

THEOLOGICAL DEBATE

BETWEEN

REV. JOHN S. SWEENEY, OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH;

AND

REV. J. B. LOGAN, OF THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH;

HELD AT

WHITEHALL, GREENE COUNTY, ILLINOIS,

ON THE

24th, 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th days of February, 1862.

UPON THE SEVERAL TOPICS SET FORTH IN THE PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE HEREWITH PUBLISHED.

"Prece all things, and hold fast that which is good."—Paul.

REPORTED BY JOHN

WINCHESTER:
S. W. DEEMAN, PRINTER.

1862.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Winchester, Ill., October 7, 1861.

Rev. J. B. LOGAN:

I reached home on Friday evening last, after an absence of six weeks, and found in my drawer a correspondence between some of my brethren and Rev. A. Davie, of your church — all residing in the vicinity of Whitehall — concerning a proposed discussion of the distinctive differences between the teaching of the Cumberland Presbyterian church and that of the church to which I belong. The following is an extract from Rev. A. Davis's first letter: "I at once addressed Bro. Logan and received a letter from him this day in which he accepts your challenge on the following conditions, viz.—1. Your man must be of good moral character, and fully endorsed by your denomination. 2. The propositions must be plain and tangible, such as may be agreed upon by both parties 3. The discussion to take place not before the 1st or 2d week in November next."

As my brethren have requested me to be their "man" in the discussion proposed, and to cut the whole matter short, I write you now for the purpose of bringing about an agreement upon the propositions and preliminaries. I offer the following:

1. Sprinkling or pouring water upon a proper subject is Christian baptism. You affirm.

2. Baptism properly administered to a proper subject, is for (i. e. in order to) the remission of sins. I affirm.

The infant of a believing parent is a proper subject of Christian baptism. You affirm.

The foregoing, as I conceive set forth the *important* points of difference between us, and certainly they are "plain and tangible."

You may fix the *time* for the debate to suit your convenience, so it is within two months from the date hereof.

The *place*, in which I suppose, is *Whitehall*. All other preliminaries can be arranged when the propositions are agreed on.

Respectfully yours,

J. S. SWEENEY.

Alton, Ill., October 24, 1861.

Rev. J. S. SWEENEY—

Dear Sir—Yours of the 7th inst. was received just as I was starting for the fall meeting of our Presbytery and I could not then respond, and as I also attended the annual meeting of our Synod, I have not been at home since I received your letter until yesterday. This will explain why I have thus delayed an answer to your letter.

You propose three propositions for discussion, neither of which do, as I conceive, present our differences as I think they can be and ought to be presented. Your first proposition I object to, because it does not covet all the ground. I propose the following propositions as less objectionable—

1. Christian baptism can only be performed by the entire immersion of the body of a proper subject in water, by a proper administrator. You affirm, I deny.

2. The infants of parents, one or both of which are believers, are proper subjects of Christian baptism I affirm, you deny.

3. Christian baptism is for (i. e. in order to) the remission of sins. You affirm, I deny.

You will see these propositions contain the substance of the three you propose, but are certainly more explicit. Then, there is certainly no propriety in placing me in the affirmative on the mode, when it is you who seek the discussion. You ought to be willing to affirm what you preach, and wherein you believe us, and other Pedo-Baptists wrong. Were I to challenge you or your people to discussion, I most certainly would expect to be placed in the affirmative, and thereby in the lead. For this is virtually assumed by the challenging party. Nevertheless, if you accede to these reasonable

conditions, I will yield my right to follow on all the propositions, and will agree to affirm on the subject, as I have proposed.

If convenient, an early reply is desired.

I propose, if you are willing, that we confine the whole argument to the testimony of the English Bible, common version. What do you say to this?

Yours, most respectfully,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, November 1, 1861.

Rev. J. B. LOGAN:

Dear Sir— Yours of the 24th of October, came to my office by due course of mail, but, owing to my absence, I did not read it till yesterday, which will account for any apparent tardiness on my part in responding.

I am not at all disposed to be *precisive* about the wording of propositions for discussion, but I certainly cannot accept your proposed substitute for my *first*, as it seems, to me, to be evasive of the true issue. I am willing to affirm in debate all I teach which is properly affirmative, but no more. I am not now, and hope never to become, so earnest a "seeker" for discussion, as to affirm, and essay to prove, a *negative!* I teach affirmatively, *that the water baptism of the New Testament is immersion.* Will you deny? If so, I can then "lead" in the discussion. If not, I can *affirm* no further—not even to accommodate myself. But you *do* affirm further. *Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person.* Con. of Faith, page 154. This I *deny.* "You ought to be willing to affirm what you preach."

It is clear as day to my mind, that so far as we differ on the *action* of baptism, you are properly in the affirmative—unless you will deny that "the baptism of the New Testament is immersion." If I believed, as you do, and as I have cited from your Confession of Faith, I would certainly be willing to affirm on this question.

It is not at all clear to my mind, that because my brethren invited yours to discussion, we must therefore affirm where you are properly in the affirmative, and "lead" where you are of right in the "lead."

I am unwilling to affirm, as you would have me, that "Christian baptism is (unqualifiedly) for (that is, in order to) the remission of sins," for the very simple reason that I *do not believe it.* If you can find the man who will affirm it, I will *deny.* But I *do* believe that baptism, *properly administered to a proper subject,* is a condition of the remission of sins, and am willing to affirm the same in debate. Do *you* believe it? If not, why *not deny,* and meet me upon the issue?

Your amendment to my *third* I very willingly accept.

As you desire that I should "lead," and as I have no objection to doing so, I will offer you now as follows: 1. The baptism of the New Testament is immersion. I affirm. 2. "Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person." Con. of Faith, p. 154. You affirm. 3. Baptism, properly administered to a proper subject is for (i. e. in order to) the remission of sins. I affirm. 4. The infants of parents, one or both of which, are believers, are proper subjects of Christian baptism. You affirm.

Surely these propositions fairly present the points of difference.

I am not of the opinion that it would be best to "confine the whole argument to the testimony of the English Bible, common version." Let me hear from you as early as convenient. Very respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

Alton, Ill., October 30, 1861.

Rev. J. S. SWEENEY:

Dear Sir — In my hasty note to you the other day, I forgot to mention the time for the debate. As you gave me any time until the 7th of December to fix the time, I have thought that Tuesday after the 4th Sunday in November, will be the time, and I propose that we begin at ten o'clock, and spend six hours each day in discussion, as follows, from 10 to 12 M., then recess till 2 o'clock, P. M.; then discuss until 4 p. M.; recess to 7; adjourn at 9 o'clock. The affirmant and respondent each to have one hour for the opening speech on each proposition, then half hour each to the close. The closing speech of the respondent is to contain no new matter.

No proposition to be discussed longer than two days, and may be closed sooner by the affirmant giving the respondent notice three hours before he desires to close. With these plain points settled. I suppose that little else will be necessary, but for each of us to select a suitable Moderator, and they two to select a third. I will have my man on the ground with me Now friend Sweeney. I understand you and your

people have been boasting and blowing a long time, that we were *afraid* to meet you in discussion. I did not seek this debate, but if there is any backing down, it must come from your side of the house.

Respectfully yours,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, November 1, 1861.

Rev J. B. LOGAN:

Dear Sir — I, this morning, mailed an answer to yours of the 24th October, and since doing so, have received yours of the 30th, and hasten to respond.

You will see from my answer, above referred to, that we are not exactly agreed upon propositions yet, unless you can accede to those presented in my letter. I desire no advantage of you, sir, in the statement of propositions. I only desire a fair statement and then a fair discussion. True, I left it with you to name the time for commencing the discussion, only limiting you to two months from the date of my former letter—but can I not prevail upon you to meet me either *earlier*, or a month later? This would suit me much better.

To all other suggestions, as to preliminaries, in your letter, I agree.

As to “blowing and boasting” I have simply to say, I have done none of it myself. If my friends have, it was in my absence.

Let me assure you there will be no “backing down” here.

Very respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

November 4, 1861.

Rev. J. S. SWEENEY:

Dear Sir — Your letters are both to hand this morning. You dissent from my first proposition as a substitute for yours, and assign what, to me, is a singular reason, viz: that I want you to “affirm and essay to prove a *negative*.” Now, my dear, sir, I have asked you to do no such thing. I ask you to do precisely what you say you are “willing” to do—to affirm that nothing is baptism but immersion. If you do not teach this, then there is no need of a discussion. If you believe that baptism can be performed other than by an “entire immersion” of the body in water, then there is no difference of opinion between us.

You say the proposition I made is “evasive.” What evasion is there? You have not pointed it out, and I venture to say you will not.

Your 2d proposition is necessarily involved in the first. I expect to be able to prove precisely what our confession teaches in taking the negative of that proposition.

I have more confidence in your intelligence than to believe you *serious* in stating two propositions to discuss the mode. Besides, you first presented only three propositions: now you have four; that is, you have split one in two and made another. You say I “ought to be willing to affirm what I preach.” I *am* willing to teach—and will do so in that discussion—just what I believe and teach elsewhere. But I am not going to let you challenge me to discussion, and then at your option let you either lead or follow—place me in the affirmative. You challenge me to do what *f* *Why to disprove your, teachings*; this is evidently embraced in a challenge. If I had challenged you I would not hesitate a moment to affirm what our Confession of Faith teaches, and ask you to disprove it if you could. I have not inserted one word in that proposition, that your people and writings do not teach, *and you know it*. Do you simply affirm that baptism is immersion? Yea, you go further and say *nothing is baptism but immersion*. The question between us is *not* whether immersion is baptism, but whether that *alone* is baptism. If you are unwilling to affirm a proposition of this kind, then it is unnecessary to prolong the correspondence. I am willing to let the world judge between us, whose propositions are “evasive yours or mine. You either believe or you do not, that immersion only is baptism. If you do, then why not affirm it (or will it not do to affirm such a doctrine) and in your own language, “if you do not, then why not *deny* it?”

As you object to the proposition on the *design*, I propose this—*Christian baptism is indispensable in order to the remission of sins*. You affirm.

I see no propriety in lugging in the *mode* and the *subject*—as you propose—in a proposition exclusively on the design of baptism. Let us discuss each separately and fairly. I ask nothing else. This last form does away with what you objected to, and I hope will be acceptable. It simply presents what I have always understood to be the universal belief of the so called Disciples, from Mr. A. Campbell down.

I still think my proposition on the made perfectly fair and plain, and not "evasive;" and, therefore, I am unwilling to discuss any other, unless it embodies the same sentiment.

You object to confining ourselves to the common version for proofs. Very well. Wherever you go, I can go. The same kind of evidence is equally admissible on both sides.

As to the *time*, you gave me the privilege of appointing the time at any period within two months, and that is the time, (Tuesday after the 4th Sunday inst.) for which we can be amply prepared. I would gladly accommodate you in putting it off had I not already written to my Moderator to be with me on that occasion. So you see I am in earnest about the matter. I hope it will be convenient to answer me soon, and that we may come to a definite and satisfactory understanding.

Yours, with respect,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, November 8, 1861.

Rev. J. B. LOGAN:

Dear Sir — Yours of the 4th is to hand, and I proceed to reply at my earliest opportunity. "Singular" as it may appear to you, it is nevertheless true, that you 'want me to affirm and essay to prove a negative."

When I say "immersion is baptism," I *affirm* something — something to which you assent, and consequently about which we will have no controversy. But when I say, "nothing but immersion is baptism," I *deny* something; and this is the proposition substantially, that you would have me to *affirm*! By the way, I am not conscious of having said I was "willing" to affirm this.

You say, "If you believe that baptism can be performed other than by an "entire immersion" of the body in water, then there is no difference of opinion between us." But I do *not* believe this. You *do*, and this is precisely the point of difference between us; and, who, I ask, is in the affirmative? There is but one proper way of getting at the point of difference here, and that is for you to come up square and affirm what you preach, and what your Confession of Faith asserts; that "baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person." *This I deny*. Will you affirm and meet an opponent upon this proposition from *your own Confession of Faith*, or will you decline?

"I have more confidence in your intelligence than to believe you *serious*," in all you have had to say about my being in the "lead," simply because my brethren are, as you are doubtless informed, the challenging party. *Seriously*, friend L., does that make a difference as to the *affirmative* or the *negative* of a preposition?

Why not ask me to *affirm* that nobody but believers are proper subjects of baptism? You could certainly do so with the same propriety with which you ask me to affirm that nothing but immersion is baptism. But whether true or false, both are *negative* propositions. What would you think of my "intelligence," were I to ask you to *affirm* that "baptism is not for the remission of sins." Whatever you might think of my intelligence, and whatever you might think of the truth of the proposition, I imagine it would take you but a short time to discover that it is a *negative* proposition. So it is, and therefore I would not ask any man to affirm it, though he might *believe* it.

You were not invited to this discussion simply "to disprove my teachings," *but to prove your own*, that are questionable.

I am willing — yea, anxious — to meet you in discussion on the action of baptism, but as you are logically in the affirmative so far as we differ, and are unwilling to affirm what you "teach elsewhere," and what is plainly asserted in your Confession of Faith, I suppose I shall be disappointed.

When I have a practice which I am "*afraid*" to affirm is Scriptural and right, and to assert publicly in the face of an opponent, I will thrust it away as unworthy the attention of a Christian. I believe in and practice immersion — which is all I do believe in and practice, as baptism — and I will assert that it is Scriptural and right in the face of any respectable opponent, any where and at any convenient time. I *deny* (simply and call for the affirmant) that anything else is baptism. You believe in and practice pouring and sprinkling for baptism, but will not affirm in the presence of an opponent, that your own practice is Scriptural! Where is the man among you who will? Where?

True, there are men among you who will debate if they can get some body to affirm a proposition with a "not," a "nothing else," an "only," or some — other *negative* term in it, over which a *quibble* may be raised.

Did you not see that the proposition I offered to affirm — “the baptism of the New Testament is immersion”— was *fatal* to your pouring and sprinkling? Why not deny it? Do you believe it? If you can deny this I will be in the “lead” all the time on the “mode.”

The difference between us upon the *design* of baptism is simple, easily set forth, and I am properly in the affirmative. I believe that baptism is a *condition* of the remission of sins, which you deny. I gave you what seems to me to be a fair proposition. You objected to it, and in your last propose the following: “Christian baptism is indispensable in order to the remission of sins.” This does not present the point of difference between us, as I am persuaded *you* will see upon reflection. God may *dispense* with, or abrogate any such condition of pardon if He choose. *Is baptism a condition of pardon?* is the question, and not whether it or any other condition is “indispensable.”

I will offer the following, which I hope will be acceptable: “*Christian baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins.*” This I will affirm, and if you cannot deny it, I suppose we are together on the design of baptism.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain yours, respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

Alton, Ill., November 11, 1861.

Rev. Mr. Sweeney:

Dear Sir — Yours of recent date is to hand. You still persist in saying that I want you to affirm “a negative.” Wow, sir, here is the proposition, and the only one, I have presented on the mode, and I say that I am willing that any gentleman or scholar in the land, shall decide whether there is in it any negation presented. I am certain there is not, and believe you are too.

“Christian baptism can only be performed by the entire immersion of the body of a proper subject in water, by a proper administrator—you affirm.” Where is the negative? The adverb only is never a negative word, and if it could be so shown in *some* instances, it cannot possibly be so here. This is what you say you believe. Then why not affirm it? The only reason that I can see is, because *you are afraid to affirm what the whole world knows you and your people teach.* As for my being afraid to defend what our confession teaches, I will show you about that if we ever discuss the subject.

This is substantially the proposition which Mr. Campbell proposed to debate with Rice, and preferred it, as the correspondence will show, to placing Rice in the affirmative on just such a proposition as you desire to place me. I am neither afraid nor ashamed to defend any where, all that our book teaches on the subject of baptism. But I do not feel bound just to please you, to take a detached paragraph from its connection out of the chapter on baptism, and discuss it rather than a full, short, comprehensive proposition covering the whole ground. This proposition I have presented embracing what you will not deny is your opinion and teaching, yet you will not affirm it in debate. You say I am “logically” in the affirmative. Well, I will put Mr. Campbell against you, for *he* claimed that logically and of right he should affirm on the mode, and proposed, *insisted on it*, and finally discussed a proposition with Rice which had this veritable “only” in it, which you are pleased to call a “negative.” Well, you charge Mr. Campbell with ignorance of language and “logic,” in not being able to discern an affirmative from a negative!!! All I ask you to do is to affirm what he affirmed, or some proposition covering the same ground. But this you stubbornly refuse to do. I have never asked you to affirm as a proposition to be discussed that “nothing is baptism but immersion.” That I grant is affirming a negative, but the proposition I proposed had no such negative, and is not, nor can it be tortured into, a negative proposition. It is one which the public will recognize as containing precisely what you teach all over the land, and your people. I understand then, that on the mode of baptism you challenge me to a defense of *my* views, and yet you refuse outright to affirm *your own*. Moreover, you challenge me to defend, and you are afraid to make an *attack*. Surely you are a brave champion.

Whenever you will frame a proposition so as to attack our faith, I will soon show you whether I will respond or not. I hold you bound now to redeem your promise. You say in your last, “when I have a practice which I am afraid to affirm is Scriptural and right, and to assert publicly in the face of an opponent, I will thrust it away as unworthy the attention of a Christian.” Now, sir, every body knows I have presented you a proposition which does express precisely your “practice” and teaching, and yet for some cause—if it be not fear, then what is it?—you persistently refuse to

"affirm is Scriptural and right, and to assert publicly in the face of an opponent." You are bound to "thrust it aside as no longer worthy your attention as a Christian."

You object again to the proposition on the design of baptism, and present another. I can see no reason for your objection. You say baptism is a *condition* of the remission of sins, "but God *may* dispense with or abrogate any such condition." Then what is the "condition" worth? It is no condition at all. It must not be dispensed with, or then it is no condition. I believe that whatever God proposes as a condition of pardon, we have no authority from God's Word to say he *may* dispense with or abrogate." If then baptism is a condition at all it is an indispensable condition. If God can and does save some men without it, then it is no condition of salvation from that very fact. However, as this will come up in the debate, I will accept it with this additional verbal alteration, which I presume you will accede to. "Christian baptism is a condition of the Gospel precedent to the remission of sins, equally important with repentance and faith." You affirm.

I have now acceded to two out of three propositions which you propose, claiming only the privilege of proposing the one on the mode. Will *you* accede to that? We shall see.

Yours, very truly,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, Ill., November 18, 1862.

REV. J. B. LOGAN:

Dear Sir: — Yours of the 11th inst. is to hand, and I hasten to respond. In affirming that Christian baptism is immersion in water, I simply affirm my faith and practice; and the wording of the proposition in this simple way is all-sufficient to develop the true position of my brethren. This, I repeat, is the extent of our *affirmation*, so far as this question is concerned,

You affirm in your creed and in your preaching that sprinkling or pouring water upon a person is baptism. I deny that it is: So that all beyond the simple affirmation, that Christian baptism is immersion, I *deny*; and this is precisely the issue between us. When you put in your little "only" you make me affirm a negative, because it extends the affirmation to any and every thing which is not immersion. Why do you put "only" in your proposition? Is it not because of the relation of sprinkling and pouring to the practice of your church, and to make me extend the affirmation to this practice? The word "only" in your proposition separates between immersion and any other action that may be substituted for it. But my relation to any other action for baptism than immersion is *wholly negative*. I deny that it is baptism: and so I think you can see that your "veritable only" is in fact forcing a negative element into an otherwise affirmative proposition.

As to what you have had to say about Mr. Campbell, it is simply *twaddy*, and I shall not notice it further.

You say you are "willing that any gentleman *or* scholar in the land shall decide whether there is in your proposition any negation presented." How is this V Will a "gentleman" do, whether a "scholar" or not? And will a "scholar" do whether a "gentleman" or not V Or do you mean any one who is both a gentleman and scholar? It this is your meaning, I agree to it. I am perfectly willing that any such person upon whom we may agree—or if you please he may be chosen by our board of moderators—shalt judge and decide between us.

In your letter of the 4th, you say, "I ask you to do precisely what you say you are willing to do—to *affirm that nothing is baptism but immersion.*" In your last you say, "I have never asked you to affirm as a proposition to be discussed, *that nothing is baptism but immersion.* THAT I GRANT IS AFFIRMING A NEGATIVE!!" Surely you write like one "crazed with care."

I will accept your "verbal alteration" to my proposition on the design, though I confess I can see no good reason for having it there.

Yours, respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

Alton, Ill., November 19, 1861.

REV. MR. SWEENEY:

Sir —Yours of the 18th. inst is received. Your persevering effort to make out that my proposition is a "negative" is a signal failure. You have given neither precept nor example but your own *ipse dixit*, which I beg leave to say is not sufficient authority. I did say in one of my letters, that what I asked you to do was to "affirm" (in substance of course) that nothing was baptism but immersion." But that was not intended as you must know, as the *form* of the proposition to be discussed, which proposition I had distinctly and explicitly stated elsewhere. You might as well have selected any

other sentence in my letter and claimed that I had presented that as a proposition to be discussed.

Negative or affirmative, you do preach in substance that nothing is baptism but immersion as all the world knows. But then, I repeat it, and the quotation you make with so many flourishes *proves* it, that I never offered you *that form* of a proposition to be discussed. I offered you a proposition which in form is *not* a negative, and teaches just what you teach—that immersion is essential to baptism. The same *sentiment* can be placed in a hundred propositions, not necessarily negative in form, any of them.

My proposition is the one which Alexander Campbell has discussed time and again, with a very «light modification. He surely was as intelligent and logical as you or myself, and yet you dismiss the reference to Mr. Campbell as *preferring* the proposition in this form as “simply twaddv.” That is, when I ask you respectfully to affirm what your great leader has selected as a proposition which, with his large experience and extensive learning, he regards as the one best of all others, calculated to draw out the differences between your people and the Pedo-Baptists, on the mode, you compliment it as “*simply twaddy.*”

I have now acceded to *two* out of the three of your own propositions. You, who have been virtually challenging our people for months past as I have understood, and actually did formally challenge me to a public discussion, *now refuse to affirm your own doctrine*, for whether you own it or not, the world knows that what I presented as a proposition on the mode, is a fair, full and explicit declaration of your faith. *You do not deny it.* But oh! it is a “negative” affirmation. Well then, Alexander Campbell all his life was so silly as to affirm, *yea, prefer to affirm* a negative proposition.

Suppose for the sake of argument, it is affirming a negative, yet it presents the true stand point of your people, just what you teach; you are bound to affirm it. I now see that you do not intend to have any discussion if you can possibly help it. You have baffled the matter off until it is now impossible to have any discussion at all in the time you have allotted. As for your quibbling about the “or” instead of the “and” in the sentence you quote from my letter, the copy in my possession reads *and*, and *not* or. Possibly in the hurry of copying I may have written or instead of and. I have no other proposition to make, if you see proper to frame a proposition so as to attack my faith, I will respond, if it be a reasonable one. But if you decline to do so, as I understand you do, then this is an end to the matter.

