of old." Now, my friends, the issue is this: Our friend makes this text do away with the house of Jacob, or tabernacle of David, and build a new one. contradistinguished from this one which had fallen down. Now hear the New Testament: "And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written: After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." Now if God built a new one, and let the old one go, how could these texts be true? Now, after this house of Jacob, or tabernacle of David, which was down, had been constructed, or established, or as the text gives it. built again, then the spiritual meaning is given. As there is no issue on that part of the meaning, I will give one additional text on the issue and leave it with you. Rom. 9:3: "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever, amen. Not as though the word of God has taken none effect. For they are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of

the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Now I challenge our friend again to show any promise of salvation to any people outside of the covenant with Abraham. This text tells us plainly what I have proven by other texts, that Abraham's fleshly seed were not in the spiritual church or family of Abraham.

Now, my friends, I have taken by plain unmistakable texts (many of them) this promise of God, and found its development into the covenant, and the covenant into the church of God, with pure men, women and babes in it, and that by God's instruction, and that this church of God was the same that Moses belonged to. All of which, if you will examine carefully our friend's speeches on this question, he has admitted. So our proposition is well sustained, when so freely admitted by our good friend. Now I ask. will our friend affirm a new church of Christ contradistinguished from this, and give me the privilege of examining it before his readers? I think I can safely answer for him. No.

I will now give you statements from Mr. J. M. Camp, a Baptist historian. On page 32 he tells us the birthplace of infant baptism was a district of northern Africa, among the unenlightened. The time, the middle of the third century. The occasion or ground for it. unscriptural notions. The design was in order to pardon or salvation. On page 33 and 34 we have an account of sixty-six bishops in council in the year 252, for the settlement of various ecclesiastical matters. One Fidus wrote to these bishops, through Cyprian bishop of Carthage, revered as great authority in all church affairs. The question he wanted settled by this council was whether an infant just born should be baptized, as the custom of that age was to kiss the newly baptized. Some thought it not proper to kiss a new-born infant, as it was treated as unclean for several days

after its birth. Others thought that not a good reason to delay its baptism. So now the answer comes from this august body of fathers: "None of us could agree to your opinion. On the contrary, it is the opinion of us all, that the mercy and grace of God must be refused to no human being, so soon as he is born." I would I had space to give all said on p. 32-34 inclusive. If you will now compare the statement on p. 32 on origin of infant baptism in the middle of the third century, with that on p. 33 and 34, sixty-six bishops, the heads or fathers of the church in council in the year 252, and it is the universal decision of the bishops that a babe just born is a scriptural subject of baptism. You take this historic fact, as given by a Baptist preacher, sixty-six bishops, fathers, educated men, in 252 years of Christ's time, could they have been ignorant of apostolic practice? We would be perfectly safe in saying that the grandfathers of these old men lived in apostolic times, and knew without doubt as to whether the apostles practiced infant baptism. So it was impossible for them to have been ignorant of, or mistaken about, this grave subject. I will ask our friend, if infant baptism is an innovation, to please give us in authentic history the name of the person who baptized the first babe, the name of its parents, with a description of the house it was baptized in, and the name of the witnesses who saw it, with the impression this new thing made on the mind of those present. If it is an innovation, he can do so. We can trace every innovation to its fountain head, and trace it down to the present time. Take the immersion heresy, for instance, and history traces it with its three dips and nude state, when they used the salt and the kiss, and when these were left off, with the names of its friends and defenders, and also its enemies. So the request is reasonable, and I trust he will give us the desired information.

MR. BURNETT'S TWENTIETH REPLY.

Mr. Weaver beats any debater we ever saw. He calls for proof, and when the proof is presented in plain black and white, he calls for the proof again in his next speech! We have given him Wesley's statement on Rom. 6:4 three times, and he is still calling for Wesley's words! It was charitably supposed that Weaver did not have the book, and was ignorant of what Wesley said; for when asked to give the words that had been, omitted, he made no attempt to do so. Then he says he has denied the charge that the Discipline locates the babe under the wrath of God till it was washed away in baptism. Yes, he has denied the statement—denied the express words of his Discipline—for we quoted the passage *verbatim et litteratim et spellatim et punctuatim*. In the baptismal service the minister prays to God that the child may be "delivered from thy wrath." Why pray this prayer, if the child is not under the wrath? Then we quoted Wesley (who wrote the Discipline), where he says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism." Wesley and the Discipline are both against Weaver, and he ought to have the honesty to come out and confess it.

He says we will not believe in infant baptism without an express command or example, and that we ought not for a like reason to believe in the baptism of men, or in women "taking the sacrament." We have express command for the baptism of men (Acts 10:48). and express example of the baptism of men and women (Acts 8:12), but no example of women "taking the sacrament." There is no "sacrament" in the New Testament. But there is abundant proof that women ate the Lord's supper. See Acts 2:38-44.

He says we ought to accuse Wall, and not Weaver, of being

ignorant of history. Wall did not say what Weaver tries to make him say, viz.. that the apostolic baptism was three dips of a nude candidate.