You remind me very much of a belligerent boy, who challenged another if he would come out into the street he would whip him. The boy took him at his word, went out into the street, and asked boy No. 1 to redeem his promise. “Oh!” says he, “I always fight in self-defense.” “*You begin the fight and then I will show you.*”

If you want to attack the doctrines and practices of our church, and feel yourself able to do so successfully, just frame your proposition and lead off, and I will meet you to the best of my ability. And when I challenge any gentleman to a public discussion of any subject, I will never refuse to *lead* in that discussion. As you now manifest no intention of discussing unless you can have it all your own way, I shall avail myself of a visit to White Hall at my earliest convenience, to redeem a promise to lecture on the subject of baptism, when you can find out whether I am afraid to teach what our confession of faith teaches. I am very sorry that my last letter was in your hand *seven days* before you answered it, as it will put me to some inconvenience to call in my arrangements for the discussion next week.

Respectfully,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, Ill., November 27, 1861.

REV. J. B. LOGAN:

Dear Sir — Yours of the 19th, post marked the 26th, (!) is to hand. You inform me that my “persevering effort to make out that your proposition is a negative is a signal failure.” I may have failed to make *you* see what is perfectly plain to others, and yet I am not ashamed of my effort.

I am almost out of patience with your sickly plea, that because, as you claim, I am the challenging party, I should “affirm” and “lead” all the time in the debate. “You have given neither precept nor example for it—” and still worse, there is no good sense in it. The fact is, I apprehend, you are afraid to affirm in debate what you preach and practice — that pouring or sprinkling is baptism. There lies the trouble. I am willing to affirm that my practice is scriptural and right. But Rev. J. B. Logan, who goes about lecturing on baptism, and advises his brethren not to practice immersion at all, but to practice pouring and sprinkling exclusively, dare not affirm in debate, *that his own practice is scriptural!*

My practice is not, boldly, called in question. *Who* will deny that immersion is baptism? The debate has always been about pouring and sprinkling for baptism; and your relation to it is affirmative; mine, wholly negative. If I understand you, you are earnestly contending that your proposition is "substantially" negative, but *formally* affirmative — that to affirm what you admit to be the "substance" of your proposition would, you "grant" be affirming a negative, yet in its present *form* it is a fair, full, plain, explicit, affirmative proposition!

Your last reference to Alexander Campbell as my "great leader," &c., makes me sorry for you. The devotees to a human creed, are so accustomed to look upon their faith-makers as their "great leaders," that they think every Christian must have some "great leader" other than Christ the Lord.

Now, sir, as my brethren insist that I shall not let you escape without a square back down, I will offer you a proposition on the "mode," which I will affirm, and which you must deny or ingloriously retreat from the field. Here it is:

Immersion in water is essential to Christian baptism. Positively there is no room for "quibbling" here. If you accept this, then we are agreed as follows:

1. Immersion in water is essential to Christian baptism—I affirm.
 2. Infants of parents, one or both of which are believers, are proper subjects of Christian baptism—you affirm.
 3. Christian baptism is a condition of the Gospel precedent to the remission of sins, equally important with repentance and faith — I affirm.
- By request of your Brother Davis I will submit the following additional propositions, which I will discuss, if you think, with your brethren, that they present points of sufficient importance.
4. All persons who are once soundly converted to God, will persevere and be finally saved — you affirm.
 5. The Cumberland Presbyterian "Confession of Faith" is a schismatical book—I affirm.
 6. The doctrine of total hereditary depravity is taught in the Holy Scriptures —you affirm.

This addition will give us six, instead of three propositions, and an equal number of affirmatives. And if you are disposed to discuss them, I suggest furthermore, and at the request of some of your brethren as well as some of mine, that we procure the services of a competent Stenographer, and have the debate reported for publication. With our consent this will be done by our friends in and about White Hall. As we are in for discussion we may as well be killed for an old sheep as a lamb. So what say you to all that is *new* in this communication?

Yours of the 11th was not in my hand "seven days," nor *two* days, Sunday excepted, before it was answered. By the way, how came it to pass, that your last was in the city of Alton, just one week before it was sent out?

Respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

P. S. — I should inform you that Mr. A. Campbell is *not dead*, unless he has died *very recently*, as you seem to be laboring under the impression that he is.

J. S. S.

Mon, Ills., November 30, 1861.

REV. MR. SWEENEY:

Yours of the 13th inst. is to hand. You say you are almost out of patience because I want you, being the challenging party, "to lead all the time in the debate." I have never asked you to lead *all the time* in the debate. I did say in substance that you ought not to refuse to do so; that when I shall become so bold and defiant as to challenge my brethren to debate, that I would not refuse to lead.

The very first proposition you made on the *subject* of baptism, I accepted and offered to affirm, and now you insist that I want you to "lead all the time." The truth is you have persistently tried to place *me* in the affirmative on all the questions on baptism, but finally agreed to affirm on the design. But I must affirm on the other two, because forsooth, as you said. "I was logically in the affirmative." You must have, had a small stock of patience as well as "logic" on hand.

As to your gratuitous statement that I am afraid to advocate pouring or sprinkling as baptism, I have neither written or hinted any such intimation, but the contrary.

As for your sneer about my "creed" and "faith-makers," you are welcome to all the credit such stuff will bring in the market. We have no creed other than that we believe taught in God's word. We have no leader but "Christ the Lord."

Never were a people greater "devotees to a human creed" than you and those who arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to the "Christian" name. Never did any people look up to human authority more than the mis-named "Reformers" have ever done to the writings and teachings of Alexander Campbell. There is no one minister in our denomination who has one half the influence over our people as a whole, as Mr. Campbell has with the "Reformers." In fact, the truth is patent that he originated your Sect, and this day stands as an oracle among you. What he says is re-echoed from a thousand "lesser lights" all over the land, as soon as it is received. Where were the so-called "Reformers" prior to Mr. Campbell's day?

Your repeated assertion that I "dare not affirm in debate that his (my) practice is Scriptural," can be better determined *after* the debate. I respectfully suggest the propriety of referring that matter to the audience who may hear us. Perhaps they may be of a different opinion.

With your usual courtesy you speak of my "going about lecturing on baptism," &c. Suppose I do. Does it not come with bad grace from you thus to sneer when you know that your entire Gospel is *inseparable* from baptism? If "baptism is a condition of the Gospel precedent to the remission of sins" then how can you preach your Gospel without "lecturing on baptism?" Or do you suppose that in this free country I have not as good a right to "lecture on baptism" as Rev. Mr. Sweeney or any one else?

Well, you have *at last* screwed up your courage so as to offer to affirm that, "Immersion in water is essential to Christian baptism. "Is it possible! I I thought your "practice" and "faith" in reference to the "action of baptism was "wholly negative."

But it seems you have at last discovered what others saw all the time, that your practice was *not necessarily* negative, and that a plain tangible proposition embracing precisely your faith could be easily formed, with no negative in it. But it seems you make this wonderful sacrifice of your "logical" position, in order that I "shall back square down," "ingloriously retreat," or then meet this Goliath of immersion. *This is decidedly rich.* You have never acceded to a single proposition of mine, but contended for your own or nothing, while I have acceded to *two* out of three you have presented, and only proposed *one*, and that one a clear, concise and explicit statement of your doctrine, and you "*dare not*" deny it. Talk about me "backing down!" Why sir, you know that I have even appointed the *day* for the debate to begin according to your own permission — made arrangements with my Moderator, and but for your persistent refusal to affirm what the whole world knows is a faithful statement of your doctrine, we might have had, and would have had, so far as I was concerned, the discussion long ago.

But sir, I *accept* your proposition as follows: "Immersion in water is *essential* to Christian baptism." You affirm. I prefer the one I submitted, but will take this, believing that it is this or no discussion.

We are now agreed upon the three propositions comprising the mode, subject and design of baptism.

You propose other propositions, and say it is at the "request of my Brother Davie." I have a letter before me, dated July 6th, 1861, and signed by three of *your* brethren challenging Brother Davis or me through him to discussion of these same propositions, with slight variations. This matter then originated with *you* and *not* with Bro. Davis. If we have any more propositions, I propose one on Divine influence.

I understand you to teach the following, that: The Holy Spirit holds communication with men only through the written word, or the Bible—you affirm, I deny. This I regard as a leading and important difference. The other propositions I do not regard "of sufficient importance" to warrant me in spending the time that their discussion in addition to the other three would require.

In reference to procuring a Stenographer, and having the debate published, I could answer you more definitely if you had stated *in what form* you propose to publish, in newspaper, pamphlet or book form. If, after consulting with my friends, and they and your friends see proper to bear the expense, I of course could not reasonably object, although I have never been anxious to see my name or efforts in print.

Respectfully,

J. B. LOGAN.

P. S. — Being engaged in a protracted meeting in my Congregation, I have not found time to transcribe this till this morning, which will account for its delay by mail.

The delay of my last I am not responsible for, further than the time at which I mailed it.

J. B. L.

December 5, 1861.

Winchester, Ill., December 9, 1861.

REV. J. B. LOGAN:

Sir—Yours of December 5th is to hand. You certainly *have* contended during our entire correspondence, that I ought to affirm and lead all the time in the debate, simply because, as you hold, I am the “challenging party.” In your *last*, you say you have urged that I should affirm on the “mode” for this reason. And if your plea holds good in reference to the “mode,” then why will it not in reference to the other questions? Hence I conclude, that if all you have had to say about the “challenging party,” amounts to anything at all, it amounts to what I said—that you want me to affirm and lead all the time in the debate, simply because, as you claim, I am the “challenging party.” Indeed, when you consented to “lead” on the “subject,” you said *you* did so, waiving your *right* to follow on all the questions.” And I now say, as I said before in substance, your plea is whimsical, puerile, and I am almost out of patience with it.

You say—“you have persistently tried to place *me* in the affirmative on all the questions on baptism, but finally agreed to affirm on the design.” I am utterly astonished at this! The truth is, and you ought to know it, I proposed to affirm on the *design* at the *beginning*, and have since repeated that I am properly in the affirmative on this question, as our correspondence will show. I have never asked you to, nor in anyway intimated that you should, affirm on the *design*.

Three times you have said substantially, that you have “acceded to two out of three” of my propositions, when the truth is, you have not acceded to a *single one of them*. This also, our correspondence will show. You may say that your proposed and accepted alterations were slight and immaterial. If so, then why did you propose them?

Who are “those who arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to the Christian name?” If you mean to *insinuate* this charge against my brethren—then I have simply to say, that it is *wholly* untrue—I will not add—“and you know it.” I shall charitably presume you make the charge ignorantly.

So far sir, from occupying such a position in relation to our religious neighbors, we hold that it is the privilege—yea, *the duty*, of all Christians to wear the “Christian name.” I seriously aver, sir, that it is *your duty*, as well as your right, to wear the Christian name. If, however, “in this free country,” you *prefer* to wear the name of the “Cumberland river,” I suppose we must yield to it our consent, however reluctantly it may be done. But let me ask you, if you persist in wearing the name of said *river*, in the name of consistency, never again taunt us for giving too much prominence to *water*’.

Your reference to the “writings of Mr. Campbell” as a creed, &c., does gross injustice to a large, not to say respectable, class of people, whom you style “Reformers.” You ought to have known, whether you did or not, that the “writings of Mr. Campbell” have never any where, in a single Congregation among that people, been received *as a creed*, or in any way as *authoriitu.ii.ve*. The sound you echo came out from Lexington, and has been echoed and re-echoed from a thousand “lesser lights” all over the land. It has become *trite*, *stale*. I neither said nor intimated, that you had no right to “lecture on bapt’sm.” You most assuredly have as good a right to lecture on that subject as any other man. “In this free country” you have aright also to advise your friends to practice no longer immersion, but pouring and sprinkling exclusively; and you have a right to utterly refuse to affirm in debate that pouring or sprinkling is baptism; but I must be allowed to say, that after “lecturing” and “advising” your friends as above, this last appears, to me, to be a *little cowardly*—that is all.

You *have*, sir, utterly refused to come into debate *affirming* that your own *practice* is scriptural. This I have never done, nor will I, while I hold my present views of religious discussion.

My mind has undergone no change as to the *affirmative* and *negative* of a proposition. I still believe that you ought to affirm on the “mode.” But as you have not the courage to do so, and as my brethren detire that I shall leave you no excuse for “backing down,” I have consented to affirm. I am in the affirmative then, not so much on account of your exceeding *shrewdness*, as you seem to assume, as by your exceeding *cowardice*.

That people whom some call “Campbellites,” and who are also some times styled “Reformers,” so far as I know them, profess simply to be Christians—nor do they arrogantly assume there were no Christians “prior to Mr. Campbell’s day.” But on the contrary they believe there were both Christians and “Reformers” long before Mr. Campbell lived. There were Christians—but not “Cumberland Presbyterians”—in the time of Peter and Paul. There were also “Reformers” before Mr. Campbell.

Mr. C. however, proposed a reformation—and I believe a good one, and so thousands of good and pious, as well as learned men have decided. It has never been assumed by these men, as some slanderously say, that they were all the Christians in the world. Hence the question you ask with such apparent triumph is both impertinent and pointless. When I said I submitted those propositions to you, “*at the request of your friend Davis,*” I said what was *true*. One of those propositions affirms, that your creed is a *schismatical* book,” and you seem to consider that a matter of little or no importance!! This is a hopeful symptom. May I not indulge the hope that at no very distant day you will give up the creature and become perfectly loyal to the “*old constitution*” — the Bible?

I cannot accept your proposition on “Divine influence.” I will affirm that *in conversion* the Holy Spirit operates always through the truth. This is the extent of my affirmation. If you will deny this, or if you will “screw up your courage” to affirm what the “whole world knows you teach,” that the Spirit in conversion operates *immediately* upon the heart—I will deny, and we can have a discussion upon Divine influence”—otherwise, the matter may end here.

It was not simply to see our names or efforts in print, that I proposed to allow our friends to have the debate reported for publication. This proposition also, was made at the request of your Bro. Davis.

I propose to allow them to publish *if they choose, and as they choose.*

Hoping to hear from you soon, and to hear as what time it will suit you to commence the discussion, I remain as over,

Respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

Alton, Ill., December 14, 1861.

REV. MR. SWEENEY:

Dear Sir — Yours of the 10th inst. is to hand. I hasten to reply to so much of it as merits a reply.

I most assuredly did say and think, and I am of the same opinion still, that you, being the “challenging party,” ought to be willing to lead in a discussion of *your own seeking*. I have repeatedly stated that I would do so willingly were I to challenge you or any one else to discussion. It is a strange kind of *bravery* for one man to challenge another to a contest, and claim the right to prescribe the mode of warfare, the implements to fight with, and then exclaim if his antagonist does not strike the *first blow* that he is a *great coward*.”

I have known men to boast of their courage before they were tried, but after such trial those who saw the conflict were of the opinion that such boasting was a little premature. I again suggest that you defer your bravery for the debate, and your boasting until after it is over. For assuredly you will need all the courage you can muster when the conflict comes, and the *audience* might think you had boasted *too soon*. “Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off” 1 Kings, 20: 11.

You continue to assert that I have “utterly refused to come into debate *affirming* that your own practice is scriptural.” This I *squarely deny*. I have refused to do no such thing. I have only refused to affirm the proposition you wanted me to affirm, because you were rightfully in the lead. While I shall deny *your* practice is scriptural, I shall certainly affirm my own in debate. I never refused to lead on the *subject* of baptism, and I expect to prove from the Bible everything I teach or practice. I never have said that I considered your proposition charging my creed as “schismatical” as of “little or no importance.” I used your own language, and said I did not think it “of sufficient importance” to justify me in spending more time than I could now devote to the other propositions. But that you may be *easy* on that score, I accept your proposition, that “the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith is a schismatical book”—you affirm. If, then, when we get through with the others, you are anxious to discuss this, I will give you a good chance to prove it.

Your *ungentlemanly* reference to “Cumberland River” in connection with our church may go for what it is worth. Does it not come with an ill grace from you to talk about becoming “perfectly loyal to the old constitution—the Bible,” when you, *refused to confine yourself to the Bible alone to sustain you in your doctrine.*

In urging that it was “right” for you to lead in the discussion, I only urged what you said in your letter Nov. 1st, that you “had no objection to doing.” If, then, you had *no* objection to leading, why have you made *so many* objections to lending?

Let me correct a strange hallucination you seem to labor under, that because different denominations of Christians are called Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, &c., that therefore they do not “wear the Christian name.” Wonderful discovery!! You say

your people "profess simply to be Christians." Do other Christian sectaries profess to be anything else than "simply Christians"? Does wearing the additional local or specific name make them else than "simply Christians"? Shame on such reasoning. But your people *do* in many places, and I can easily prose *it*, call themselves other than by the "simple" name "Christians."

You object to my proposition on divine influence, and offer to affirm that "in conversion the Holy Spirit operates always through the truth." Did you ever know a professed Christian who did not believe this? Who is it that believes or teaches that he operates through falsehood!

I still affirm that the writings of Mr. Campbell are as influential over the minds and acts of your people as any creed on earth is over the people that adopt it. *He is the father of your church.* I am glad that you have found that there were "Christians" and even "reformers" prior to the existence of your church. Cumberland Presbyterians have never claimed that any people bearing their local or specific name existed prior to the year A. D. 1800. But they do claim that a people have existed since old Abraham's time who have believed and taught the principles and doctrines that we believe and teach.

When I said in my last that you had tried to place me in the affirmative on all the questions on baptism, I had forgotten that you had at first presented any proposition on the design. I am willing to make the correction so far as the design is concerned, but so further.

You challenged me to discuss the prominent differences between us, and then insisted on placing me in the lead on two out of the three propositions. I say again that *I did* accede to "two out of three of your propositions." And now I have acceded to *three* out of *four*. The verbal alterations do not affect the propositions only to make the meaning clearer, and then when you *accept* them they become, to all intents, *your own propositions*, just as if you had thus offered them yourself. But I care little for all these useless repetitions.

We are agreed on four propositions. As to the *time*, I had made all my arrangements for the time we had agreed upon, and had put off other engagements to January and February. I do not see how I can find time before the middle of February or the first of March. I was at liberty during all of last month, or to within a week past, but now my engagements cover over several weeks. Perhaps the last week in February would answer. What do you say to this? I shall notice no farther these minor matters unless something new transpires. An early answer is desired in reference to *the time*.

Respectfully,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, December 20, 1861.

Rev. J. B. LOGAN:

Yours of the 14th has been neglected a few days owing to my engagements from home. All you have had to say about "boasting," "bravery," &c., is perfectly gratuitous. I have only said and repeated—what *you know* to be true—that you will not consent to *affirm*, as a proposition to be discussed, that pouring or sprinkling is baptism. This you have *persistently* refused to do. But this is no more than is *common* with all who believe in and practice *rantism* for baptism. *Why* are you all so desperately afraid to *affirm*, in a proposition to be discussed, that *your own practice* is accordant with the *word of God*? Oh! "you are the challenging party"—"you seek the debate," and therefore "you ought to *lead*." I am certain that if I believed religious discussion to be wrong, I should feel as guilty for *accepting* as for *giving* a challenge.

If not *before*, I certainly have *during* our correspondence, challenged you to the proof of your own doctrine. Why do you refuse? If not for fear, why is it? Is it possible that the champion, the here, the "lecturer" among the believers in sprinkling and pouring is afraid to affirm simply that his *doctrine* and his *practice* are *scriptural*? But he allows to do that in "taking the negative"! Exactly! That is all understood here!

You say, "while I shall deny *your practice* is scriptural, I shall certainly affirm my own in debate." I predict, sir, that you will do *no such thing*. My "*practice*" is *immersion*. Will you dare deny that *that* is "scriptural"? If you had consented to do this some time ago, the discussion might have been over long since. In your letter of Nov. 4, you say, "the question between us is *not* whether immersion is baptism," and now you say, "I shall deny your practice (immersion for baptism) is scriptural"! You are certainly growing worse on my hands.

That I maybe "*easy*" you "*accept*" my "*proposition*" on the creed question. Very well—I am "*easy*." I suppose if I were to consent to "AFFIRM" and "LEAD"

you would discuss all other questions that have been named! Would you not? I discover you are decidedly a *negative* man. Some think much depends on having the *last word*. It is not true that I "*refused to confine*" myself "*to the Bible alar*" to sustain my "*doctrine*." You never *proposed* to do so, and you ought to know it.

But now for the "strange hallucination." You ask, "do other Christian sectaries profess to be anything else than simply Christians?" Yes, sir; some of them profess to be Cumberland Presbyterians, and *that* is something "else than simply Christians." "Does wearing the additional local or specific name make them else than simply Christians?" Yes, sir; if that "local or specific name" amounts to *anything at all*, it makes them just *that much* "else than simply Christians." And if such "local or specific name" is *nothing*, then in the name of reason what do you wear it for? But do you say you are *generally* Christians and *specifically* Presbyterians? That will not do, for you are "*generically*" Presbyterians, and "*specifically*" Cumberland Presbyterians! Pray, what are you *individually*?

If you had been at Corinth when Paul addressed that letter to the congregation there, in which he so severely reproveth them for their "divisions," you could have fixed it all up simply by informing the venerable Apostle that the parties and party names there were all "local or specific"! "Do these local or specific names make us else than simply Christians?!"

I am tired of such phrases as "our church," "your church," "their church," "my church," "his church," &c., &c. There has never been but one person on this earth who had a right to say "my church." Jesus the Christ says, "upon this rock I will build MY CHURCH."—Matt. 16: 18. And we are either members of this church or we are not; *and if we are*, we have no right to *legislate* for it, much less to *divide it into many "branches," and give to each a "specific name."* I must be allowed to object to all this sectarianism.

After quoting my proposition—"that in conversion the Holy Spirit operates always through the truth"—you ask, "did you ever know a professed Christian who did not believe this?" Now, sir, in answer to this, allow me to make a quotation from the Confession of Faith adopted by that people who are—at least "*generically*"—"professed Christians." Here it is: "Ail infants dying in infancy are regenerated by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, where and *how* he pleaseth; so also are others who have never had the exercise of reason, and who are incapable of being outwardly called *by the ministry of the word*"—*italics mine* Now, sir, dees that article, from your own Confession, teach that "in conversion the Holy Spirit operates *always* through the truth"? Do you not believe that the Spirit operates sometimes *without* the truth? What does "*ordinarily* through the truth" imply?

But again, you ask, "who is it that believes or teaches that he operates through falsehood?" If he does not "operata through the truth," is there no *alternative* than that he should operate through a "*falsehood*"? Must the Spirit, in conversion, operate through the truth, or *necessarily* through a *falsehood*? You seem to understand it so. Of course, then, *you* have no sympathy for the notion that the Spirit operates in conversion *without instrumentality* With you it is either *through the truth or through a falsehood!* Very well, then. If you "make a stand" here I shall not *attack* you at present, but remain "easy."

I have no objection to your saying that with us A. Campbell's writings are "influential," for this is certainly true, in a limited sense—yea, they are greatly so. *But they are not received as a creed, and I think you know it.* Your emphatic declaration that "*he is the father of your church,*" is simply *ridiculous, for more than one reason.*

You must hunt up something better than this to say in defense of your Confession, at Whitehall, or your reputation as a debater will be apt to suffer.

Shall the debate commence on Monday after the last Lord's day in February?

Hoping to meet you then, by the will of God, and to cultivate more extensively our limited acquaintance, I remain, most respectfully,

Yours in the hope of immortality,

J. S. SWEENEY.

Alton, December 26, 1861.

Rev. Mr. J. S. SWEENEY:

Dear Sir—Yours of the 20th inst. is to hand. It is useless to repeat over and over again, as you have done in your letters, that I have refused to affirm the doctrine I believe and teach on baptism. I refused to be the affirmant on the mode of baptism because I believed you were properly the affirmant; but I did never refuse to affirm in debate what I believe and teach. I shall most assuredly do so in the discussion.

Suppose I had agreed, as you wished me, to lead on the mode, and suffered you to be in the negative; would that have placed you where you would not have taught your own doctrine? You certainly know better than this. If being in the negative, then, would not disqualify *you* from teaching your own doctrine, will it deprive me of the like privilege? It seems to come with an ill grace from you to berate me for wanting the place of the negative, when it appears the only trouble is, *you*. *wanted the place yourself*. I have never said "religious discussion was wrong," and therefore your charge of "guilt" on my part for "accepting" the challenge falls to the ground.

As for my being a "negative" man, I opine you will think me *positive* as well as negative before we are through.

You still console yourself that your people wear simply the name "Christian," while other sectaries wear other names. But your people *do not* wear *only* the name "Christian." In some places they call themselves "Reformers," in others "Disciples," in others "Disciples of Christ," and still others "Christians." Now you must see that as long as you live in a glass house yourself, you have no right to throw stones at others.

Why did Paul not address his letter simply to "Christians," or the "Christian church"? Why did he call them "Corinthians," "Ephesians," "Romans," &c, by their "local or specific names?" All these names he uses, and yet no one but an idiot, it seems to me, would claim that they were less Christians because they were called by a "local name" also.

To avoid the dilemma into which you have fallen on divine influence, you quote from our Confession to prove that we believe infante and insane persons are saved through Christ, and by the Spirit, but not by the outward ministry of the word. Well, what of it? You did not say that in conversion the Holy Spirit always operates through the outward ministry of the word. If that is what you *mean*, as you now intimate, just place your proposition in that form, and I *will deny*. You say he operates always through the truth. So says our Confession. The Holy Spirit is the spirit of truth, and can and does save, without the outward ordinances, in all those cases where the subject is deprived, by the Creator, of reason, but always through *the truth*. Do you believe infants, dying in infancy, are saved? If so, how can they be saved, seeing there is no salvation only "through the truth," and that truth you define to be the Holy Scriptures? They can neither read nor understand them, and of course they cannot be saved *by* them. What a wretched doctrine. On your plan you have no evidence of the salvation of one infant that dies in infancy. They cannot be saved through the Bible, and therefore, I suppose, they are not saved at all.

Had you said the Holy Spirit always operated through "instrumentality," then I should have denied; but you propose to discuss what I never heard any one deny who pretended to take the Bible for his guide. By the way, as you are so anxious to place me in the affirmative on all the questions but one, I will offer to affirm, before the audience at Whitehall, the very passage you quote as objectionable from our Confession; or, for the sake of brevity, will place it in this form: "All infants, dying in infancy, and all others who have never had the exercise of reason, and who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth." Now, sir, *deny* this proposition if you please.

I would prefer Tuesday rather than Monday after the 4th Sunday, February, as the time for beginning the debate, for the reason that I cannot leave home until after Sabbath, and it will take all of Monday to get there and to get ready. If this time suite you, and I presume it will, there is nothing left now but to adopt some equitable rules of debate—such as are found in some Logic, say Hedges'—which, I presume, can be easily agreed upon when we meet.

One word more. You say I "never proposed to you to confine ourselves to the Bible alone," and that "it is *not true* that I [you] refused" the proposition. I am not surprised at your uneasiness when this matter is mentioned. Now, sir, with due deference, I *did* thus "*propose*," and *you did* thus "*refuse*." Here are my exact words—"I propose, if you are willing, that we confine the whole argument to the testimony of the English Bible, common version. What do you say to this?" Remember, I said to confine the *whole argument* to the testimony of the common English Bible:—Letter Oct. 4th, 1861. Now here is your reply, (dated Nov. 1, 1861, page 3.) "I am not of the opinion that it would be best to confine the whole argument to the testimony of the English Bible, common version." In your last letter you say "it is not true that I refused to confine myself to the Bible alone to sustain my doctrine." Now all I have to

say is, you are mistaken, for you *did* refuse to do so, as your language above quoted proves. Now we see who is willing to stand or fall by the testimony of God's word *alone*, as to what we believe and practice.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain yours, &c.

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, January 7, 1862.

Rev. J. B. LOGAN:

Yours of 26th December, postmarked Jan. 1st, came to hand to-day, and I hasten to reply. I shall be brief. I certainly agree with you, that "it is useless to repeat over and over again" that you have refused to *affirm*, in a proposition to be discussed, what you teach elsewhere—that sprinkling or pouring is baptism—and shall therefore finally dismiss the matter.

Christians were primitively called "Saints" on account of their *holiness*; "Disciples," because they were *learners*; "Brethren," because of their fraternal relation. To these epithets we have never objected. Did you not know it?

But you have found authority for your parties and party names at last! "Paul addressed the Christians," you say, as "Romans," "Corinthians," "Ephesians," etc. "Eureka!" Then you are an "AUonian," and not a "Cumberland," for the reason that you live in *Alton*. You are not on the Cumberland River, in Cumberland county; neither are you at the *Cumberland Gap*. Your "local name" is "Altonian."

Well, sir, I *will* say that, "in conversion, the Holy Spirit operates always through *instrumentality*." Now we will see what you will do. Say yes or no, at once, and let the correspondence close.

I certainly did refuse to "confine the whole argument to the *English Bible, common version*." Is there no difference between "*English Bible, common version*," and "*Bible alone*?" You see the difference.

I am willing to accommodate you: let the debate commence on *Tuesday* instead of Monday.

I am willing to be governed by the *Rules of Delate* found in Hedge's Logic.

Yours, &c.

J. S. SWEENEY.

P. S.—If you accept my proposition on "divine influence," I shall endeavor, during the discussion, to enlighten you a little in regard to the "infant and idiot" question, for I discover you are most wretchedly in the dark just there.

J. S. S.

Alton, January 14, 1862.

Rev. J. S. SWEENEY:

Dear Sir—Yours of the 7th inst., postmarked the 9th, came to hand in due time, but owing to my having my hand burnt, I have not been able to write sooner.

You admit that Christians are called, in the Bible, by other names than "simply Christians," and yet you say your people go by 1,000 other name, and condemn other denominations for being called by other names. This is strange consistency!

If you *mean* that "the Holy Spirit, in conversion and sanctification, always operates through the instrumentality of the Bible or written word," then I *deny*. You can say "yes or no."

I certainly can see no "*difference*" in rejecting a proposition to confine our *entire* argument to the testimony of the "*English Bible, common version*," and the "*Bible alone*;" and I think others will view it in the same light. What is the "*difference*" between confining ourselves *wholly* to the Bible, and taking the "*Bible alone*?" Surely this is a distinction without any difference—unless you mean to deny that the common version is the Bible!

Suppose you do call me an "Altonian"—is that inconsistent with being a Christian also? If not, my wearing the name Cumberland Presbyterian is not inconsistent with being a Christian. Try again, brother; your position will not do.

I will be open to all the light you can give me respecting "infants and idiots," and I am not surprised that you decline my proposition. Meanwhile, I should not be surprised that you find yourself in need of that very beneficial article, 'light,' before we are through.

Respectfully,

J. B. LOGAN.

Winchester, January 17, 1862.

Rev. Mr. LOGAN:

Dear Sir—Yours of the 14th is to hand. The apology for your delay is, of course, perfectly satisfactory.

Really, my dear sir, my appreciation of your intelligence will not allow me to believe you serious in attempting to justify yourself in wearing a *parly* name from the fact that Christians were called "Romans," "Corinthians," "Ephesians," "Galatians," &c. Do you suppose they were *separate denominations*, having their respective *creeds*, etc., like the denominations of this day? Are you called a "Cumberland Presbyterian" *for the same reason* that Paul called some of his brethren "Galatians?" Any man who lived in *Galatia* was a "Galatian," as much as any Christian there, *whether he. teas a Christian or not*. Can any man be as much a "Cumberland Presbyterian" as you, whether he is a Christian or not? *You* must say no. Then why resort to so miserable a farce!

In my letter of the 20th I offered to affirm the following: "In conversion, the Holy Spirit operates always through the truth"—to which you objected, saying, "had you said the Holy Spirit always operates through instrumentality, then I should have denied." In my last I offered to strike out "through the truth" and insert *your own words*, "through instrumentality," but now it seems you will not make a stand there, though you selected the ground yourself! The trouble is, there is nothing equivocal about that proposition! It is entirely too plain! You know you do not believe it, yet you will not deny it in debate *after saying you would.* I shall pursue you no further, but will accept the proposition you offered to affirm in your last letter, but one, as follows: "All infante dying in infancy, and all otters who have never had the exercise of reason, and who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth."

Though this is not the proposition I desired, and sincerely believe you ought to affirm, yet I will spend a few hours hearing you try to prove it.

If you choose, you can give the name of your Moderator to Hon. N M. Knapp, of this place, who is my Moderator, and they may agree upon an umpire by correspondence before the time for the debate.

Very respectfully,

J. S. SWEENEY.

February 13, 1862.

Rev. J. S. SWEENEY:

Dear Sir—I have requested Rev. A. Davis, of Whitehall, to act for me so far as arranging for the presiding Moderator, to whom you can refer, and with whom confer.

Respectfully,

J. B. LOGAN.

DEBATE

ON THE

FIRST PROPOSITION.

IMMERSION IN WATER IS ESSENTIAL TO CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.
[SWEENEY AFFIRMS.]

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

Believing religious discussions, within proper circumstances, to be right, I have no apology to offer for appearing before you, upon this interesting occasion, to enter upon the discussion of the proposition just read in your hearing. Being in the affirmative, I shall proceed to the proof of the proposition. However, it may be expected, and may not be amiss, that I should say a few words relative to the origin of this discussion. As I understand it, the discussion originated with our mutual friends, in this place and its vicinity. It may be, that my brethren first *formally* submitted the challenge to the friends of the worthy gentleman, whom the circumstances make it necessary that I should call my opponent upon this occasion. However this may have been, it matters not. If I believed religious discussion to be wrong, I should feel as guilty for *accepting*, as for *giving*, a challenge. The proposition to be discussed to-day, has not come before you precisely in the shape that I designed it should. My friend should have been in the *affirmative* on this question, as his *relation* to the point of difference between us is really *affirmative*, while mine is negative. If the debate were about *immersion* for baptism, I should affirm, but it is really about *sprinkling* and *pouring* for baptism, and hence my relation to it is really negative.

I believe that baptism is simply immersion, and immersion is baptism—that the terms mean one and the same thing. The position of Mr. Logan, here, seems to be rather equivocal. He will not *deny* that immersion is baptism, nor will he *affirm* that sprinkling or pouring is, as our correspondence will show. In fact, none will deny that immersion is baptism; but there are many who deny that pouring or sprinkling is; and hence the discussion is about my friend's practice, and not about mine.

We find that the Greek word *baptizo* was the term always used by the Savior and his apostles, when speaking literally of the rite of baptism.

That this word *baptize* always means immerse, or its equivalent, I shall proceed to show. The first proof which I shall adduce, is that of the classic usage of the word, or its use by the Greek writers before, at the time of, and after the days of Christ and his apostles. This, by the way I will observe, is the highest authority, in determining the meaning of words. Before introducing my first proof it may be proper to observe that the word *baptize* is not translated in our common version of the Bible, but only Anglicized; that is, the word is retained in the translation, while the termination merely is changed, from *baptizo* to *baptize*, to adapt it to the English language.

I. *The usage of the word by the Greek classic writers, or writers in the Greek language.*

The word *baptizo*, with its cognates, was, as we shall see, uniformly used by them to mean *immerse*, *submerge*, *plunge*, *overwhelm*, etc., and never to mean sprinkle or pour. The primary meaning of the word was *immerse*, which idea was embraced in all its other meanings as consequential, while other and different words are used to express the actions of pouring and sprinkling. Mr. Logan will not affirm that *baptizo* means to sprinkle. (Here Mr. L. said that he *would*.) I wish the audience to mark that; and we will see if he will do so. I shall say, that it means *immerse*. My first example shall be from Polybius, (History, book I. chap. 51, 6,) in his account of the sea-fight at Drepanum, between the Romans and Carthaginians. He says:

"For if any [of the Carthaginians] were hard pressed by the enemy, they retreated safely, on account of their fast sailing into the open space; and then with reversed course, now sailing round, and now attacking in flank the more advanced of the pursuers, while turning and embarrassed on account of the weight of the ships and the unskillfulness of the crews, they made continued assaults and *submerged (baptized)* many of the vessels"

As it is a generally admitted law of language, in translating, that the substitution of the word, in the translation, must make good sense, in order to a correct translation, and that if the term substituted will not make good sense, it is not the correct one; we will try the three words sprinkle, pour and immerse here by that rule: "*Sprinkled* many of the vessels!" "*Poured* many of the vessels!" This would be perfectly absurd — to speak of *sprinkling* or *pouring* vessels or ships in the ocean; and yet it would be correct if the meaning of the word *baptizo* is either to sprinkle or pour! But let us substitute the word immerse: "*immersed* many of the vessels;" and it will make good sense, and be a correct rendering.

Again, (Book viii. chap, 84.) in describing the operations of the engines of Archimedes, for the defense of Syracuse, when besieged by the Romans, in lifting the prows of the Roman vessels out of the water so as to make them stand erect on the stern, and then let them fall, he says:

"Which being done, some of the vessels fell on their side, and some were overturned. but most of them, when the prow was let fall from on high, *being submerged (baptized)*, became filled with seawater and with confusion."

"Being *sprinkled*, became filled!" "Being *poured*, became filled," would be perfect nonsense, but "being *immersed*, became filled," makes good sense. I could also add to these, examples from Plutarch, the great Greek biographical writer, and Aristotle, the celebrated Grecian philosopher, had I time to do so, exhibiting their use of the word, and showing that they

used it in precisely the same sense in which Polybius used it, in the examples quoted from him, and in which the substitution of the words sprinkle and pour for *baptizo* would be as absurd and nonsensical. We find that Eubulus (fragment of ancient comedy, entitled *Nausicaa*,) used the word in the same sense as the other Greek writers, that of *immerse*. Polybius again, (*History*, book xxxiv, chapter 3, 7,) in describing the manner of taking the sword-fish, with an iron-headed spear, says:

"And even if the spear falls into the sea, it is not lost: for it is composed of both oak and pine, so that when the oaken part is *immersed* (*baptized*) by the weight, the rest is buoyed up, and is easily recovered."

"The oaken part is *sprinkled* by the weight!" "is *poured* by the weight!" — will not make sense, but "is *immersed* by the weight" will, and is the only one of the three words that will, as the hearer can see, and is therefore the correct meaning and translation of the original word.

Strabo, the celebrated Greek geographer, uses the word in the same sense. Out of several examples from him, I select one or two, which will sufficiently show the meaning in which he uses the word, (book vi. chapter 2, 9,):

"For even those who cannot swim are not *immersed* (*baptized*), floating like pieces of wood."

"Are not *sprinkled*!" — "are not *poured*!" will make no sense, nothing but the word *immersed*, as used.

Again, (book xiv, chapter 3, 9,) speaking of the marching of Alexander's army along a narrow beach, flooded in stormy weather:

"And they marched the whole day in water, *immersed* (*baptized*) as far as the waist. 'W

"*Sprinkled* as far as the waist!" — ¹¹ *poured* as far as the waist!" — how absurd and nonsensical! And yet these are proper definitions, or renderings, of the word, and ought to make as good sense as immerse, if Mr. Logan's theory of baptism is correct.

Diodorus Siculus, or Diodorus the Sicilian, (*Historical Library*, book xvi. chapter 80,) in his account of Timoleon's defeat of the Carthaginian army, on the bank of the river Crimissus in Sicily:

"The river rushing down with the current increased in violence, *submerged* (*baptized*) many, and destroyed them attempting to swim through with their armor."

To say that it "*sprinkled* many," or "*poured* many," and "destroyed them," would not only make the meaning nonsensical, but they would not have been destroyed — just as those sprinkled or poured by my friend are not baptized.

Josephus, the great Jewish historian, is my next witness as to the meaning of the word *baptizo*; and his testimony is the more valuable, as he was not only cotemporaneous with the apostles, and wrote immediately after the time of Christ, but wrote in the Greek language, and might be supposed to understand the meaning of Greek terms as fully as the Grecian writers themselves. Whatever, then, was the meaning that he gave to the word *baptizo*, may be taken as its real meaning, and as the sense in which it was used by our Savior and the apostles. . In his work on the Jewish Wars (book i. chapter 22, 2,) describing the murder of the boy Aristobulus, who was drowned in a swimming-bath, by Herod's command, he says:

"And there, according to command, being *immersed* (*baptized*) by the Gauls in a swimming-bath, he dies."

"*Being sprinkled*" — "*being poured* by the Gauls," etc., would not only make no sense, but there would have been no drowning in the case. It was only by "*being immersed*," that the boy was drowned. I can give several other extracts from Josephus, equally as strong on the meaning of the word *baptizo*, but have not time, and will make only one more. In his life of himself, he says:

"For our vessel having been *submerged* (*baptized*) in the midst of the Adriatic, being about six hundred in number, we swam through the whole night."

Let us now try the three words here: "*sprinkled* in the midst!" — "*poured* in the midst!" Verily, if the vessel was only sprinkled, they might have remained on it, and have had no swimming to do; but the ship "*being immersed* in the midst of the "sea, they had to swim, or perish, in the water. Josephus and these persons would doubtless have been glad if it had been the baptism for which my friend contends!

Plutarch again, (Life of Theseus, xxiv,) in quoting the celebrated oracle of the Sibyl, respecting the city of Athens:

"A bladder, thou mayest be *immersed* (*baptized*); but it is not possible for thee to sink."

"Mayest be *sprinkled*?"—be *poured*?" would make no sense, and is absurd, while *immerse* conveys the idea.

Epictetus, the Grecian moralist, (Moral Discourses, fragment xi,) uses the word *baptizo* in the same sense. So does Lucian, (on Timon, the Man-hater,) he said, that if he saw a winter torrent bearing a person away, and he (the person) with outstretched hands were imploring help, he (Timon) would thrust him headlong, "*immersing* (*baptizing*), so that he should not be able to come up again; that is, "*sprinkling* or *pouring*!" Verily, there would not have been much danger of his drowning the man, if such was the meaning of the word; while "*immersing*" would have been the very thing for Timon's purpose. Epictetus was born about the year 50, and Lucian, 135 after Christ; so that the meaning of *baptizo* being precisely the same then as that of the Greek writers before Christ, it must have been in the sense of *immerse* that it was used by Christ and the apostles.

Hippocrates, the Greek "father of medicine," born in the year 155, of the Christian era, (on Epidemics, book v,) describing the respiration of a patient, affected with inflammation and swelling of the throat, (*Cynanche*), and oppression about the heart, says:

"And she breathed, as persons breathe after having been *immersed* (*baptized*), and emitted a low sound from the chest, like the so-called ventriloquists."

This is one of the most illustrative passages we could have quoted, as the comparison being that of a person who had been plunged all over into water, and then arising, or coming out, would exactly suit that of a person baptized. But suppose we say, "after having been *sprinkled*" or "*been poured*!" how nonsensical and absurd would it sound! — as well as entirely destroy the comparison. Again, he says, in reference to the same case:

"And she breathed, as if breathing after having been *immersed* (*baptized*)."

That is, as we see persons breathe after they have been baptized; but if we make it "*sprinkled*," or "*poured* there would be none of this hurried breathing about it— it would be as nonsensical as the example just quoted.

Dion Cassius, born about the year 155, (Roman History, book xxxvii, chapter 58,) in describing the effects of a violent storm of wind:

"The ships which were in the Tiber, and lying at anchor by the city and at its month, were *submerged* (*baptized*), and the wooden bridge was destroyed."

Not submerged, or immersed, but only "*sprinkled* or "*poured!*" a little, by the force of the storm! Again, (book xli, chapter 42,) in describing the defeat of Curio, by King Juba, of Numidia, at the siege of Utica, in Africa, and the drowning of the fugitives, in their eager haste to get aboard of their vessels, and others by overloading and sinking them, he says:

"And many of them, who had fled, perished; some thrown down by the jestling, in getting on board of the vessels, and others *submerged* (*baptized*), in the vessels, by their own weight."

But according to Mr. Logan's meaning of *baptizo*, they were not submerged, or immersed, but only *sprinkled* or *poured!* Think of men and vessels *sprinkled* in the water! What absurdity! But substitute the word *immerse*, and the sense is good, and we have the meaning of the passage. We could give example after example, had we time, from this Greek writer, in which he uses the word, and always in the same sense — that of immerse or submerge, but never in that of sprinkle or pour.

Porphyry, a Greek philosopher, born in the year 233 after Christ, (*concerning the Styx*), in describing the *Lake of Probation*, in India, and the use made of it by the Brahmins for testing the guilt or innocence of persons accused of crime, says:

"The depth is as far as to the knees,* * * * * and when the accused comes to it, if he is guiltless he goes through without fear, having the water as far as to the knees; but if guilty, after proceeding a little way, he is *immersed* (*baptized*) unto the head.

To say "he is *sprinkled* to the head!" "*poured* to the head!" would make as little sense, and be as nonsensical, as any substitution of these terms to *baptizo* we have made; while to say "he is *immersed* to the head," makes good sense, and is in keeping with the real meaning of the original. If this immersing to the head was evidence of the guilt of the accused, according to the Hindoo religion, Mr. Logan's theory of *sprinkling* would certainly let them all off!

HELIODORDS, about 390 years after Christ, (in his *Æthopics*, *Story of Theagines and Chariclea*, book v, chapter 28,) speaking of a band of pirates, who had seized a vessel, and were unable to manage it in a storm that ensued, says:

"And already becoming *immersed* (*baptized*), and wanting little of sinking, some of the pirates attempted at first to leave, and get aboard of their own bark."