He does not deny the statement of Philip Schaff, the great Presbyterian encyclopedist, that all commentators of the world in all ages (except two) said Paul found immersion in Rom. 6:4, but asks: "Why did not the two find it?" They were like Rev. J. C. Weaver—had their eyes shut. And he thinks "our friend" could find water in the book of Romans, if Paul had mentioned it. Paul did mention it in Rom. 6:4, and John Wesley found it, and Adam Clark found it, and Albert Barnes found it, and all the great men of the earth found it, except J. C. Weaver and two more! Did you ever hear of the man who did not see the rats run out of the barn? His name was J. C. W.

As to our charge that there are no babes in the Methodist church, he asks the readers of this debate to secure a church record and see for themselves that the statement is not true. Our friend is a dodger. He knows most of these readers will never see a church record. You observe that he has not asserted that the names of the babes can be found on the roll of members. There is a place in the class-book where the pastor enters the names of all persons married by him, and all babies sprinkled by him. but he does not enter them as members. This scribe once had a debate with Mr. Weaver in a church where he was pastor. The class-book was called for, but it was not produced. It was in the pulpit desk, locked up, and Mr. W. would not give us the key. We made him a proposition, that if he would produce the church record, and there was one baby's name on the roll of members, we would give up the debate! He did not unlock the desk. We then confronted him with the statement of Dr. Jacob Ditzler, that there is not an

infant in the M. B. Church, South, and he admitted that babes "are not *bona fide* members!"

In reply to our re-quotation of the text, "Upon this rock I will build my church," he quotes two texts, one of which says God will not "utterly destroy the house of Jacob," and the other that God will "build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen." Neither one of these texts has any reference to the church of Christ. The "tabernacle of David" is the royal house of David. The "house of Jacob" is the fleshly family of Jacob, the Jews. The house of Jacob is in existence today, but it is no part of the church of Christ. Does Mr. Weaver belong to the "house of Jacob?" He knows he does not. Christ said, "I will build (*oikodomeso*) my church," and God said, "I will build again, or re-build (*anoikodomeso*) the tabernacle of David." Do you not see the prefix (*an*) to that verb in the latter text? The church was to be builded. and the tabernacle re-builded. Mr. Weaver's eyes are as blind to Greek as they are to water in Rom. 6.

He next comes to history, and finds (A. D. 252) sixty-six bishops in Africa sitting upon the case of a babe two days old, as to whether they should give it baptism and save it from hell-fire! He says the preachers had some scruples about kissing a new-born babe, but that was not the trouble. They had imbibed the Weaver idea that baptism came in room of circumcision, and Fidus wished to be consistent and wait till the child was eight days old; but they had also imbibed the Wesley idea that all infants are "conceived and born in sin" and are under the wrath of God till it is washed away by baptism, and many infants die before they are eight days old. Hence their action on the case. Listen:

"But in respect of the case of infants, which you say ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after birth, and the law of ancient circumcision should be regarded. . . .

we all thought very differently. . . . We all rather judge that the mercy and grace of God is not to be refused to any one born of man. . . . We must strive that, if possible, no soul be lost. . . . But again, if even the greatest sinners, and those who had sinned much against God. when they subsequently believed, remission of sins was granted—and nobody is hindered from baptism and from grace—how much rather ought we to shrink from hindering an infant, who being lately born, has not sinned except in that being born after the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the ancient death at its earliest birth, who approaches the more easily on this very account to the reception of the forgiveness of sins."

These African bishops, whose grand-daddies Weaver thinks knew the apostolic practice, did not want any poor little babe to go to damnation, even to save the law of circumcision, for want of a little water! They did not want the "mercy and grace of God" withheld from any born sinner, and thought that they should "strive that if possible no soul be lost," especially before it is eight days old! One might almost conclude that a two-days-old babe could receive forgiveness of sins without baptism, especially as the sins were not his own! Ah, if those bishops had but discovered Weaver's pre-natal regeneration! Our friend could not find infant baptism in the Bible, but he finds it two hundred and fifty years down the Anno Domini, away out in Africa, where they dipped two-days-old babes head-and-ears in the pond to save them from hell-fire for sins the babes did not commit!

Our friend asks, if infant baptism was an innovation, that we give the name of the man who baptized the first babe, etc. Suppose we ask Weaver to give the name of the first person who prayed to the Virgin Mary, or worshiped images, or exorcised demons, or put salt in the mouths of the converts, or in-

vented sponsors, or advocated a pope? Could he do it? Instead of his foolish demand, he ought to find the name of the apostle that baptized infants, or the text in the Bible that authorized it. He knows that he has not done it, in twenty long speeches.

But he says he can trace the heresy of immersion. Yes, he can trace it through all the centuries, but he can not find where it stops this side of the apostles. Infant baptism stops in Africa, two hundred years down the Anno Domini, and you can not find a trace of it beyond that date, but immersion goes back to the Jordan. Every historian in the world says it was the apostolic practice. We gave Bingham, and Bossuet, and Milman, and Mosheim, and Neander, and Stanley, and Stackhouse, and Schaff, and Waddington, and Wall—all members of pedobaptist churches—and they all say immersion was the primitive practice. Not one says sprinkling was the practice. We challenged him to find a single one in the whole world. So all the historians are against him, and the Bible is against him, and he might as well give it up.

FINIS.