"Becoming *sprinkled!*" — "*poured!*" — becoming *immersed.*" The hearer can see, at a glance, the most suitable word, and the only one of the three, that will make sense. I will remark here, that the accompanying circumstances, show that *immerse* must be the only meaning of the word *baptizo*, in these examples, as here the mention of "sinking." And that the same holds true, in reference to the use of the word, in the

New Testament, where the rite of baptism is mentioned, I will show.

To all these testimonies I shall add that of Heimerius, a Greek rhetorician, born about 315 years after Christ, (*Oration X*, § 2), who ought to be supposed to understand the meaning of his own language, and who used the word in precisely the same sense of all the other Greek writers; and *Themistius*, another rhetorician and philosopher, who lived early in the second half of the 4th century, (in his *Oration iv.* 23.)

We come now to *Suidas*, (*Lexicon*) who being an old Greek lexicographer, may be supposed to have well understood the meaning of all the words of his own language. In a quotation, illustrative of the meaning of *baptizo*, like Webster and other English lexicographers, he says:

"Desiring to swim through, they were *immersed* [*baptized*] by their full armor."

To say "they were *sprinkled!*" or "*poured,*" "by their full armor," would be absurd in the extreme, while "*immersed* by" it is the only word that will make sense, and correctly render it. We then come to *Chrysostom* an eminent Greek writer of the Church, one of the "fathers," as they are called, born 347 after Christ, who uses the word in the same sense, in at least three different instances. In the *Epistle to Damagetus* and *Life of Pythagoras*, both by unknown Greek writers, we find the same.

Æsop, the noted Greek writer of fables, in his fable of the mule, who, finding that he lightened his load of salt by lying down in the water, repeated the experiment, when loaded with wool and sponges:

"One of the salt-bearing mules, rushing into a river, accidentally flipped 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 panniers."

"*Sprinkled* the panniers!"—"poured the panniers!" would, if any thing, make worse nonsense than any substitutions for *baptizo*, which we have made; while the word *immersed* alone will make good sense, as all can easily see. I could quote other passages from *Æsop*, of the same character, but this will suffice.

Plutarch, a celebrated Greek writer, born in the year 50 after Christ, and living near the time of the apostle; also uses the word in the same sense of all these other Greek writers, (*On the comparative skill of water and land animals*). Also *Achilles Tatius*, middle of the 5th century, (*Story of Clitophon and Leucippe*, book iii. chapter 1,) in at least four different examples. Also *Demetrius*, the Cydonian, middle of the first century, and cotemporaneous with the apostles, which gives his authority the greater weight, as the sense in which he used it must have been that in which they made use of it. He says, (on contemning death):

"For the dominion [of the soul] over the body, and the fact that, entering into it, she is not wholly *immersed* (*baptized*). but rises above," etc.

To speak of the soul being "*sprinkled*" or "*poured*" by the flesh, would be nonsensical and absurd in the extreme, while *immersed* is the only word that will make sense of the figure. To translate *baptizo*, in these Greek writers, by *sprinkle* or *pour*, would make sad havoc of their language, but *immerse*, in every case, would make good sense:

I shall finish my list of quotations from the Greek classic writers, on the use of the word *baptizo*, by one from *Gregory*, (*Panegyric on Origen*, xiv.) His authority is one of the greatest importance and weight, as he was a Christian writer, (about the middle of the 3d century,) and was

well acquainted with the meaning of the words or terms of the Greek language, particularly when used in a religious sense. Describing Origen as an experienced and skillful guide through the mazes of philosophical speculation, he says:

"He himself would remain on high in safety, and stretching out a hand to others save them, as if drawing up persons *immersed* (*baptized*.")

Here is an illustration from Christian baptism, which Gregory, being a Christian and a bishop, understood well, as he was accustomed to the drawing or raising up of persons baptized, when he would baptize them. But where is the drawing up of the baptized from the water, in Mr. Logan's baptizing? There is none of it at all! Let us again substitute the words sprinkle and pour, and see how it will sound: "drawing up persons *sprinkled!*"—"drawing up persons *poured!*" Enough. The absurdity is too plain.

I here close my list of quotations from the Greek classic writers, in which we have presented a host of testimonies of the most overwhelming character, sufficient to convince any but the most sectarian and blind on the subject. I have before me every known occurrence of the use of the word *baptizo*, by the Greek classic writers; and I affirm, without any fear of successful contradiction, that there is not a single exception to the meaning of the term, which we have given, in all its classic use — that it means primarily to *immerse*, and to *submerge*, *dip*, *plunge*, *overwhelm*, etc., and can never, directly, by implication, inference, or consequence, be made to mean sprinkle or pour; andean as we have abundantly seen, never be thus translated, in these writers, without offering violence to their language, and involving their meaning in nonsense and absurdity.

Let us now read the commission, as recorded by the writers of our Savior's life: "Go, teach all nations, *baptizing* them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." ¹¹ Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is *baptized*, shall be saved;" and ask, this being the meaning of the word at that time, how would the apostles have understood it? Would not their idea have been, that it always meant to *immerse*? If while they preached to the people to be *baptized*, they meant something else than the meaning of the word, in its common acceptation, how could the people have ever understood them? Under such circumstances would it not have been impossible for them to obey the gospel? If the Savior had used the word in a different sense, would he not have so informed the apostles? unless, indeed, it was his intention to deceive them; and who can blasphemously say that he so intended?

2. My second class of witnesses shall be the *Greek Lexicons*. And I will remark that, 1. These Lexicons are all by Paidobaptist authors, or men who believed in and practised sprinkling for baptism; 2. They all give *immerse*, or its equivalent, as the meaning of *baptizo*, 3. With the exception of one or two quite modern ones, they give *immerse* as its primary meaning; 4. None of them ever give either *sprinkle* or *pour* as even a tropical meaning of the word, much less as its real meaning. Now let Mr. Logan stand up before this audience, and say that the word *baptizo* means to sprinkle. I here challenge him to do so, and defy him to produce the proof.

3. My third class of witnesses shall be the Quakers. As they do not hold to *water* baptism, but reject it altogether, and believe in no baptism but that of the spirit, they may be regarded as an impartial class of witnesses. Let us now see what they say on the subject.

Robert Barclay.— "*Baptizo* signifies *immergo*; that is, to *plunge* and *dip in*; and that was the proper use of water baptism among the Jews, and also by John and the primitive Christians, who used it. Whereas, our adversaries, for the most part, only *sprinkle* a little water upon the forehead, which doth not at all answer to the word *baptism*: so that if our adversaries will stick to the word, they must alter their method of sprinkling."

— *Apology, proposition xii. § 10.*

John Gratton. — "John did baptize into water; and it was a baptism' a *real dipping*, or *plunging* into water, and so a real baptism was John's."

— *Life of John Gratton, page 281.*

William Dell. — Speaking of baptism, he calls it "*the plunging* of a man in cold water."—*Select Works, page 389, edition 1773.*

Thomas Ellwood. — "They [the apostles, at the feast of Pentecost] were now baptized with the Holy Ghost indeed; and that in the strict and proper sense of the word *baptize*; which signifies to *dip, plunge, or put under*."—*Sacred History of the New Testament, part ii, page 307.*

Samuel Fothergill. — "By which [baptism of the Holy Spirit,] I understand such a thorough *immersion* into his holy nature, as to know him, the only begotten Son of God, to conform the soul to his own image."

— *Remarks on Address to People called Quakers, page 27.*

Joseph Phipps. — The baptism of the Holy Spirit is "effected by spiritual immersion. * * * * *

The practice of *sprinkling* infants, under the name of *baptism*, has neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament." — *Dissertations on Baptism and Communion, page 25, 80.*

William Penn. — "I cannot see why the bishop [of Cork, in answer to whom he wrote,] should assume the power of unchristianizing us, for not practising of that which he himself practices so unscripturally, and that according to the sentiments of a considerable part of Christendom; having not one text of Scripture to prove that *sprinkling in the face* was the water baptism,—in the first times. Then it was in the river *Jordan*; now in a basin!"—*Defense of Gospel Truths, against the Bishop of Cork, p. 82, 83.*

Thus testified Wm. Penn, the founder of the State of Pennsylvania, against sprinkling and in favor of *immersion* as the only baptism. Hear another Quaker witness, whose testimony, on account of the honesty and impartiality of the witness, and its discriminating character, should be entitled to the greatest weight:

Thomas Lawson. — "Such as '*rhantize*, or *sprinkle* infants, have no command from Christ, nor example among the apostles, nor the first primitive Christians, for so doing.

* * * * * The ceremony of John's ministration, according to divine institution, was by *dipping, plunging, or overwhelming* their bodies in water; as Scapula and Stephens, two great masters in the Greek tongue, testify; as also Grotius, Pasor, Vossius, Minceus, Leigh, Casaubon, Bucer, Bullinger, Zanchy, Spanhemius, Rogers, Taylor, Hammond, Calvin, Piscator, Aquinas, Scotus. * * * * * As for *sprinkling*, the Greeks call it *rhantismos*, which I render *rhantism*: for it is as proper

to call sprinkling *rhantism*, as to call dipping *baptism*. This linguist cannot be ignorant of, that *dipping* and *sprinkling* are expressed by several words, both in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. It is very evident, if *sprinkling* had been of divine institution, the Greeks had their *rhantismos*; but as *dipping* was the institution, they used *baptismos*; so maintained the purity and propriety of the language. * * * * To sprinkle young or old, and call it baptism, is very incongruous; yea, as improper as to call a horse a cow; for baptism signifies *dipping*. However, *rhantism* hath entered into, and among the professors of Christianity; and, to gain the more acceptance, *it is called baptism!*"

Such is the testimony of this man, which carries the air of impartiality on its very face. It is the more valuable, on account of the discrimination he makes between the two Greek words, *baptismos* and *rhantismos*, two entirely different words, implying different actions, the one *immersion* and the other *sprinkling*, and his testimony that the first one was the one used to denote Christian baptism. We have been censured frequently for calling sprinkling *rhantism*, and thus endeavoring to ridicule it; but here we have the precedent, set long ago, by a man who was for calling things by their real and proper names. One more quotation here, and we are done with this class of witnesses:

Anthony Purver. — "*Baptized* is but a Greek word used in English, and signifying *plunged*." — *Note on 1 Cor., xv. 29.*

This finishes our quotations from the Quakers. Such is the harmonious and united testimony of these, our impartial friends.

4. My fourth class of witnesses shall be the *concessions* of Paidobaptist writers, or of the advocates and practicers of sprinkling for baptism. I regard this as a class of evidence of the greatest importance to the cause of immersion; as the *concessions* which men make on any subject, tend to show the fallacy and unsoundness of their own views, and (he correctness of those of their opponents. — And first.

Witsius, (in the year 1626). — It cannot be denied that the native signification of the word *baptein* and *baptizein*, is to *plunge*, to *dip*. — *CEcon. Faed. i. iv. cxxi. § 13.*

Salmasius, (1588)— "*Baptism* is *immersion*; and was administered, in ancient times, according to the force and meaning of the word. Now it is only *rhantism*, or *sprinkling*; not *immersion*, or dipping." — *Be Caesiare Virorum*, page 669.

Gomarus, (1563). — "*Baptismos* and *baptisma*, signify the act of baptizing: that is, either *plunging* alone; or *immersion*, and the consequent washing." — *Opera, Disputat. Theology xxxii. § 5.*

Buddeus, (). — The words *baptizein* and *baptismos*, are not to be interpreted of aspersion, but always of *immersion*." — *Dogmat. lv. c. i. 85.*

— Calvin, (1500). — "The word baptize, signifies to *immerse*; and the rite of *immersion* was observed by the ancient church." — *Institut. Christ. Relig. l. iv. c. xv. § 19.*

Beza, (1519). — "Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word it is certain *immersion* is signified." — *Epistola II, etc.*

Luther. — "That the minister *dippeth* a child into the water, signifieth death; that he again bringeth him out of it, signifieth life. So Paul explains it, (Rom. vi.) * * * * Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized, to be *entirely immersed*, as

the word imports and the mystery signifies."—*In Dr. Du. Veil, on Acts viii. 38.*

John Wesley.—"Alluding to the *ancient manner* of baptizing by *immersion.*"—*Note on Romans, vi. 3.*

Dr. Samuel Clarke.—"In the primitive times, the manner of baptizing was by *immersion*, or *dipping* the *whole body* under the water."—*Epos, of Church Cat., page 294, edition 6.*

Assembly of Divines.—"*Buried with him by baptism*, (see Col. ii. 12). In this phrase the apostle seemeth to allude to the *ancient manner* of baptism, which was to *dip* the parties baptized, and, as it were, bring them under the water for awhile, and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up, to represent the burial of our old man, and our resurrection to newness of life."—*Annot. on Matt. iii. 6, and Romans vi. 4.*

To these concessions could be added others, almost without number, equally as strong; so that, I could literally overwhelm my very worthy opponent with concessions from these eminent, scholarly, and *honest* men of his own party. But enough. Immersion was the universal practice of the Church, for several centuries after Christ; and sprinkling for baptism was an innovation, which at first was earnestly resisted, by many noble men, who were afterwards, in a manner, "*impressed*" into the practice of sprinkling, against their belter judgment. Why they yielded to this innovation, shall, in justice to them, appear in the progress of this discussion.

II. My second argument shall be a short one, and is as follows: There are in the Greek language, *three* different words: *baptizo*, *cheo*, and *rantizo* each one expressing a different action. I have shown, by the Greek classical writers, the Greek Lexicons, the "*honest*" Quakers, and some of the most learned and eminent Paidobaptists, that *baptizo* means *immerse*. It will be admitted, that *cheo* ordinarily means to *pour*, and *rantizo* means to *sprinkle*. Now, (strange to say,) if our Savior and his apostles did not intend us to understand (by *baptizo*) *immersion*, they have unfortunately selected that word, *baptizo*, to express the action, every time they speak literally of the institution; and never once used either *cheo* or *rantizo*! Is it not a little strange! Can my friend account for it? We read in the commission: "Go, teach all nations, [*baptizo*] *baptizing* them," etc. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature: he that believeth and *is baptized*, shall be saved," etc. Now what does he mean, by *baptizo*? Plainly, if he uses it in its ordinary acceptance, the means *immerse*; and if he uses it in any peculiar, or appropriated sense, then some *explanation* was due from him to the apostles and to the world.—[*Time expires.*]

MR. LOGAN'S FIRST REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, and Ladies and Gentlemen:—I must confess that I feel some degree of embarrassment and diffidence, after having to leave the city of Alton, where I was getting along in peace, quiet and harmony with my brethren of the Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian communities, to come and have to plunge into the stormy arena of debate here at Whitehall, where I was never before, where I am a stranger, and the people comparatively strangers to me! As to the *origin* of this discussion, about which my worthy friend made some remarks at the outset of his speech, he certainly does not understand himself. It was

he who challenged me, and I have his letter to that effect, which I can produce, if my statement is called in question. My friend has already had one discussion with me here, (in November last,) and came off triumphant, for the good reason that he had no opponent! He *knew* that I would not be here, came, and not finding me, proclaimed a victory—his comrade publishing to the world, in his paper, that I had backed down! Some men become awfully valiant when there is no opponent to meet them!

My friend, Mr. Sweeney, has produced a great array of testimony before you from the Greek Pagan writers, and I do not know what all, to prove that the word in the original is *immerse*, and nothing else, and that it cannot, by any construction, be made to include the ideas of either *sprinkling* or *pouring*! The word *immerse* is a Latin word, from *immergo*, and will not, therefore, do to represent the Greek word *baptizo*, from which comes our English word *baptize*. He wants us to throw away the old word, and take one not representing the original, in order to sustain his views of the action of baptism, and bolster up his sinking cause! The adoption or Anglicism of the original word for baptize, upon which he harps so much, has become an old song with him and his friends! They tell you that the old, or common version, is a Paidobaptist version, made to conform to Paidobaptist views of the action of baptism; and therefore not to be relied upon! As to this, I can tell the audience that all the words of the common version were *adopted* from the Latin, Greek, Saxon and other languages.

1. In the first place, I can produce testimony from my worthy brother's own side, from the Baptist Annals of the Bible, by Christopher Anderson, in favor of the common version. He shows that it was not even suggested by King James, who has the honor of it, but was originated by Joshua Reynolds; and that the translators were selected not *by*, but *for* King James. My friend has labored to show that it was a *sectarian* version, got up to sustain sectarian views. Now I affirm that it is not a sectarian version, but a faithful translation of the original, at the time it was made.

Our Baptist friends have affirmed that the common version, when read by the people, would make *Baptists* out of them; but the result has proven the contrary, and that the more extensively it has been read, the more have Paidobaptist sentiments gained ground and prevailed. I am surprised that my friend has made no quotations from the *Bible* to sustain his position! He has neglected the good Book, and passed it entirely by; and yet it is that which is to decide this matter. He has all the time been appealing to *Pagan* Greek writers to prove the action of a *Christian* ordinance! Now these writers never used the word *baptizo* in a *religious* sense, and are not, therefore, competent authorities. My brethren have the *Bible* on their side, and my friend is welcome to all that he can gain from these pagan writers! He has affirmed the word *baptizo* to be a *specific*, and not a generic term; but I am ready to affirm the contrary—that it is a *generic*, and not a specific term. A single instance where the word means something else precludes the possibility of confining the meaning to *immersion*. My friend's idea here (of the meaning of the word in the original) will not bear him out, as it fixes the idea of *drowning* to the word, and does not include that of *rising*, or *emerging* from the water, which is essential to his idea of Christian baptism. I will here affirm that ninety-nine out of every hundred of such cases as those made

by him from these Greek classical writers, mean to *sink*, *drown*, etc., without including the idea of rising or taking out!—so that his baptism would be a fatal one to the subjects of it, if he take immersion as the only meaning of the original word, as used by those Greek writers, from whose works he has so abundantly quoted.

Again: Presbyterians baptize by *applying* the water to the subject, which is the scriptural mode, and not by applying the *subject* to the water, according to my friend's mode of baptizing by immersion. Our mode is more consistent with that of the Bible. "We read there as follows: "I indeed baptize you *with* water; but there is one coming after me mightier than I. * * * He shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire; which shows that the water was applied to the subject, and not the subject to the water. But according to my friend's definition of the word *baptizo*, to mean *immerse*, he would have to apply the subject to the water; and it would read: "I indeed *immerse* you *with* water!" "*immerse* you *with* the Holy Ghost!" etc.—which would make no sense, and be simply ridiculous! His definition of the word, therefore, will not do. All the cases he has adduced of the meaning of the word, as used by these Greek writers, show it to mean to *sink*, *destroy*, etc., and will not apply to its meaning as used in the Bible. They may, therefore, just simply go for what they are worth, which will be nothing, in this discussion—not one cent.

I will admit that there is one clear case of *immersion* in the Bible—that of the swine, into which the Savior permitted the devils to enter, and they were all *drowned*, which will agree very well with my friend's definition of the word *baptizo*, as used by these Greek writers. My friend has undertaken to prove that baptism is *immersion*, and immersion is *baptism*; but he has so far signally failed, as he has not been able to prove, out of all the cases of the meaning of the word, as adduced by him, that the idea of *arising from* or *out of* the water, was included in the meaning of the word in the original; but only that of *sinking*, *drowning*, etc., so that his baptism will be fatal to the subject of it.

As to the meaning of the word *baptizo*, upon which my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, has harped so much, and on which he has presented such an array of testimony from the Greek writers, I will say, that Mr. Carson, in his work on baptism, and Mr. A. Campbell, of his own church, who is regarded as the very highest authority by his brethren, both agree in making the meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo* the same, or synonymous; and that this meaning is included in the root *bap*, from which they come, and which merely means to dip, without reference to mode. To show that the word does not always mean to *immerse*, as my friend has labored so hard to prove, and that it also has other and different meanings, I will now quote from the Greek Lexicons. And first on *bapto*, the root of *baptizo*:

Scapula.—"*Bapto*—to immerse, to plunge.; also, to stain, dye, color; also, to wash."

Here this venerable lexicographer, as Mr. Campbell terms him, gives *stain*, *dye*, *color* and *wash* as other and different meanings of the word.

Ubsinus.—To dip, to dye, to *wash*, to *sprinkle*, (*abluo*, *aspergo*).

Groves.—"*Bapto*—to dip, plunge, immerse, to *wash*, to *wet*, *moisten*, *sprinkle*, to steep, imbue, to dye, etc."

Here are two Lexicons, and one of them by the distinguished lexicographer, Groves, that gives, as the meaning of *bapto*, not only to *wash*, *wet*.

steep, imbue, dye, but also to *sprinkle* and to *wet*. And let the hearer bear in mind, that both Mr. Carson and Mr. Campbell admit that *bapto* and *baptizo* are synonymous in meaning. And if *bapto*, the root, means to *sprinkle* and to *wet*, consequently, according to them, the word *baptizo*, that comes from it, must mean the same. But we will hear some more of the Lexicons: .

Schrivellius. — "To baptize, to immerse, to *cleanse, washy*

Donnegan. — "To dip, to plunge into water, to submerge, to *wash*, to dye, to color—to *wash*, etc."

Schleusner defines *baptizo* not only to plunge, but to *cleanse, wash*, to *purify with water*."

Suidas defines *baptizo* not only to sink, plunge, immerse, but to *wash, cleanse, purify*," etc.

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

Greenfield defines it: "to immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; and in the New Testament, to *wash, perform ablution, cleanse*; to immerse."

Here we have a host of the most eminent lexicographers, who give the meaning, not only of *bapto*, but of *baptizo*, to be, to *cleanse, wash, dye, color, purify with water*. Some of them give these as the *primary* meaning of these words; and *immerse* as only a *secondary* meaning of them! What will my friend have to say to these?—as he gives *immerse* as the primary meaning of *baptizo*, and as its only meaning, where the rite of baptism is spoken of! We wish the audience to notice, that he did not make a single quotation from the Greek *Lexicons*! He quoted abundantly from the Greek classics, pagan writers; but he took good care to pass all the Lexicons by!

Scapula gives the Latin words *mergo* and *immergo*, to *cleanse, wash*, etc., as the definition or meaning of the Greek; and so does Hornbekius too. Why do these Lexicons give so many different meanings to this word *baptizo*, if, as my friend contends, *immerse* is its proper meaning? I can illustrate these different meanings of the word, and the different modes of baptizing, as well as show that it is a *generic*, and not a specific term, by the illustration of traveling. We can travel in various ways, as on *horseback*, in a *carriage*, and on *railroads*; and yet include them all in the term *traveling*. These are all different *modes* of traveling, as *sprinkling, pouring* and *immersion* are different modes of *baptism*. So we can travel to Whitehall or Alton by *three* different, roads, and yet arrive at the same place. It matters not by what road we travel, so we get to the place. So it matters not by what *mode* we are baptized, so we are baptized. The *substance* of baptism, the thing itself, and what it secures to us, is the main thing, and not the mode. Robinson, Grove and Sidus, authorities of the highest character, define the word *baptizo* to mean to *wet, wash, purify*, etc. The Greek Lexicons all, as we have seen, say, with united testimony, that it means *wetting, cleansing*, etc., and nowhere give *immersion* as its only meaning, which they ought to do, to sustain the position of my friend.

As to the authorities which he adduced from Wm. Penn and the Quakers, they are not much to be depended on. As the Quakers reject water baptism altogether, they are not proper witnesses to be introduced into this discussion. It is only those who *believe* in it that are qualified and prepared to testify. Men are not as competent witnesses in that in which they do not

believe, and have no interest, as those of an opposite character. So we shall pass them by without any further notice.

We come now to my friend's *concessions* from Paidobaptist writers, upon which he harped so much, and on which he laid so much stress. These prove nothing for his cause, as all these writers, according to his own acknowledgment, admitted *pouring* and *sprinkling* to be valid baptism, and *practiced* both these modes as such. They occupied the very same ground on this subject that we do, as their writings will abundantly show. How, then, I will ask, can their testimony prove anything for his cause, when, though they admitted *immersion* to be valid baptism, they, at the same time, equally admitted *sprinkling* and *pouring* to be baptism, and as valid as immersion? In order for their testimony to avail him anything, he must show that they conceded immersion to be the apostolic and only baptism. The word *Paidobaptism* merely means *infant* baptism, which these Paidobaptists believed in and practiced. My worthy friend will not take their concessions on *infant* baptism, which he is as much bound to do as to take their concessions on *immersion*! He well knows that John Calvin never disputed *sprinkling* as baptism. He merely *tolerated* immersion, but did not believe or admit it to be the proper and only baptism. What would an impartial jury say in such a case as this? Would they not be bound to decide against my friend? If he takes these *concessions* as evidence in favor of *immersion* as the only baptism, he is equally bound, by all the rules of evidence, to take *all* they have said, and not to garble out what they have said about immersion as baptism, and pass all the balance by, which they have said! The rule in court is, to take *all the evidence* of witnesses, in a suit at law, and not to pass a part of it over, and reject it, because it does not happen to prove anything for one of the parties! Such *ex parte* evidence as this would not be admitted. Here are two parties—my worthy friend on the one side, and myself on the other, on the question under discussion; and he is legally bound, by all the rules of evidence, in religion as well as in law, to take *all* that these witnesses testify, whether for or against his cause. If I am willing to take *all* their evidence, is *he* not just as much bound to do so? Most certainly he is. But he refuses to do it, because they do not testify in everything just to suit him and his cause!

I have now gone over all that my worthy friend has said, and devoted to it all the notice which I conceive that it deserves. I have fully, and, as I trust, satisfactorily, replied to all his arguments; at least all that are worth replying to. And I will here affirm, I am able to prove, and that from the best authority, that from the *first* to the *eleventh* century no sect appeared who practiced *exclusive immersion* as baptism; but that *sprinkling* or *pouring* was practiced all the time. And I here promise to make good, by competent testimony, everything I affirm. I will admit that Macknight and Dr. Geo. Campbell admitted *immersion* to be valid baptism: but at the same time they did not repudiate *sprinkling* and *pouring*, but also admitted them to be valid baptism, and practised them as Paidobaptists. And I am also willing to admit that *immersion* was the prevailing mode of baptism, in the English church up to the time of King James. I am willing to admit all this, without any detriment to my cause.

But I am going to the Bible, to offer some reasons why I practice *sprinkling* for baptism. My friend, as you have seen, has not gone there to get

any arguments for his exclusive immersion; and yet it is that divine volume which must at last decide the question. He has all the time been quoting to you from the Greek pagan writers to prove the action of a Christian ordinance! Well, now, suppose he could prove from these writers that *immerse* is the proper and only meaning of the word *baptizo*? What would he gain by it? It would be no evidence of the meaning of the word as used in the Bible! The New Testament writers never used the word as these writers did, but in another, a different, and appropriated sense. The Greek language had greatly changed, and words that at first had a certain and definite meaning, came to have quite a different one in the progress of time, and sometimes almost a contrary one. The Jews, at the time of the Savior and his apostles, spoke a language very different from the Hebrew which the Jews first spoke. I can very easily illustrate this by the changes which have taken place in the English language since the common version of the Bible was made. For example, the word "conversation," which then meant "behavior," now means the language of persons when conversing with each other. The word "prevent" then meant to "anticipate," but now it means to "hinder." When David said that he "prevented the dawn," he did not mean that he hindered the day from breaking, but that he anticipated it, and arose from his bed before the dawn of day. And thus, as to many other words we might name, but these will suffice for my purpose. This shows what changes language can undergo in the course of time. So as to the word *baptizo*, which had come to have a different meaning, at the time of the Savior, from what it did as used by these pagan Greek writers; and to include the idea of sprinkling and pouring as well as immersion—to mean the application of water to a person, when used in a religious sense. Suppose, then, that my friend could prove, from these writers, that the word meant to *immerse*, it would be no argument for him, at last, as this change in the meaning of the word shows.

I prefer for my friend to go in the lead on this question, and produce his arguments to show that *immersion* is the scriptural baptism. While he affirms this, I affirm that baptism is rightly administered *by sprinkling*; and until his affirmation is proven, mine is as good as his. Water baptism is emblematical of the cleansing efficacy of the Holy Spirit. It is an outward sign of the inward, spiritual grace of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, of which it is a figure. The apostle says: "Having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and your bodies washed with pure water." Hence it is properly administered *by sprinkling*, and must be both *inward* and *outward*. We are taught an important lesson here; and that is, that the figure must correspond, and there must be both the inward and the outward baptism. We read of the *pouring* out of the Spirit, and of the *sprinkling* of the heart, corresponding to these two modes of baptism; and how, I would ask, can we get the idea of *immersion* from either of these? We read again: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing* of *regeneration*, and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Here the *shedding* of the Holy Ghost on us is *figurative* of our baptism; and what resemblance is there between this *shedding* of the Spirit, and the *immersion* of my worthy friend, which he is trying to palm off on this audience as the only baptism? Verily, there is none, not a particle; and yet we see that without this baptism of the Holy Ghost the water

baptism is not worth a cent! We see from all this, that the *design* in baptism is the principal thing, and the *mode* is nothing. It matters not whether baptism is administered by *pouring*, *sprinkling* or *immersion*, as it is rightly administered by all these three modes, as the *baptism* of the *Spirit* is the principal thing.

I affirm that we can find no clear case where any person was immersed in the New Testament. If the term *baptizo*, as affirmed by my friend, is *specific* in one case, it is *specific* in all; if *generic* in one case, it is *generic* in all. If we can succeed in showing that it is *generic* in one, (and we have succeeded in doing so in more than one,) then my friend's position—that it is *specific*—falls to the ground, and with it goes his theory of exclusive immersion, which he has labored so hard to sustain!

I shall await the gentleman's Bible arguments, if he has any.—Closes.

MR. SWEENEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—The gentleman's reference to the *origin* of this discussion, makes it necessary for me to refer to that matter again, though he may think I do not "understand myself." It seems from his version of the matter, that he was very "quietly" and unobtrusively gliding along in the quiet city of Alton, at peace with all his religious neighbors, when he was very suddenly shocked by receiving my letter, challenging him to come all the way up to Whitehall; and here, among "strangers," enter "the stormy arena of debate." Now, I submit, that if the gentleman will read that "letter" again, he will find in it an extract from a letter he had already written to his friend Davis, concerning this very discussion, from which I infer that the gentleman had been previously waked up to the matter. I say again, that this debate originated with our mutual brethren; perhaps mine first *formally* submitting the challenge. He was selected by his friends, and I by mine, to conduct the discussion; and here I finally dismiss this unimportant matter. One word in reference to my "victory" here, upon a previous occasion. I was here in November, as he stated, but found no brother Logan! And furthermore, I say, I fully expected to meet my opponent, when I left home; and so expected until I arrived in the vicinity of the place, and learned from a letter he had written his friends, that he would not be here. He had set the time for us to meet then, himself; and though we had not fully agreed upon all the propositions, yet I supposed, as he intimated nothing to the contrary, in any of his letters to me, that we would meet, and discuss such of the propositions as we were agreed on. By the way, the gentleman could have informed me that he would not be here at the appointed time, as easily as his own friends. On my return home from this former "engagement," I found a letter from him, written in time to have kept me at home; but it had "quietly" remained in the city of Alton just *one week!* But enough of this. We are both here now; and, if the gentleman has imagined, that I would prefer to meet him, when he is not by, he may be undeceived.

Almost all the gentleman had to say about the "common version of the Bible," was perfectly gratuitous, and served only to fill up the time. I only, said what every, *even moderate*, scholar knows to be true—that the translators of the common version of the Bible, did not translate *baptizo*. It is a Greek word anglicized, and *transferred* to the English Bible. If the gentleman feels like saying that I am not correct, let him do so. I think it

quite probable we will hear from the gentleman again about *translation*, even before we close the discussion on this proposition.

I think I believe everything taught in this book, [pointing to the Bible,] as firmly as my friend. But because I get all my religion from it, shall I therefore go there to learn the *alphabet*? and to learn the meaning of words? My friend is "surprised" that I have made no quotations from the Bible, to prove my proposition! I will ask him to be patient, and will give him Bible to his heart's content, before we are through. The Greek classics, about which he has so much to say and which he seems disposed to reject altogether because their testimony, happens to be against him, constitute the highest authority in determining the meaning of this word, and are so regarded by nearly all *really learned* men, Paidobaptist as well as Baptist. My friend did not *feel* as indifferent as he *looked*, when he passed the matter by, calling them *pagan* writers!

The Gentleman intimates, that in the New Testament *baptizo* is used in a "*religious sense*," and in one different from that in which the pagan Greek writers used it. Now, that is much easier *said* than *proven*. Let him make out his case here; for mere assumption will not suffice to prove his position. Did the gentleman forget that I introduced some *Christian*, as well as *pagan*, writers? Did he forget, that I introduced Josephus also, a Jew, writing in the Greek language, and cotemporaneous with Christ and the apostles? I now aver, that *all* writers *pagan*, *Jewish* and *Christian*, who wrote just before the time of, and after Christ, so long as the Greek was a *living* language, used this word in the sense for which I am contending. Let him produce a single exception from these writers, if he can. Consequently Jesus and the apostles must have used it in precisely the same sense. My friend is bound to admit, that they used *all* the *other words* of the Greek language in precisely the same sense of these pagan writers; but when it comes to the word *baptizo*, he has to make an exception, and have them use that in a peculiar, appropriated and indefinite sense! And why? Because it does not happen to suit his theory of baptism, which has *sprinkling* and *pouring* in it, and he must try and get these, ideas into the meaning of the word! If as my friend would have us believe, our Savior and his apostles used this word as none others were wont to use it in that day, then I submit, that, instead of a *revelation*, as it claims to be, the Bible is a *deception*, and an imposition upon the world!

But, says my worthy friend, "it (*baptizo*) is a *generic*, and not a *specific* term." I purposely avoided the use of the terms "*generic*" and "*specific*," simply and plainly affirming, that *baptizo* expresses the *action* to be performed in baptizing; but if my friend feels able to show this audience that it is a *generic* word, let him do so. *I deny* that it is.

But Mr. Logan has discovered that the word *baptizo* means to *drown*! This gives him the horrors!. He has no notion of being drowned, or of drowning anybody! There is no *drown* in the word in debate. It means simply to *immerse*, *dip*, *plunge*, *whelm*, etc. Whether a person is drowned, or comes out of the water undrowned, depends on *circumstances*. That the boy Aristobulus was drowned, by order of Herod, in the example we gave, was the *result* of *continued* immersions; the drowning was the result of these, and not in the word *baptizo*, used to denote these immersions. We learn nothing from the word *baptizo*, as to *how long* the thing immersed stays under, or in the element. A "bladder" dipped in water,

(in another example I gave,) would pop up quickly. Other things more slowly—some not at all of themselves. But I showed in an extract from Gregory, that a Christian preacher knows something of “drawing up persons baptized.” *Baptizo* simply puts into the element, without reference to whether the thing is left there, or drawn out again. It simply means to *immerse, submerge, overwhelm*, etc., as I have abundantly shown; and hence was the most appropriate word in the Greek language, that could be used by the Savior and his apostles, to express the *action* of Christian baptism.

As to my friend’s argument, drawn from the expression, “I indeed baptize you *with* water,” I will give attention to it in due time. Let us be careful not to get too much on hand at once, but attend to what we have before us.

My friend admits that the Bible contains at least one clear case of *immersion*—the *devil* immersed the *swine*! But as the *devil* *lost* his *bacon*, it seems that he afterwards determined to *change the mode*! [a laugh.] He *immerses* no more of his subjects!

Just before reading the Lexicons, my worthy friend made a statement, the correctness of which I am bound to call in question. In fact, I know it was *incorrect*. But I suppose he made it so unintentionally. It was this: “Mr. Carson, in his work on Baptism, and Mr. A. Campbell of his (my) own Church, who is regarded as the highest authority by his brethren, agree in making the meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo* the same, or synonymous.” Now, in order to see whether this is so or not, let me read Mr. Carson on baptism, page 19: ¹¹ Yet there is a very obvious difference in the use of the words, (*bapto* and *baptizo*,) and a difference that naturally affects the point at issue. This difference is: *bapto* is never USED TO DENOTE THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM; and BAPTIZO NEVER SIGNIFIES TO DYE. The primitive word *bapto* has two significations: the primary to *dip*, the secondary to *dye*. But the derivative, (*baptizo*), is formed to modify the PRIMARY ONLY.” Here, then, we discover that Carson does not say that these two words, (*bapto* and *baptizo*,) “are synonymous” in meaning, but the contrary.

Mr. Logan, then proceeded to notice the Greek *Lexicons* on *bapto*. Why did he do this? Does he not know that the controversy is about the meaning of *baptizo*, the word always used in the New Testament to denote the rite of Christian baptism, and not about the meaning of *bapto*, a word never used to denote it? Did he find any Lexicon, that gave *sprinkle* or *pour* as a meaning of *baptizo*? Not one. They were *Paidobaptists* too, witnesses from the gentleman’s own side of the house; yet not one of them would venture to say, that *baptizo*, in any way, means either to *sprinkle* or *pour*! Does my worthy friend think that these Lexicons sustain him? Do his friends think so? Surely not. It makes but little difference, so far as *reputation* is concerned, what a man says, who has none. But men of reputation will not hazard so much as to say that *baptizo* means either to *sprinkle* or *pour*!

But my friend says that the Lexicons give “*wash*,” “*dye*,” “*stain*,” “*purify*,” etc., as meanings of the word. Let us see how that is. And in doing so, I will read from some of the most eminent and scholarly *Paidobaptists*:

1. Altingius.—The word baptism properly signifies *immersion*; improperly by a *metonymy of the end* washing."—*Loci. Commun. pars i. loc. xii. p. 198.*

2. Alstadius.—"Baptizein, to baptize, signifies only to *immerse*; not to wash except by consequence—*Lexicon Theologicum, chapter xii. page 221.*

Baptizo certainly does not literally and primarily mean "wash," and precisely the opposite, "stain." The effect of dipping, may be either to "wash" Or "stain," as the element may be pure or impure. "Wash," "stain," "purify," "dye," etc., are not *real*, but only consequential or tropical meanings of *baptizo*. You see a lady dipping a yarn in blue dye, and she says she is *dyeing* or *coloring* it; when the truth is, she is really dipping it, and the effect, or consequence, is, the yarn is colored. The same act performed in a different element, would produce washing as its effect. But that *immerse* is the real, primary meaning of *baptizo*, I think I have shown to the entire satisfaction of this vast audience; and that it cannot, even by a "metonymy of the end," be made to mean *sprinkle* or *pour*, is equally as obvious.

Sir Wm. Blackstone, the great writer on law, lays it down as a rule of legal interpretation; "That the words of a law are generally to be understood, in the *usual* and *most known* signification."—*Comment, vol. i. section ii.*

Bishop Taylor says: "In all things where the precept is given in the proper state of laws, he that takes the *first sense* is the likeliest to be well guided. * * * * 'In the interpretation of the laws of Christ, the *strict sense* is to be followed."

Budeus.—"It is necessary, doubtless, that he who *desires* to be understood when he writes or speaks, should intend to convey only *one* meaning; which, if we obtain, we have the *true* and *genuine* sense."—*Theolog. Dogmat, 1. i. c. x. § 18.*

An anonymous writer, but of great authority, in the great work, the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, says: "Laws being directed to the unlearned, as well as to the learned, ought to be construed in their *most obvious meaning*, and not explained away by subtle distinctions; and no law is to suffer a figurative interpretation, where the proper sense of the words is as commodious, and equally fitted to the subject of the statute."—*Vol. vi. article Law, p. 41.*

One more quotation on this subject, and I am done with it:

Dr. Sherlock.—"When the words of the law are capable of different senses, and reason is for one sense, and the other sense is against reason, there it is fit that a *plain* and necessary reason should expound the law. But when the law is *not capable* of such different senses, or there is no such reason as makes one sense absurd and the other necessary, the law must be expounded according to the *most plain* and *obvious* signification of the words, though it should *condemn* that which we think there may be some reason for, or at least no reason against; for otherwise it is an easy matter to expound away all the laws of God.—*Presen. against Pop. ii., chap. i., p. 26; b. ii., chap. in., p. 328.*

These quotations must suffice on this point for the present. The hearer can see what these great authorities say on taking the *primary*, and *plain* meaning of words, or of giving to them their first and *most obvious* sense;

which, as can be seen they lay down as a most important principle of interpretation of all language, whether in reference to law or religion; and one that is always to be followed, unless forbidden by the connection of words, and attendant circumstances. It is this principle as applied to the word *baptizo*, for which I am contending against my friend, who is laboring to establish the opposite, and endeavoring to eke out *pouring* and *sprinkling*, from, secondary and inferential meanings of the word! But not only is its primary meaning to *immerse*, but that is *included* in all its other meanings, *plunge*, *submerge*, *overwhelm*, etc., all of which comprehend the idea of *immersion*. And! it is this first and primary meaning of words, which must strike every unprejudiced and impartial reader of the Bible as the correct one—every one, who has not been educated in a sectarian system of religion, and had his mind blinded by tradition and error—as has been often exemplified, in numerous instances. Who, that has not had his mind thus distorted, warped and prejudiced, would understand the word *sprinkle* to mean *immerse*, or *immerse* to mean *sprinkle*! — or the word) *baptize* to mean to sprinkle or pour, when, the primary, meaning of the word, and all the circumstances connected with it, show that it means to *immerse*!

It was a most singular rule, that Mr. Logan laid down, "that only those who believe in water baptism are qualified to testify and was evidently *manufactured* by him for the occasion, and to escape the force of the testimonies, which I had brought to bear against him from the "honest" Quakers. But something must be done to invalidate the testimony of these "honest Quakers!" I supposed, and am of the opinion still, that they might be considered *impartial* witnesses, as to the *meaning* of the word, and the ancient practice; and perhaps the *most* impartial of any, especially as they are not parties to the controversy, and not interested in contending for any of these "modes," as they are called, of water baptism. And their testimony is still the more important, valuable, and worthy of being accredited, from the fact that, as they believe in the baptism of the Spirit, they would be naturally disposed to lean to *pouring* and *sprinkling*; as the Spirit is said to be "poured out," "shed abundantly." "falling on us," etc.— to lean to my friend's side of the question. But we see, that in the face of all this, they testify, with great unanimity, to *immerse* as the meaning of *baptizo*.

My friend said, that I read from none of the "*Lexicons!*" True, I did not; but he did; and did so, without finding the word *sprinkle* or *pour* given as the meaning of *baptizo*. It is not every time a man *uses* Lexicons, that he succeeds in *proving* what he wishes to prove! I will admit, that he found one or two quite *modern* Lexicons, gotten up by Pedobaptist lexicographers, since this "baptismal controversy," as it is termed, began to rage—gotten up by *sprinklers*—that give "*wash*(not *pour* or *sprinkle*), as a real meaning of *baptizo*.; and they have all the other Lexicons, (and all of them by *sprinklers* too) against them, when they say *wash* is the primary meaning of the word! And he forthwith claims and proclaims, that the Lexicons are on his side!! This really caps the climax! On this principle, if out of a crowd of witnesses I can get one or two to say that a thing *may be so*, I can claim them all on my side! —though their combined testimony may be all against me!

I was not surprised at the *uneasiness*, that my worthy friend manifested,

when he came to the "Pedobaptist concessions." True enough, as my friend claims, these men practised *sprinkling* and *pouring* for baptism, at the same time that they made the *concessions* I read from them, that *baptizo* means to *immerse*, and that *immersion* was "the ancient manner of baptizing." But let it be borne in mind, that *they did not claim divine authority for aspersion*, (or sprinkling) They admitted that the Church had *changed the manner* of baptizing; and while they *conceded*, as I have shown, they only *practised aspersion by the authority of the Church!* But let us hear one of the Doctors of the church, on the subject:

Dr. WETHAM says:—"The church, which cannot change the least article of the Christian faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremonies. Not only the Catholic church, but the pretended Reformed churches have altered this primitive custom, in giving the sacrament of baptism; and now allow of baptism by *pouring* on *sprinkling* water on the person baptized."

I have also the testimony of Dr. Wall, the author of the great work on Infant Baptism, and many other eminent men, who *acknowledge the change* by the church, from *immersion* only, to *sprinkling* and *pouring*. If called in question, or demanded, they shall be produced and read. Will my worthy friend be so honest, as to make the same confession that these men did?—that aspersion is practiced upon the sole authority of the church? But I am told by him, that I must take *all* these men say, on the subject of Baptism—or *nothing!* This is decidedly new! I was aware, that when a witness, *not a party* to the cause being tried, is introduced, all his evidence must be taken, or none. But the case here is different. The men from whom I read, belong to my friend's party—they are *party to the controversy*—and I have a right to use any *concession* they may have made, without taking all they say, on any and every subject, whether pertinent to the question in debate, or not. Strange that my worthy friend did not make this very wonderful discovery, before he introduced Messrs. Carson and Campbell, as witnesses for himself! Is he willing to take *all they say*, on the subject of baptism? I think not! But a few more words here, on the subject of these *concessions*. According to the tenor of the reasoning of my worthy friend here, the *concessions* of these witnesses for *immersion*, ought to be *nullified* by what they say about *sprinkling* and *pouring*—because they acknowledged and practised these as baptism! This is strange sort of logic! If they were *inconsistent* with themselves, in admitting *immersion* to be baptism, and the ancient manner of baptism, while they practised *pouring* and *sprinkling*, it matters nothing to us. It is that which makes their concessions the more valuable—in fact, which gives their admissions the character of *concessions*; for if they had believed in, and practised immersion, to the exclusion of pouring and sprinkling, they would have been no concessions at all. Concessions, therefore, are among the most valuable testimony; for it is the strongest presumptive proof of the correctness of a thing, when men are compelled to *concede* it against their prejudices, prepossessions and practice.

My worthy friend informs us, that from the *first* to the *eleventh* century, nobody practised "*exclusive immersion*;" and that *sprinkling* and *pouring* were practised as Christian baptism, during all this time. I must learn what kind of immersion "*exclusive immersion*" is, before I say much about that. But if he will show, that *sprinkling* and *pouring* were *practised*,

from the *first* to the eleventh century, he may "wear the blue ribbon," back to Alton, [a laugh.] Allow me, sir, to predict, that it will turn out, that the first subject that ever *pretended* to be baptized, in any other way than by *immersion*, was one *Novatian*, who, in the year 251 had water profusely poured upon him, in his bed! Let my friend show a case of aspersion earlier than this, if he can.

The gentleman has also informed us, that in the course of time, "the meaning of words is *changed*." This is only true of the words of a *living* language, and not *all* of them. But this is too small a place for a man of his dimensions to escape through; for I have shown that *baptizo* in Greek, as used by Greeks, Jews, and *Christians*, meant *immerse* as long as the Greek was a *living* language; and there are no *changes* in *dead* languages. Let him prove that, in the Christian Scriptures, this word is used "in another sense;" for I affirm that it is *assumption*, resorted to, to bolster up, and save a "sinking cause!"

My worthy friend says that baptism "is an outward sign of the inward spiritual grace"—that the "blood of Christ is *sprinkled*," and "the Holy Spirit is poured;" and therefore, he would conclude, I suppose, that both *sprinkling* and *pouring* are *baptism*! I know not, whether to call all this mystification, or twistification! Where, in the Bible, does he learn, that baptism is an "outward sign" of *any thing*? Let him tell us. Does he really believe, that the Holy Spirit was literally *poured out*? Certainly not, for that would suppose the Spirit *material*. The Holy Spirit is said also to be as *dew*. Our Lord represents the Spirit as a *well*, the water of which, *springs up*. The Holy Spirit make glad the city of God. I had not supposed any of these passages were to be understood in a *literal* sense. But my friend has a convenient way of arranging things, so as always to be equal to the *present* emergency. When he wants to prove *pouring*, he has the Holy Spirit baptism pouring; but when he comes to "*buried* by baptism," he makes that Holy Ghost baptism, and *admits* it is a *burial*, as I can read from his Book on Baptism, which I hold in my hand; and will read it if necessary. Then, I suppose, if water baptism must be like Holy Spirit baptism, it must be a *burial*, at least *occasionally*! So it will be a *burial*, any how, and in any way it can be fixed; and if a *burial*, *immersion* must be the action, as nothing but that will represent a burial. My friend has here placed himself between the two horns of a dilemma; and he may take either one of them; and whichever one he takes, will fix *immersion* down upon him as the Christian baptism.

3. My third argument is based upon the following *Scriptural* language:

"Then went out unto him, Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan: and were all baptized of him *in Jordan*," etc. (Matt. iii. 5,6.) Mark has it "in the river of Jordan." Now why, if I am wrong, and my friend right, did John baptize "*in the river*?" This shows us how John "baptized *with water*"—he did it "*in the river*!" What sense is there in such language as "*poured* the people *in a river*!"—"*sprinkled* the people *in a river*!"—[*Time expires*.

MR. LOGAN'S SECOND REPLY.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend, Mr Sweeney, has taken occasion to allude again to the *origin* of this

discussion, in order to get rid of the charge of having challenged me, in the first place, to hold it with him. I have given you my understanding of its origin, which fixes the challenging upon him, or his friends which is the same thing; and, as I stated, in my first speech, I have the documents to show how it originated, and that the challenge first came from his side. But you have heard his admission, that, perhaps, his friends first *formally* submitted the challenge! This *clears* myself and my friends of the imputation of having given it, which is what I have been endeavoring to show; and fixes it upon him and his friends. I wished to place the origin of the discussion, where it properly belongs, and that the audience might see who had been the challenging party.

My friend says that *one* word cannot express but *one* action. Now that is the very thing to which the proposition under discussion refers, and the proof of which devolves upon him. It reads, that "immersion in water is essential to Christian baptism." If this be true, then that one word, *immersion*, is all the word that can express the action. Now, that is the very thing about which the debate is; and which it is incumbent on my worthy friend to prove.

My friend speaks of the Lexicon's making baptism aspersion by *consequence*. Now they do not say "by consequence." They define *baptizo* as meaning to *wash*, to *cleanse*, to *purify*, to cleanse by washing, to purify with water, etc., as well as to dip, immerse, etc. I will not deny that the word means to immerse, but then I contend that that is not all its meaning; and that it may be made to include the idea of *sprinkling* and *pouring*. As used in the New Testament, to define a religious rite, it merely means to wash, cleanse, purify, etc., without reference to the manner or mode of doing so. Baptism, as I have shown, is emblematical and figurative in its character, representing the work of the Holy Ghost on the heart; and as the Spirit is represented in the New Testament as being "*poured out*," "*shed on us*," etc., and the heart as being "*sprinkled* from an evil conscience," the *sprinkling* and *pouring* of water on the subject would most aptly represent the Christian baptism.

As to the meaning of the word *baptizo*—that it always implies to *immerse*—Dr. Carson, the great Baptist authority, acknowledges that he has all the Lexicons against him here. He says:

"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 Lexicon®," etc

Now let it be borne in mind here, that this great Baptist authority, after giving his position, that the word *baptizo* always means to dip or immerse, honestly confesses that he has *all* the lexicographers and commentators against him in that opinion!—and that the word expresses nothing but *mode*. Now, my worthy friend has been endeavoring to show to this audience that the Lexicons are *all with him*, and on his side, in attempting to prove the same thing with Carson, that the word always means to *immerse*; but Carson admits that they are *all against him*, and consequently as much *against* my friend, as his position is precisely the same. As Carson says that the word expresses nothing but *mode*, and I have shown from him, as well as Mr. A. Campbell, that *hapto* and *baptizo* are *one* in meaning; consequently, if the meaning to *wash*, *purify*, *sprinkle*, etc., can be predicated

of *bapto*, it can also of *baptizo*, as *sprinkling is a mode* that can be inferred of both, and really is as much baptism as immersion—the position to be proven, and which is thus clearly demonstrated. For if I can succeed in proving *sprinkling* to be a meaning of these words, and baptism is *mode*, and expresses nothing but mode, as Mr. Carson says, then sprinkling is a valid mode of baptism. Sprinkling, pouring and immersion are all *modes* of baptism; as riding on horseback, in a carriage and on a railroad are all *modes* of traveling. Traveling is the thing itself, and these only different modes of it; and so baptism is the thing itself, and these only the three different modes of performing it.

Wahl, an eminent Greek lexicographer, defines *baptizo*, as we have seen, "first—to wash, perform ablution, cleanse; secondly, to immerse, etc."

Here we see that this great lexicographer, who is as high authority as any that my friend can produce, gives the words *wash* and *cleanse* as the *primary* meaning of *baptizo*, and immerse as its *secondary* meaning. What will my friend say to this?—as he has so vauntingly announced to this audience, that *all* the Lexicons are *with him!*

Greenfield, as we have seen, another great authority as to Lexicons, "defines it: to immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; and in the New Testament, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse; to immerse."

Here we have Greenfield in addition to Wahl, who, after giving the meaning of the word, as used by the Greek writers, or in that language, gives the New Testament meaning of it to be first, or primarily, to *wash, cleanse, etc.*, and immerse as its *secondary* meaning; thus fully sustaining my position. He makes a distinction, as we see, between its *primary* and *secondary* meanings, as used in the New Testament; and it is the meaning of the word, as there used, which we are now engaged in discussing. So we see again that my friend has not got *all* the Lexicons *with him!*

I spoke of the *change* which the words of a language undergo in the process, of time, and my friend endeavored to show you that *baptizo* never underwent any change during the ages and hundreds of years that the Greek language was spoken as a living tongue. Other words changed, but this word never! It was all the time *immerse*, and nothing else! I do not wander at this, as *immersion* seems to be all that my worthy friend can see in it! I will here read a few extracts from the debate of Messrs. Rice and Campbell on this subject of the change of words. Mr. R., in speaking of the *change* which the word *prevent*, which I gave as an example, had undergone, so that from once meaning to *anticipate*, or go before, it had now come to have the meaning of *hinder*, says:

'When Mr. Campbell was about to give a new translation of the New Testament, he asserted that this word had lost its original meaning, and to prove it, quoted the passage—'Mine eyes *prevent* the dawning of the morning.' And this was one of the evidences of the necessity of a new translation. I agreed with him, that this word had lost its original meaning. Again: what is the literal or radical meaning of the word *conversation*? It signifies *turning about from one thing to another*. Hence it was formerly used to signify *conduct*, and in this sense it is almost uniformly used in our translation of the Bible. But is this its present meaning? Has it not lost its original import and assumed a meaning, quite different? It is now certainly used in the sense of talking—oral communication.

"Mr. Carson, one of the most learned critics who has written in favor of immersion, fully sustains the principle for which I am contending. He asserts that words very often lose entirely their original signification, and a *secondary meaning* comes to be the *true and proper meaning*. It is not true, therefore, that, words of any class always retain

their original, philological import. On the contrary, their *meaning is perpetually changing*; and usage only, as the ablest critics declare, can determine it."

Thus we have seen, from these two great authorities, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Carson, that the words of a language change their meaning, in the process of time, so that often a word will come to have quite a different meaning from what it once did. Now can my friend show that such was not the case with the word *baptizo*?—that it was an erosion to the general rule about the change of the language? If he can, he will have his two great friends, Messrs. Carson and Campbell, against him as to this change of words! And we see this, too, from some other words, which have so changed their meaning that they have come to denote things not only entirely different from their original signification, but in some cases almost the opposite of it! And thus *baptizo*, from meaning at first to *immerse, submerge, plunge*, etc., could easily become so changed in its meaning as to include the idea of *sprinkling* and *pouring*, when used in a religious sense, as in the New Testament. The *primary* and principal meaning of the word is, as we have seen from some of the Greek Lexicons, to *wash, cleanse, purify*, etc., while the *secondary* meaning was *immerse*. As our Savior and his apostles were doubtless familiar with the *washings* and *sprinklings* of the Jewish law, which were "for the *purifying* of the flesh," we might expect them, in describing a Christian ordinance, to use such terms as were already familiar to the Jews in describing these legal washings, and in the *same sense* in which *they* used them. Hence we read of "divers *washings* (*baptisms*) that when the Jews come from market, "except they *wash* (*baptize*), they eat not ; " " having your hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and your bodies *washed* with pure water and that baptism is "not the putting away of the *filth* of the *flesh*, but the answer of a good conscience toward God," etc. As my worthy friend and his brethren contend that the expression "and your bodies washed with pure water," alludes to *immersion* as the proper baptism, can he tell us how this *washing* is to be performed *with* water, if *immersion* of the body is alluded to here by the apostle as the Christian baptism? How would it sound to substitute the word *immersed* for "washed," (as he was so fond of *substituting* when on the Greek writers), and say, "your bodies *immersed* with pure water!" What kind of sense would it make? As it is my friend's rule, it ought to work well, if his position is correct, as you know that "a good rule must work both ways."

My worthy friend endeavored to entertain you with one of his witticisms. on what I said in reference to the devils' entering into the swine, as a clear case of *immersion*, which I was willing to admit. He said he had no doubt that the devil was highly pleased with *our* manner of *proselyting*, by sprinkling and pouring for baptism; and who had *changed* the mode from immersion to these. If there has been any *change*, it is the party of my worthy friend who have made it, from the apostolic mode of sprinkling and pouring to immersion. As to these *than gee* in the sentiments of the people, from sprinkling to *immersion* as the correct baptism, on which they delight to harp so much, it is well known that they, (my friend and his brethren) are the cause of them, People would remain satisfied with their baptism by sprinkling, if *they* were not eternally going about the country, and preaching immersion, and unsettling their minds, by persuading them that the have never been baptized—never received the pardon of their sin, are not

of the kingdom of Christ, and all this! It is this that is unsettling the minds of the people, and causing the spread of immersion sentiments, of which my friend and his brethren are so fond of boasting; and not a change of sentiment, caused by investigation of the word of God!

As to the *concessions* of Pedobaptists, upon which my worthy friend harped so much, and which he seemed to regard as among the strongest evidences for his theory of exclusive immersion, I will say, that if true, if while they conceded *immersion* to be the ancient manner of baptism, they practised *sprinkling* as baptism—they were inconsistent and *dishonest!* Such authorities, who teach one thing and at the same time *practise another*, are evidently dishonest, and not to be relied on. Their *dishonesty* invalidates their testimony, and makes it worthless! If they really believed *immersion* to be the scriptural and only baptism, which these *concessions* imply, they ought to have *practised* it, and rejected sprinkling and pouring altogether. Such evidence as this would be rejected in a court of law; and should have no weight in matters of religion. If in law, inconsistency in evidence makes it worthless, and causes its rejection, it is certainly entitled to weight in the far more important matter of religion, where a man's eternal life and all are at stake!

Besides, it can easily be shown, that a great many of these men never did believe *immersion* to be *essential* to Christian baptism. They regarded it as only a *mode* of baptism, while they admitted and taught that *sprinkling* and *pouring* were equally valid as *modes* of baptism. They occupied the same ground here, that we do; that the *outward* or water baptism was *emblematical* of the *inward* or Spiritual baptism, of the work of the Spirit upon the heart, in conversion and regeneration, which was the substance, the main thing, in baptism; and that as the Holy Ghost was represented as being "*poured* out" on the people, as being "shed upon them abundantly," the "*heart sprinkled*,"ⁿ etc. that baptism was correctly administered by either *sprinkling* or *pouring*, as the *application* of the water was the principle thing, without regard particularly to the mode; and hence that *immersion* was not absolutely essential to the *validity* of the ordinance.

Dr. Wall, in his great work, the "History of Infant Baptism," states, in the second volume of that work, that there never was a time from Christ to his own day, when persons were not *sprinkled*, in being baptized; and that *affusion* (sprinkling) had been the *practise* of the church from the days of the apostles. Wall is a great authority with the party of my friend, one that they are very fond of quoting when endeavoring to prove *immersion* as the only and apostolic baptism; and we see here what be testifies. So they will have to go somewhere else, and hunt up some other authority to "bolster up" and sustain their "sinkingcause."

As the party of my friend are so fond of trying to prove *immersion* by *Pedobaptist* authority, I am now going to prove by good *Baptist* authority, that valid baptism can be administered by pouring and affusion. I will prove it by Mr. Benedict, in his "History of the Baptists," which is of the highest authority among our Baptist friends, who are as great sticklers for *immersion* as my worthy friend and his party, and which I expect will be accepted by them. But in the first place, I can tell my friend and this audience the reason, that the word *baptizo* was not translated, but only transferred into the English language, or *Anglicized*, as the term is. It was because there was no *one* word in the language, which would express

its fall meaning. The word *immerse*, as I have shown, is a *Latin*, and *nos* an English word; and to define the word *baptizo* by that word, would no more be a *translation* of it than the word *baptize*. It would be merely substituting a Latin word for a Greek one. Mr. Benedict says: "*Immerse* is a Latin word;" and "*Immersion* may be performed by *pouring* or *sprinkling*." * * * [Here Mr. Sweeney said: "Read on."] If long enough continued." Well, it is done at last by *pouring* or *sprinkling*!

I cannot get my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, to quote from the Bible—to go to the word of God, for testimony on this subject—and yet, as I have told him, that is the authority at last, which is to decide this question. He is engaged all the time, in quoting the authority of learned and eminent men, as if that were to decide it. Now, this will do very well in its place, and I am not disposed to disregard them. But I want these evidences, or testimonies, to go for what they are worth, and no more, without attaching any undue importance to them. Now, I can let my friend know, that I can quote as many of these learned men as he can, in support of my position on this subject—to prove that *sprinkling* and *pouring* are valid modes of baptism. And I can, perhaps, God as many *Baptist* concessions, as he can get from *Pedobaptists*. As to *proving*, I am under no obligation to prove anything, as my position on this question is that of the *negative*. All the obligation I am under, is to prove that my friend does *not prove* his point, and does not sustain the affirmative on this question.

As my worthy friend has laid so much stress upon the expressions, "*Baptized in Jordan*," "*baptizing in the river of Jordan*," etc., and as so much stress is laid by him and his brethren on these expressions, "*went down into the water*," and "*came up out of the water*," etc., I must devote some attention here to these things. I will here quote again from Dr. Carson. He is speaking of the Greek preposition *apo*, translated "out of" in the common version, (in Matt. iii. 16,) where the baptism of our Savior by John is spoken of. On page 130 of his work on Baptism, he says: "Though I have thus proved, that for anything to be found in *apo*, our Lord might have been baptized in the middle of Jordan, yet since *apo* necessarily implies no more than *the edge* as the point of departure; since we are *not otherwise informed* that John and He *went into* the water *previously to baptizing*, as we are informed with respect to Philip and the eunuch, I think there is *no reason to believe* that John the Baptist usually *went into* the water in baptizing." * * * * [Here Mr. Sweeney said: "Will my worthy friend please to read on from Carson some further?"] The striking difference between the accounts of these two baptisms, leads me to conclude that John chose some place on the edge of the Jordan, that admitted the immersion of the person baptized, while the baptizer remained on the margin." Will that satisfy my friend? The remainder of the quotation, which I have read, detracts nothing from the evidence of the first part of it, for which I read it; but, if any difference, adds to, and confirms it, as the hearer can easily see. The audience can also easily see the admission or *concession*, (as we have been on the subject of concessions,) of Mr. Carson here, on the meaning of *apo*. He says, that it necessarily implies no more than *the edge* of the water; and that, as we are *not otherwise informed* that John and Christ *went into* the water *before* the baptizing, there is no reason to believe that John usually *went into the water*, when he baptized. As the *primary* meaning of the word *apo* is "from," (and [

wish it to be noted that my friend is a great stickler for the *primary* meaning of Greek words,) and as the meaning of *eis* is "to," as well as into, we can with propriety say that our Savior came up "from [not "out of"] the water and that Philip and the eunuch "went down to the water," and when he had baptized him, "they came up from the water." This rendering, which is as correct as in the common version, according to this meaning of these Greek particles, would leave the supposition, or inference, that the baptizing was by *sprinkling* or *pouring*, as strong as for its being by *immersion*. In fact more so, as it would be awkward in the extreme, if not nonsensical, to say: "And they went down to the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and when he had *immersed* him, they came up from the water" And if, as Mr. Carson says, there is no reason to believe that John usually went *into* the water, when he baptized, the presumption is naturally left on the mind, that his baptism was by *affusion*. In fact, it would be impossible to account for his baptizing such immense 'multitudes as resorted to him, in the *short time* that his ministry lasted, in any other way, as we are told that, "there went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan; and were baptized of him in [or at] Jordan, confessing their sins." Let it be noted, that they were baptized *by him*; and how so many hundreds and thousands of people could have been *immersed* by *one* man, in the short space of a few months, is an impossibility, that would require a great stretch of credulity to believe. But on the supposition that they were only *sprinkled*, or baptized by the affusion of water, all is easily reconciled, and there is no impossibility in the matter. As to its being done at the *river* Jordan, upon which my worthy opponent and his friends lay so much stress as presumptive evidence in favor of *immersion*, I can reply, that in a country so *dry* as the land of Judea, and affording so few springs and streams of living, or constant-running water, such a quantity of water would be required for the people and their animals to drink, and for washing, cooking, and other necessary purposes, that a large stream, such as the Jordan, would be necessary to furnish a sufficient supply for them. And for the same reason, we read that John *baptized* "at Enon, near Salem, because there was *much water* there;" or "many waters," (many springs,) as the original is literally rendered. As, according to Mr. Carson, *apo* only means the *edge* of the stream, and we have no evidence that John went any further, in baptizing, the presumption, as we have shown, is entirely in favor of *aspersion*, and against *immersion*, as the Christian baptism.

Mr. Carson also quotes from Homer, the great Greek poet, to show that *apo* means not at the river, but one edge of it — that is, not at the banks, but at the edge of the water. He (Mr. C.) also shows, that the expression, "all *within* the river," means all the space included *within the banks*, whether occupied by the water of the stream, or not, including the "bars," beach, or dry ground, left by the water, when the stream is low, as we frequently see the case with our own streams, in the Summer and Fall seasons of the year; so that the expression, "in the Jordan," and "in the river of Jordan," may merely allude to the dry ground, or "bar," and does not necessarily imply *in the water* of the river. And hence, John's baptizing "in the river of Jordan," may with propriety imply that it was merely at the *edge* of the water, and not necessarily *in* the stream of the water itself

So when it comes to the *authorities* and *concessions* of eminent and learned men, I am even with my friend, and can give him "tit for tat" and can produce as many in favor of *aspersion* as he can for *immersion*. In fact, the great majority of Christians, in all ages, from the days of the apostles down to our own times, have practiced *affusion* for baptism; as good and pious men as the world ever saw among them; and yet, according to my worthy friend, they were all mistaken and wrong!— and among them, too, as he must be forced to concede, men learned in the Greek language, and well acquainted with the meaning of its terms. It is *matters of fact* which we want, and not mere theories and assumptions.

I have been laboring to try to get my worthy friend to come to the *Bible*, the New Testament, to decide this question, as that is the umpire that must at last determine it; but it seems to be in vain; as he is all the time bringing up authorities, outside of it! Let him come there, and we can soon settle it. But while he is bringing up these authorities, of course I must meet them with others to rebut them; and I have shown him and this audience, that I am fully equal to him, in this respect, and can present as great an array of learned and eminent authorities as he can; and that too, from his own side of the house.—[*Time expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My friend's continued reference to the *origin* of this debate, is, I am satisfied, a mere *cant* for sympathy. So also are his references to his own very "quiet, unobtrusive, and peaceable" life, among his religious neighbors! All this is for *sympathy*, which I suppose he is convinced that he will need. Let him come out at once, and directly call me the challenging party, if it will do him any good. Let him make his pretensions to being a very quiet man. Of course he and his Methodist brethren have forgotten all about, with what pugnacity he was "pitching into" old uncle *Peter Cartwright*, only a short time since! His *book on Baptism* too, is all forgotten! What if my friend has quite a reputation as a debater and newspaper controversialist! He must be looked upon as very "quiet," "unobtrusive," and not at all *pugnacious*! But to proceed with the discussion of the question before us.

I said, and repeated it, that "one word cannot express two different actions," much less three, as *immersion*, *sprinkling* and *pouring*. My friend produced no instance to the contrary. Why, sir, my proposition is self-evident. If *baptizo* means *immerse*, it cannot express another action so different as *sprinkle* or *pour*. I showed very clearly, as I thought, and gave you good Pedobaptist authority for it, *how baptizo* means to "wash," it is only by *consequence*: and in precisely the same way it may mean to "stain," or "color." My friend might as well contend for *stain* or *color*, as the *real*, *primary* meaning of the word, as for "wash," upon which he lays so much stress; for it is only by a metonymy of the end, that it can be made to mean either. Our English word *dip* may be made to mean *wash*, or *stain*, in the same way, by putting the *effect* of the action for the *action itself*. But would any one claim that *wash* or *stain* is the primary, *real* meaning of *dip*? By no means, as such a thing would be an absurdity.

Let us not forget, that there can be a *baptism without a drop of water*— in oil or molasses, for instance: and hence there can be a *baptism* without

any *washing*! This completely upsets the assumption of my friend, that *wash* is the primary meaning of the word. I think the audience can easily see that *baptizo*, only means wash by consequence, as I have before shown; and then only when the action is performed in pure water.

As the gentleman has had so much to say about Mr. Carson, and seems to exult so much over what he conceives to be his admissions and concessions, I would ask, *in what* were "all the *Lexicons* and commentaries" against Mr. Carson? Did Mr. Logan show? Will he do so? I predict that he will not! Mr. Carson took the ground, that "dye," "wash," etc., should never be given as meanings of *baptizo*, *in any sense*. The *Lexicons* say it means "dye," "wash," etc.—some of them, as I have shown, taking the pains to say, "*by consequence*." This was the difference. Do any of the *Lexicons* say it means *pour* or *Sprinkle*? No, no Lexicographer has ever ventured to say, that *baptizo* can, *in any way*, be tortured so as to mean either *pour* or *sprinkle*! Here is where my friend needs authority; but will never get even good Pedobaptist authority!

But without one scrap of authority, or any show of reason, the gentleman persists in asserting that *baptizo* is a *generic* term; and illustrates by the word "*travel*" He says "*travel*" is the thing itself, and "*walking*," "*riding*" etc. "*are modes of traveling*." So "*baptism* is the thing itself, and these [immersion, pouring and sprinkling] the three different modes of performing it." When my friend says that "*baptism* is the thing itself," I would be pleased if he would explain what he *means* by "*the thing itself*?" My friend ought to explain here; but I will venture the prediction, that he will never tell us what *baptism*, "*the thing itself*," is! If it is decided that *immersion*, *sprinkling* and *pouring* are all simply "*modes of baptism*," then what is *baptism itself*?

Out of *all* the *Lexicons*, my friend hits found *two*, gotten up since this controversy arose, *both sprinklers*, who say that *baptizo* means *primarily* to "*wash*;" and these two have *over thirty*, more ancient ones, against them! Still, he seems to think he has proven *sprinkling* and *pouring* to be baptism, by the *Lexicons*! How overwhelmingly ridiculous!! Suppose all the *Lexicons* were to say that it means "*wash*"—does that sustain him? What *washing* is there about filliping a little water from a preacher's fingers upon the forehead of a person? Persons baptized are said to have (as an *effect*) their "*bodies washed with pure water*." This is not done by *sprinkling a few drops* of water upon the person! To *sprinkle* a little water on clothes, and then say that they are *washed*, would be supremely ridiculous! What would my friend say, if Mrs. Logan were to sprinkle a little water on his soiled linen, and then tell him it was washed, and he could put it on, and go to meeting!

Why has my friend resorted to all that reading from Campbell & Rice's Debate, to prove what nobody denies? — that many of the words of a *living* language do, in course of time, very essentially change in meaning? What of that? Did I not show that *before*, *in the days of*, and *after* Christ, all writers, Greek, Jewish and Christian, used this word in the sense for which I contend? Did I not call upon him to produce *one single exception*?

— and has he ever attempted to do so? Will he make the attempt? We shall see. It is much easier for him to talk of baptism being "*the thing itself*," and having many "*modes*!"

My worthy friend very modestly referred to Paul's expression, "*divers*

washings (baptisms);" and would have us to understand that this refers to the "sprinklings" of the former dispensation. He might get an argument here, if there had been *no immersions* under that dispensation. But as there were "divers" *immersions* there, and as *baptizo* means *immerse*, it follows that Paul referred to the *immersions*, and *not* to the *sprinklings* of the former dispensation.

The gentleman admits that we are a very *zealous* people. He says that we are "eternally going about over the country preaching immersion," and that we "unsettle the minds" of such as have been long "satisfied with sprinkling" as baptism! Well, in reply to this, I am free to acknowledge, that I and my brethren *do* persuade every *believer* we find, to be baptized, where he has not already obeyed the gospel of Christ — to be "*Mined* with Christ in baptism" —and then the minds of such are forever *settled* about their baptism. I am truly sorry, that this course seems to annoy my good friend, because we are not willing to let people remain satisfied *in error*, believing that when they have had their foreheads moistened with a few drops of water, from the fingers of a preacher, "in the name of the Trinity," they have been "*buried* with Christ in baptism;" but believing it to be my *duty*, I cannot desist from going on in the same course, however annoying it may be to him and his friends. We are taught by the apostle James, that "the wisdom which is from above, is *first* pure, then peaceable, gentle," etc. We are to have *purity* first, cost what it may, and annoying as it may be; and then all that *peace*, gentleness, quietude, etc., which he was so quietly enjoying at the good and quiet city of Alton, with his Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian neighbors, until it was so rudely broken in upon, by this discussion!

My friend brings a most sweeping charge against his Pedobaptist brethren whose "concessions" seem to annoy him so much! He says that, *believing* one thing and *practicing* another and different one, they were "inconsistent and *dishonest*;" and that consequently their "testimony should be rejected" as worthless! Well, in reply to this, while I am not willing to defend, as consistent, all who *now preach* one "mode," and *practice* a different one, to save a member, I will volunteer to defend those I quoted, as being at least *honest*, and far more *consistent* than those who do likewise, at the present day! Those men honestly believed that the church had the right to "change the mode" They believed that the ancient order was *immersion*, but the church had changed the "mode," and they practiced *aspersion* upon its authority, We will hear some of these on the subject:

Mr. Perkins.—"The *ancient custom* of baptizing was to *dip*; and, as it were, to dive *all the body* of the baptized under the water; as may appear in Paul, Rom. 6 chap., and the councils of Laodicea and Neocesarea; but *now*, especially in cold countries, the CHURCH USETH ONLY TO SPRINKLE the baptized, by reason of children's weakness," etc. — *Works*, vol. i., p. 74, edit. 1608.

Mark the words, "*now the Church useth only to sprinkle!*"—showing that the change was made upon the authority of the Church, with the acknowledgement that *immersion* was the *ancient* custom or practice, and that used by the apostles, as his reference to Paul, in Romans vi. chap., sufficiently shows.

I will now give the testimony of Dr. Wall, in his work, the "History

of Infant Baptism," who seems to be such great authority with my worthy friend. He says:

"In case of sickness, weakness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasion, baptism by *affusion* of water on the face, was by the ancients accounted sufficient baptism. I shall out of the many proofs of it produce two or three of the *most ancient*. Anno Dom. 251, Novatian was; by one party of the clergy and people of Rome, chosen bishop of that church, in a schismatical way, and in opposition to Cornelius, who had been before chosen by the major part, and was already ordained. Cornelius does in a letter to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, vindicate his right, showing that Novatian came not canonically to his orders of priesthood, much less was capable of being chosen bishop: for that all the clergy and a great many of the laity, were against his being ordained presbyter, because it was not lawful (they said) for any one that had been baptized in his bed in time of sickness, as he had been, to be admitted to the office of the clergy. * * * * * France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by *affusion* was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it. † † † † It being allowed to weak children [in the reign of queen Elizabeth] to be baptized by *aspersion*, many fond ladies and gentlemen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weak, children, too tender to endure dipping in the water."

Again, Wall says:

"There had been—some synods in some dioceses in France, that had spoken of *affusion* without mentioning *immersion* at all, that [immersion] being the *common practice*; but for an office or liturgy of any church, this is, I believe, the *first in the world* that prescribes aspersion absolutely. † † † † And for *sprinkling*, properly called, it seems it was, at 1645, *just then beginnings* and used by *very few*. It must have begun *in the disorderly times* after 41. † † † † But then came the Directory, and says: 'Baptism is to be administered, not in private places, or privately; but in the place of public worship, and in the fare of the congregation,' and so on. 'And not in the places where fonts, in the time of Popery, were unfitly and superstitiously placed.' So, they reformed the font into a basin! This learned Assembly could not remember, that fonts to baptize in, had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built; but that *sprinkling*, for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in other Popish countries,) in times of Popery. And that accordingly, *all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been owned, have LEFT OFF dipping of children in the font: but that all other countries in the world which had never regarded his authority, do still use it; and that BASINS, except in case of necessity, were never used by Priests, of any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves.*"—*Hist. of Inf. Bap., part ii., chap. ix, pp. 463, 467, 470, 471, 472, 477.*

Here we have the testimony of this learned Pedobaptist, not only that *aspersion*, (or sprinkling for baptism,) was introduced by the authority of the church, which made the *change* from immersion to sprinkling, but that the *most ancient cases* of aspersion which can be found in history, did not take place until about the year 251, when Novatian had water *poured* on him for baptism, while on a sick bed; that as late as the year 1645, *aspersion* was *just beginning* and used but by very few; and that, lastly, the change was made by the Pope of Rome, and on the authority of the Roman Catholic church.

We discover, then, that these men practiced sprinkling and pouring upon the authority of the *church*. But as my friend will not recognize as all-sufficient the authority of the church; and yet will practice *sprinkling*, where will he get *his* authority? The *classics* are against him; the *Lexicons* are against him; the "honest *Quakers*" are against him and his own learned and honest Pedobaptist *brethren* are against him; but he is nothing daunted by all this! — these are not intimidating circumstances to *him!* He very coolly informs us, that "baptism is the thing itself;" and

immersion, pouring and sprinkling are only so many *modes* of baptism!

But let the audience bear in mind, that this very happy conception is not yet one hundred years old!

My worthy friend says, that the reason *baptizo* is not translated is, that there is "no word that will fully express its meaning." What a wonderful word that *baptizo* is! If the word *sprinkle* will not "fully express its meaning," then the man who is only sprinkled is not "fully" baptized! The same may be said of all my friend's "modes." Now will he be so kind to inform the audience, *how many* words, and what they are, that will express the meaning of *baptizo* "fully." It is very important, that we should have this little piece of information.

My friend says that he "can, *perhaps*, find as many baptist concessions" as I can get from Pedobaptists. He cannot find one single concession, at all *vital* to this question, from any Baptist work. Let him try it. Has Mr. Carson said that John baptized by *aspersion*? Has he conceded anything worth a "copper" to my friend?

4. I come now to my *fourth* argument, based upon the record of our Savior's baptism:

"And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water."—*Matt. iii. 16.*

I am prepared to admit all that my friend, as a scholar can claim here, as respects the meaning of the Greek word *apo*, which is here rendered "out of." He says that its *primary* meaning is *from*. Well, be it so. But will my friend say, that it necessarily means from the *edge* or *margin*? May it not mean *from within*, or *from the centre*? We are not to translate words just as we please—as the necessities of our cause may require. All words should have their *primary* meaning, unless the *circumstances of the case* (not our pressing necessities) make it necessary to give them a *secondary* meaning, then it must be done. Now, in the case before us, it is absolutely necessary that *apo* should be rendered "out of," or, if you please, *from within*. Why? Because Mark says: "Jesus was baptized of John *in Jordan*;" and hence they *must* have come *from within* the water. But my worthy friend tells us, that "*in*" here cotoes from *en*; and may be correctly rendered "*at*;" so that "Jesus was baptized of John *at Jordan*." We shall see about that. He will not deny that *in* is the *primary* meaning *en*; neither will he deny that *en* should have its *primary* meaning in every instance, where there is no good and substantial reason for giving it another, and a secondary meaning. Now let him show some good reason for saying that *en* here means *at*. It will not suffice for him to say that the word is so rendered in other places. This is admitted. But that he, or any other scholar under the sun can show a good reason for thus rendering it *here*, is just what I flatly and squarely deny. I contend that we have no right to give a *secondary* meaning to a word, just whenever it suits us to do so. This would be a terribly licentious and dangerous rule of scripture interpretation, as well as utterly unauthorized by all the laws of language! When my friend deserts this good old "Pedobaptist version of the Bible," and turns *translator*, he should give a good reason for every *alteration* he makes of its language.

Here, then, we see that our Savior was baptized *in Jordan*; and when he was baptized came *up out of* the water. But my friend baptizes, as he incorrectly styles *sprinkling*, *in the house*; and what is more, there is no

coming up out of the water, when it is performed! And as for his *Jordan*, I can drink it dry at a single draught! [a laugh.]

5. The reason given for John's baptizing in a certain place, implies immersion:

"And John was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there."—*John iii. 23.*

It is only necessary to notice here, that the expression, "because there was much water," is given as a reason why John was baptizing in Enon. Now, I would ask, does my friend require "much water" for sprinkling! But he informs us, that "much water" is not so good a rendering as "many springs." I would be highly pleased with a little authority just here. I roundly and flatly deny, that the words rendered "much water," can, under any circumstances, be correctly translated "many springs;" and it strikes me that a scholar would only take such a position to save a "sinking cause!" By the way, what a translator friend Logan has become! My prediction concerning him is already fulfilled. There is scarcely any one whose wit is so barren that they can say *nothing*; but no wit can evade the force of this argument.

6. I come now to the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch:

"As they [Philip and Eunuch] went on their way, they came to a certain water: and the Eunuch said, See here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If though believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still. And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," etc. *viii. 36-39.*

Notice, 1, "they came unto the water." Now they are already "at," or "to" the water; 2. Then "they both went down into the water." "Into" here cannot mean "to;" for they had before come "unto" the water. ii. Alter the baptism, "they both came up out of the water." But as my friend is decidedly a *dry land* gentleman, I will notice this "into" and "out of," a little further. "Into" here is from *eis*, the primary meaning of which is "into," as here rendered by this "good old version," that my friend only occasionally deserts. It must have its *primary* meaning here, unless some circumstances in the connection forbid it. Let my friend give a reason for rendering *eis* by "to," in this place. I have here, not only the primary meaning of the word, but all the circumstances too, in my favor. They had already come "unto" the water; and hence if *eis* carried them any further, it must have carried them *into* the water. This is obvious. But again: "out of" here comes from the Greek particle *ek*, and not from *apo*; and its *definite* meaning is *out of*. *Ek* never means *from*. But if my friend thinks that he can produce a single instance, in all the New Testament, where it means simply *from*, let him do so. I venture to say, he will not try the experiment. As then *ek* definitely and invariably means "out of," *eis* must necessarily mean "into;" for it is perfectly obvious, that *ek* could not have been used, if *eis* had not carried them *into* the water. *Ek*, the definite particle, limits *eis*, the indefinite one. Positively it does appear to my mind, that the Holy Spirit was *particular* here, to leave these sprinklers without anything about which to quibble. If this passage does not prove, that they went *into* the water to baptize, let my friend give us the words that can do it. According to his principle of in-

terpreting the Bible, can he prove that any one will ever enter *into* heaven? If so, let him give us the words that will do it.

7. My seventh argument is, that the scripture explanations of baptism show it to be *immersion*:

"Therefore we are *buried* with him *by baptism* into death."—*Rom. vi. 4.*

"*Buried* with him *in baptism*, wherein ye are *risen* with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."—*Col ii. 12.*

Here we have in baptism represented both a *burial* and a *resurrection*. This has been not inaptly called, the Lord's own explanation of baptism. The *learned* may keep the *unlearned* in ignorance, as to the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*; but here is an explanation of baptism, which all who will try, can understand. And, according to this language of the word of God, nothing but *immersion* for baptism, will do; as neither *sprinkling* nor *pouring* will represent a *burial*, nothing but *immersion*. What would we think of a man, who should *sprinkle* a little earth upon the body of a dead man, and then say, that he had *buried* him! Would not such a man be regarded as fit for the *lunatic asylum*? And when we consider the meaning of *baptizo*, and notice these circumstances here connected with its use by the apostles, how much more reasonable are those who contend that it means either *sprinkle* or *pour*? It is considered by all denominations of professing Christians, to be a good rule of scripture interpretation; that if a word, when substituted for another as a definition, will make good sense, it is a correct definition of the term; but that, if it will not make good sense, it will not do as a definition. Now let us apply this rule to the passages before us, and substitute the three works, *sprinkle*, *pour* and *immerse*, in the place of baptize: "*Buried* with him *by sprinkling* into death!" "*Buried* with him *by pouring* into death!" "*Buried* with him *in sprinkling*, wherein ye are *risen* with him!" "*Buried* with him *in pouring*, wherein ye are *risen* with him!" What nonsense would this make!—and yet, if my friend's theory of baptism by *sprinkling* and *pouring* is correct, and these the Scriptural baptism, these readings ought to make good sense. But let us substitute the word *immerse*, and see how it will read: "*Buried* with him *by immersion* into death"—"*buried* with him *in immersion*, wherein ye are *risen* with him." Now this makes good sense; and is the only one of these three words that will; and proves *immersion* to be the apostolic, Christian baptism, to the *exclusion* of pouring and sprinkling as such, which are the *inventions* of men, to take the place of the ordinance of God; who have thus "made void" the gospel of Christ, by these human "traditions!" This rule will apply to every passage in the New Testament, where baptism is mentioned, and where the Greek particles connected with it are correctly translated. There is a perfect harmony and congruity between *immersion* and the idea of a *burial* and resurrection; but not one particle of *resemblance* between these and *sprinkling* and *pouring*!

The only way to escape the force of this argument, is to desert *all* the "Fathers;" all the commentaries; all authorities; all common sense; and like the *Socinians*. say that these passages do not refer to *water* baptism—"it can mean something else!"

My worthy friend has been complaining, that he could not get me to come to the Bible, that I kept quoting from the classics, "and all this; and by the manner in which he has been continually referring to the subject, has been rather *insinuating* that I was *afraid* to come the sacred

volume! If such has been his impression, I trust that he is now undeceived on that point. I told him that I would give him scripture to his heart's content, before I was dene; and I trust that he has now had it! And if that does not satisfy him, he shall have still more!—[Time expires.]

MR. LOGAN'S THIRD REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, has taken occasion again to refer to the origin of this discussion; but as I have said enough on the subject, I shall pass it by, without any further notice, as it would only be consuming time for nothin?. But as he spoke of my "pitching" into "old uncle Peter Cartwright," I must say a few words in reference to that. I did have something to say in a religious newspaper, about the old man, but nothing of a derogatory or disrespectful character. I said something, I believe about his *eccentricities* of character, but nothing impugning or assailing his religious character, as it was that of a good and pious man. But the audience can easily see what my friend is after; and that it was for the purpose of making capital out of the affair, and enlisting the sympathies of our Methodist friends, in his favor, and of prejudicing them against myself! He knows very well how to play upon this string, when necessary for his cause!

Well, I am glad that I have got my friend into the Bible at last! I have been trying very hard to get him there; and telling him that this question must be settled by that; but he has all the time been bringing up his Greek and other authorities, as if it was to be settled by them! I am willing to take them for what they are worth, and to attach all the authority to them which they deserve; but that is little, when compared with that of the Bible. I think that I have shown to my friend and this intelligent audience, that I can be even with him, in producing these authorities in my favor, and can produce as many learned and great names, to sustain my position on this question, as he can in support of his! But they are ail merely *men* at last, uninspired men, who have given us their *opinions* on the subject; and these will weigh nothing against the Bible.

My worthy friend goes to Dr. Wall again, and makes a long quotation from him, on the *changing* of the *mode* of baptism from immersion to sprinkling and pouring, by the authority of the Church, and to show that these modes were modem *innovations*, of recent origin, introduced by the Pope of Rome, and I know not what all! This *ad captandum* argument, that the change was made by the Pope, and on the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, and that sprinkling and pouring as baptism owe their origin to them, is a favorite one of my friend and his party. They well know the *prejudice* against the Pope and the Catholic church, in the popular mind, and how to play upon this, in their own favor and against Peditobaptists, so as to cast all the odium they can upon *affusion* and *pouring* as baptism!

Now, I am ready to admit that Dr. Wall conceded *immersion* to be baptism, but at the same time he stuck to *sprinkling* as valid baptism too. My worthy friend read to you some long extracts from Dr. Wall, from which he endeavored to prove that *affusion* and *pouring* for baptism were comparatively modern innovations, not introduced until some time after the apostles and not in general use until quite a late period; that the change from, *immersion* to these was made by no higher authority than the church;

and, to throw, as much odium as possible upon these modes of baptism, and excite all the prejudice he can against them, that the change was made by the Pope of Rome and on the authority of the Roman Catholic church; and' all that. If my worthy friend had read a little more, in connection with the extracts he made from Dr. Wall, he would have found that his authorities here would not have availed him as much as he supposed. Dr. Wall says:

"On the other side, the anti-pedobaptists [the opposers of Pedobaptism] will be as unfair in their turn, if they do not grant that in the case of sickness, weakness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasions, baptism *by affusion of water on the face was by the ancients accounted sufficient baptism*. I shall, out of the *many proofs for it*, produce two or three of the most ancient."—Wall, Hist. of Inf. Bap. Vol. ii p. 385.

Let it be noted here, that Dr. Wall says, that baptism *by affusion was, by the ancients, accounted sufficient baptism*. This expression, "by the ancients," is an evidence of the great antiquity of affusion—of its origin in the days of the apostles. My friend endeavors to show, that the date of the two or three *most ancient cases*, mentioned by Wall, is that of the *beginning of affusion*; but he is evidently mistaken. Wall meant that it was *out of* the most ancient cases, he made the selections adduced by him. But let us hear Dr. Wall again, on the case of Novatian, when he was baptized by affusion on, a sick bed, which my friend quoted, in reference to the origin of *affusion*, in. order to show that it began about that time, and consequently could not have originated with the apostles. Dr. Wall had just been speaking of the charge against Novatian, of not coming canonically to his orders of priesthood, when he says:

"This shows that at the time when Novatian turned Christian, which could not by this account be much above one hundred years after the apostles, *it was the custom for any one that in time of sickness desired baptism, to have it administered to him in his bed by affusion*; as in another part of his letter, [letter of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, on the case of Novatian] it is said of him: 'baptized by affusion in the bed as he lay.' It is true, the Christians had then a rule among themselves, that such a one, if he recovered, should never be preferred to any office in the church. Which rule they made, not that they thought that manner of baptism to be less effectual than the other, but for the reason expressed by the council of Neocaesarea, held about eighty years after this time the twelfth canon whereof is: 'He that is baptized when he is sick, ought not to be made a priest (for his coming to the faith is not voluntary, but from necessity) unless his diligence and faith do afterward prove commendable, or the scarcity of men lit for the office do require it.'"—Wall, Hist. of Inf. Bap. Vol. ii. p. 386, 387.

Here we see that, according to Dr. Wall, the advancement, or preferment, of Novatian to the office of bishop, was opposed, not on account of his *baptism by affusion*, as my friend endeavors to show, but because it was performed on a *sick bed*, on account of his repentance and faith being induced by the fear of death, leaving room to doubt their genuineness; and hence the canon made by this council, that such a one should not be promoted to the office of priest, until he should give evidence of the genuineness of his repentance and faith, in his life after his recovery. We also see here, from Dr. Wall, that the rule made by the ancient Christians among themselves, that in such cases as the one of Novatian, if such a one recovered, he was never to be preferred to any office in the church, was not made because they thought that baptism *by affusion* was less effectual than that by *immersion*, but on account of the reason expressed by the council of Neocaesarea, as I have quoted; and that, at that early period.

it had *become a custom*, when persons desired baptism on a sick bed, to have it administered to them by affusion, which sufficiently shows the great antiquity of *sprinkling* as a mode of baptism, and which would easily refer it back to the days of the apostles; as there were no doubt persons then living who had seen some of the apostles, as John for instance, or were cotemporaneous with some of them. So you will discover, that my friend has Wall against him here, on the anti-pedobaptists.

We have seen, that my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, in the extracts he made from Dr. Wall, is good at *scrapping*—in taking such portions from him as suit his own particular purpose, and passing over others that are against him—leaving out the connection, which is necessary in order to understand a writer, and get the sense he intends to convey! His brethren are very fond of trying to show, that we Pedobaptists, as they call us, *scrap* the scriptures, in order to sustain our doctrines, and in support of our systems of religion; but, if I am not mistaken, he is just as good at *scrapping* the Bible, as he is at scrapping Dr. Wall! They are eternally crying out about our “scrapping” the scriptures; while they are all the time “scrapping” them themselves! They profess to have no creed but the Bible, and to accept of everything taught there; but we find that their whole system, all their doctrines, are based upon *scrap*s of scripture, one text here and another there in the Bible, selected out of it as they happen to suit them, taking good care to pass over all such as do not suit their particular purpose! They are the worst and veriest *scrapers* of scripture in all the country! Now, by thus taking texts of scripture out of their connection, I can prove almost anything I please, however absurd and unscriptural!

My friend affirmed, that the Greek church always practiced *immersion* as the only baptism; but I deny the assertion. It can be easily shown, by reference to the history and practice of that church, that such has not always been the case, but that the Greek Christians practice, and have practiced *affusion* as well as immersion.

He has laid particular stress on the sense in which Josephus uses the word *baptizo*, in order to prove his exclusive immersion. But who was Josephus? He was a Jew, it is true, but not an inspired writer; and, writing in the Greek language, he used the word as the Greek pagan writers; and his authority is worth no more than theirs. He did not use the word in the sense in which it was used by the New Testament writers and first Christians, as applying to the rite of baptism.

My friend also said that the Greek language was *dead*, and therefore could not change; and that as the word *baptizo* meant to *dip* or *immerse* as used in that, it must still mean the same thing. Now he should remember that, at the time of our Savior, it was a *living*, and not a dead language; and hence his argument, drawn from its being now a dead language, unfortunately for him loses all its force, if it has any; as for my life I cannot see any argument in it at all!

My friend should also remember that we have no continuous history of the Jews, in the Bible, for at least 200 years before Christ, and in that length of time they might have come to speak the Greek language imperfectly; and hence, the word *baptizo* might have so changed from its original meaning to immerse, as to also include the meanings of *sprinkling* and *pouring*; as we find that, in that length of time, the Hebrew language, as

originally spoken by the Jews, had become so changed as to be almost entirely a different language!

My worthy friend has also attempted to entertain the audience, by referring to, or quoting from, my little book on Baptism, and attempted to make capital out of it. The parade which he made over it, reminds me of a fable I once read somewhere, about a mountain and a mouse. The mountain heaved and labored tremendously, when, lo!—&c. Such seems to be the result of the mighty laborings of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, on this question!

He says, that *baptizo* is an English word anglicized, not translated, but only changed from the Greek to the English language. Well, what of that, and what argument is there in it for exclusive *immersion*? No more than for *aspersion* and *pouring*. I thought that everybody knew that—that it is an English word anglicized from the Greek—without my friend having to be at the pains to tell them. But the case is different with his word *immerse*, which, as I have shown you, is a Latin, and not an English word.

My friend has also attempted to show to you, that Pedobaptist authorities claimed, that the church had the power to change the ordinance of baptism from *immersion* to *sprinkling* and *pouring*. But I deny the assertion; and affirm that no Pedobaptist authority has ever claimed such a power as this for the church.

My friend has got into Jordan at last! And we see, that the whole stress of his argument is laid on the word "*in*;" "baptized of him *in* Jordan" —"baptized of him *in* the river of Jordan," etc. But what does that prove for his cause? Have I not shown from one of his authorities, Mr. Carson, from his own side of the question, that the expressions "*in* Jordan," and, "*in* the river of Jordan," may include all the space *within the banks*, whether covered by the water or not? — and may mean the bars, beach, etc. of the stream, as well as the water itself? So it may refer to the administration of the ordinance of baptism, by *affusion* or *pouring*, at the edge of the water, as much as to its being done in the water itself, by *immersion*. Mr. Carson says, that there is no proof, that John or Jesus ever went into the water, or the stream itself, of the Jordan; as the ordinance could have been performed at the edge of the water, and consequently I would say by *affusion*. But my friend must have them *in* the water! It is "*in*" with him all the time, and nothing but "*in*!"—despite of what this great Baptist authority says on the subject: With him, "*in* Jordan," and, "*in* the river of Jordan," must mean *in* the *water*, or it can mean nothing! But we find that John's mission was not in the Jordan, but in the *wilderness* of Judea. We are told, that he came "*preaching in the wilderness of Judea*," and, "*John did baptize in the wilderness*, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Here we are positively told that John, not only preached, but *baptized* in the wilderness of Judea; and how, I would ask, could he have *baptized* in such a place, in any other way than by *affusion*? We know the desert character of such places as a *wilderness*, particularly in an old and long settled country, like Judea, and the great scarcity of water, even for ordinary uses; and that it would render *immersion* impossible, as that requires a good deal of water, and *affusion* or *pouring*, the only modes of baptism practicable, as they require but little water, not more than would be required for the ordinary, uses of drinking, cooking, etc.

As to the Greek particle *apo*, upon which my friend harps so much as meaning "out of," I have shown that its primary meaning is "from;" and my friend is a great stickler for the *primary* meaning of words, as you know, so that the expressions, "went up straightway out of the water," and "straightway coming up out of the water," may merely mean, "from the water;" and my friend's great argument here falls to the ground! John chose some place on the *edge* of the stream, to perform his baptism; and there is no evidence that he and our Savior ever went *into* the water. I would ask, does my friend, when he baptizes, stand on the *edge* of the water? If he does not, then he does not baptize like John, according to Mr. Carson.

Again, in the case of the Israelites passing over Jordan, when they entered the land of Canaan, we have an example of the use of "*in*," showing that it does not necessarily mean *in* the stream, or even the space within the banks, but can mean the brink or *edge* of the water. The scriptural account reads as follows:

"And thou shalt command the priests that bare 'the ark of the covenant, saying. When ye are come to the *brink* of the *water* of Jordan, ye shall stand still *in* Jordan."
—*Joshua, iii. ch., 8 ver.*

Here we see, that the expression, *in* Jordan, means merely at the brink or *edge* of the water. This corresponds exactly with what Mr. Carson says, as we have seen; but will not be of much comfort to my friend, who will have "*in*" always to mean *in* the *water* itself, and will not admit that it can ever mean *at* the *edge* of it; though I have here given him scriptural authority for "*in*'s" meaning at the edge of the water, as well as the learned authority of Mr. Carson too. But that of the Bible is sufficient with me, to decide the meaning of the word "*in*," whether used in Greek or English; and to show that it can only mean within the banks, the space included by them.

My worthy friend lays great stress on the passage of scripture:

"And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there."—*John iii ch., 23 ter.*

Because the reason here assigned by the apostle, for John's baptizing in Ænon, is "because there was *much water* there," my worthy opponent and his friends, as well as Baptists generally, argue that his baptism was an exclusive *immersion*. As *immersion* requires a good deal more water than *affusion*, they assert that is the reason of its being said there was "*much water* there." Now does not my friend know, that where there were such immense concourses of people, with their animals, and we might add their children too, their "households;" if my friend will allow the expression, as resorted to John's baptism—does not he know, that "*much water*" would be necessary for drinking, washing, cooking, etc? Then why try to argue *immersion* from such an incidental expression as this? And does not my friend know too, that the literal rendering from the original is, "*many waters*," instead of "much water?" He tries to ridicule my argument, because I gave "*many springs*," as well as "much water," as the correct rendering from the Greek, which he endeavored to expose as awkward, and all that! Now he knows just as well as I do, that I gave "many waters" as the primary meaning, the correct and literal rendering, and "many springs" () more as a *commentary* on the original? Travelers, who have visited Ænon, and among them Dr. Barclay, the missionary

of my friend's Church to Jerusalem, describe Ænon as a place of "many springs," forming a beautiful, transparent stream of water, admirably adapted for the purpose I have named, and for the administration of baptism by *affusion* and *pouring*., but, the water being only a *few inches deep*, not at all adapted for it 'by *immersion!* Hence the argument drawn from this source, will avail my friend nothing in favor of immersion'

But there are some other things in the last speech of my friend, which I wish to notice before I am done. He says, that it is impossible for *one* word to express *three actions* as different as *sprinkle*, *pour* and *immerse!* But have I not shown, that Christian *baptism* means the *application of water* to a proper subject; and that these were only three different *modes* of that application! This, by the way, will be a sufficient reply to his question, in which he asked me to tell what *baptism* is? Or, if it will suit him better, I can tell him that it is a Christian ordinance, for the admission of the person baptized into the visible Church.

Again, my friend says, that 'there can be a baptism, without a drop of water, in oil, or something else! Now, he knows as well as I do, that there can be no *Christian baptism*, without watery and that is the point we are arguing.

As to the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, about which my friend has so much to say, and on which he gives us such a long, learned and labored criticism, I have shown sufficiently that the Greek particles rendered "into" "andoutof" in the common version, mean "to" and "from;" and do not necessarily imply *immersion*. This completely destroys his argument, drawn from that case.

My worthy friend quotes from the 6th chapter of Romans, and 2d of Colossians, what Paul says about being *buried* with Christ, by and in baptism; and bases upon it what he conceives to be a conclusive argument for *immersion*. But what evidence have we here of the action of Christian baptism? Not a particle. There is no mention of *water* in either case, which is essential to his argument. The baptism, of which the apostle speaks, is not a *literal* baptism, or one of water; but is *spiritual* and *moral*, as is evident from the circumstances and connection. In Romans he says:

"Knowing this, that cur old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed. that henceforth we should not serve sin; for he that is dead is freed from sin."—Rotn. vi. 6, 7.

Now, my friend will hardly contend that a *literal* and real crucifixion of the body, and a *literal* death and destruction of it, are meant here by the apostle! He will be compelled to say, that this part of this passage is all figurative — that it is moral and spiritual. And if he cannot contend for these as *literal*, neither will he fee able to show that the *baptism*, mentioned in the connection, is *literal*. By all just rules of interpretation, the *burial by baptism*, and the *resurrection*, 'must be *spiritual* and *moral* too, as much so as the crucifixion and death, tit will not do to have a part moral and spiritual, and another part *literal*, just as we please! They must all be one, or all the other.

My friend has been telling you about *licentiousness*, in interpreting the scriptures; but if this is not a *licentious* manner of interpretation, I knew not what is! So his strong argument here is entirely destroyed!

As to the passage he quoted from Colossians. (Col. ii, 12,) t h e words.

"wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God," sufficiently show that the baptism mentioned is of the same character as that in Romans, spiritual and moral, and *not literal*, or of *water*. And the same rule of interpretation will apply here as there.

If the *rising* mentioned is a *literal* one, then it must be done by the operation or *power* of God; and I expect that if my friend were to wait for God to *raise* the subjects he (my friend) *buries* in the water, they would remain there a long time — in fact, they might never be raised again! I contend, that the rule must be carried out, one way or the other, all *literal* or all *figurative*. If it be contended, that they are to be raised *by their faith*, it will not relieve my friend of the difficulty; for if they are to wait for that to *raise them* out of the water, they will never be raised, but must remain there, and drown!—[*Time Expires*].

MR. SWEENEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend, seems to think, that I alluded to the "uncle Peter Cartwright" affair, for the purpose of "enlisting the sympathies of our Methodist friends in my favor, and of prejudicing them" against him. But I can assure him, that in this he is mistaken. My allusion to that "affair" was simply to show, that my friend is not so exceedingly "quiet," "peaceable," and "unobtrusive," all the time, as he would have us believe! He is doubtless very quiet by "spells," but I am inclined to think that he, even *he*, has his belligerent "streaks!" But my intentions shall not be concealed. I do hope to convert many of the Methodist friends, as well as many of the Cumberland friends; but until they are *converted*, I fully expect my friend to have all their sympathies.

My friend says, that all these "concessions" I have adduced, are only the "*opinions* of uninspired men." Very true; but do they not show, that 250 years ago *Pedobaptists did not claim divine authority only that of the church*—for *aspersion*? And this is precisely what I introduced them to show.

The gentleman inveighs against, me, for "*scrapping* Mr. Wall." If I did Mr. Wall injustice, why did he not show *wherein* I did it? True, I did not read all upon one page, but I gave him the pages from which I did read; and he failed to show that Mr. Wall did not say what I read from him, or was not the author of the expressions and remarks I quoted from him. But what did all his additional reading from Wall amount to? Why, just nothing at all! Mr. Wall says, that by "*the ancients*" *affusion* "was accounted sufficient baptism." Then immediately following he adds: "I shall, out of the many proofs for it, produce two or three of the MOST ANCIENT." Then follows the case of *Novatian*, A. D. 251. This sufficiently shows who Wall's "ancients" were. They were those who lived, A. D. 251. Now I say fearlessly, *no man can produce a MORE ANCIENT case of affusion than this of Novatian*; and it "was accounted sufficient," not by Christ or His apostles, but by *the church* in the middle of the *third century*! Thus much "antiquity" I am willing to allow *aspersion*, and no more. If my friend can find a more ancient case than the "*MOST ANCIENT*," he is welcome to do so! But he says, at that early period, "it had become a custom, when persons desired baptism on a sick bed to have it given them *by affusion*." Now what do you suppose he means by "it

That it had *become* a custom, is just what I believe; but I was surprised to hear *him* talking about its having "*become* a custom" in the *third* century! I imagine that this was unwarily said.

If there was any one living in the time of Novatian's affusion, who had "seen the apostles," as my friend intimated, he was over a hundred and fifty years old! The gentleman should recollect, that very great *changes* take place, even in one hundred years.

All that the gentleman had to say about our professing to have no creed, but to take the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, and yet "scraping" the Bible, taking a text here and there, etc., was perfectly gratuitous; and, taking this with his repeated enquiries about his "*time*," the one explains the other. The fact is, I suppose, he is so much in the habit of "scraping" himself, and of taking "texts" of scripture out of their connection, and perverting them from their real meaning, to bolster up his erroneous doctrine, that he thinks others must do the same! Hence the charge he here brings against us.

My worthy friend intimated, that my statement of the practice of the Greek church, was not correct. Now let us understand each other here. I say that the *Rule* in the Greek church is to *immerse*; and that the deviations from this *Rule* are only occasional and exceptional, and for convenience, and are *without canonical authority*. I hold in my hand the proof of what I say, from the "EUCHOLOGION," or Ritual of the Greeks. I might also add, to save time and for further explanation, that it is said by some, that the Greeks have *added to immersion*, (trine immersion,) a kind of *affusion*, for which they claim no higher authority than that of the church. Let me give you a statement from an eminent *Pedobaptist* writer, on this point:

Deylingius.—"So long as the apostles lived, as many believe, *immersion only* was used: to which afterward, perhaps, they *added* a kind of *affusion*, such as the Greeks practice at this day, *after having performed the trine immersion*."—*Observat. Sac. pars iii. Observ. xxvi. § 2.*

I am sorry to have to give attention again and again, to some matters of apparently minor importance. But this sometimes becomes very necessary. My friend has given up that *immerse* was the meaning of *baptizo*, as used by the Greek writers from whom I quoted. So far, so good. I expect him to surrender only a little at a time. Now I suppose, if I can convince him that the meaning of the word has undergone no change since then, I will have him about ready for baptism. And have I not shown, that such was its meaning with Greeks, Jews and *Christians*, as long as the Greek was a *living* language? And if that was the case, consequently when the language "*died*," or ceased to be spoken, its meaning was still *immerse*, has remained so ever since, and will continue so to the end of time. I am very well aware, that the Greek was a *living* and a *spoken* tongue, in the days of Christ, and for hundreds of years afterward; and have shown that 350 years after Christ, *Christian* writers understood this word to mean simply *immerse*. Now let my worthy friend show, where any writer in the Greek, Pagan, Jewish, or Christian, *at any time* ever used this word in the sense for which he is contending. Will he make the attempt? We shall see.

My friend will have to labor his quibble, about "*immerse*" being a *Latin* word, before any reply will be necessary. I have said, that *baptize* is a *Greek* word merely *anglicized* from *baptizo*, and not translated; but when *translated* its meaning is most elegantly and correctly expressed by *im-*

merse. Now what if immerse does come from the Latin *immergo*? Does that affect my argument? If it does, I must confess that I am utterly unable to see it. But then I am aware, that my friend must *say something*, though it be but to keep up appearances!

My friend "denies the assertion," that Pedobaptists ever "claimed that the church had the right to change the ordinance of baptism from *immersion* to affusion." But I must ask the audience to bear in mind, that I did not merely assert this. I read from their own writings, the *proof* of what I said—that they believe that *immersion* was the *ancient manner* of administering the rite of baptism; but that the *Church* had since decided, that *affusion* was *sufficient*. Why, I can *baptize* my friend in Pedobaptist *admissions* of this kind; and if he call for more than I have already read, he shall have them *by the dozen*.

Mr. Logan *seems* to be very happy, that I have "got into Jordan at last!" It is exceedingly hard for me to believe, that he is really as happy as he appears to be. *Pedobaptist* preachers are not wanted to be happy in or about *water-courses*. They are generally much happier on *dry land*! But how did he dispose of my argument, drawn from the expression, "baptized in the river of Jordan?" Why, he says he has proven from Mr. Carson, that the expression, "in the river of Jordan," may include "all the space within the banks," whether covered by the water or not; that "it may mean the bars, the beach, etc., as well as the water itself." Well, I must call my friend's attention again to the fact, that when our Savior "was baptized in John in Jordan," he "came up straightway out of the *water*." The Savior did not merely come up from the "bars," "beach," etc., but came *up out of the water*. This shows that our Lord was baptized in the *waters* of Jordan,

He says, "Mr. Carson says, that there is no proof that John or Jesus ever went *into the water*, or the stream itself, of Jordan." Now I flatly deny that Mr. Carson ever said *any such thing*. Let him produce Mr. Carson's language to that effect, if he can.

My worthy friend has discovered, that John's mission was *in the wilderness*. John baptized in the wilderness; therefore it is *not true*, as the Holy Spirit says, that he baptized in the river of Jordan!! This is my friend's argument, I suppose. Shame on such quibbling! Now I have supposed that all Bible students were aware, that the wilderness of Judea *includes* the Jordan. We are told truly, in the New Testament, that John "did baptize," as well as "preach," "in the wilderness;" and as we find him preaching on the banks of the Jordan, and are told that the people of "all the region *round about Jordan*," came to him, and were "baptized of him in Jordan," the just inference is, that Jordan was *included* in the wilderness.

My friend utterly failed, as was perfectly apparent to every attentive, unprejudiced hearer, to meet my criticisms upon the words *en, apo, eis* and *ek*. We are not at liberty to translate these words, to suit our own convenience. There are *rules* in such things, by which we are to be governed. We are to let every word have its *primary* meaning, unless some circumstance in the connection, demands for it a secondary meaning—then, and then only, a *secondary* meaning must be given. I admit that the *primary* meaning of *apo*, is *from*; but it may mean *from within*, or "out of," as, for instance, when I say, my friend, Mr. Logan, is *from Alton*. Now if it

can be shown, that he came from Main street, then *from* must be understood in the sense of *out of*—out of Alton. When we say, that a man is from England, or from France, we do not mean that he is merely from the *edge*, or *shores*, of these countries, but from some place *within* them. And the man who would attempt to argue, that the expression, "*from* England," meant that he was from the shores, would be regarded as uttering a perfect absurdity! And just as unreasonable and absurd are the arguments of my friend and his Pedobaptist brethren, in their vain and futile attempts to prove that the Greek particles we have mentioned, merely mean *at*, *to*, and *from*! Strange that men will reason with good, common sense, on *secular* matters; but when you take them on the subject of *religion*, they become wild and fanatic — as if there was no analogy whatever between the two! I showed, that when the Savior was baptized, he was "*in* Jordan," and hence he had necessarily to come "*out of*" it. As for *en*, its primary meaning is *in*, as my friend will admit; and now if he is disposed to desert this "good old version," let him give us a good and substantial reason for doing so.; and, for giving here, a secondary meaning to *en*. I admit that it may mean "*by*," and "*at*," within proper circumstances; but I deny that the proper circumstances exist in this case. Let him show that they do, if he is able.

And while I am on these little words, I will notice again *eis* and *ek*, in the case of the Eunuch's baptism, It is said, "they went down (*eis*) *into* the water; they came up (*ek*) *out of* the water." Here I showed, that they were already *unto* the water, before they went "*into*" it. Now *eis* here cannot mean "*to*," for they had before come unto the water; and hence, if the words, "*went down into the water*," moved them *at all*, they carried them literally into, beyond the surface of the water. But again; the *primary* meaning of *eis* is "*into*" as my friend must admit; and hence, if he would give it a *secondary* meaning, he should show in the surroundings his reason for it. But instead of his being able to do this, the surroundings are all against him, with an iron power that he cannot bend to suit him. Finally, *ek*, as I before said, means definitely and invariably, *out of*. It never means merely *from*, under any circumstances. This makes it absolutely certain, that Philip and the Eunuch were *in the water* when the baptizing took place. Until my friend meets this matter, in a manner worthy of his size, I shall not refer to it again.

I must now go over with my friend to Ænon again; and see something about those beautiful "*springs*." He now says, his *translation* is "*many waters*;" and, that "*many springs*" is merely his "*commentary*." Well, that is decidedly an improvement! But we are not together yet on this passage.

He says that travelers, among them my brother Barclay, testify that there are "*many springs*" there. Yes, and Dr. Barclay says, furthermore, that there are *pools* there, from a few inches to *six feet deep*. This shows sufficiently, that there was the greatest quantity of water there, and that of ample depth, to *immerse* in, and to immerse any number of people, that might have come to John; and also for every other purpose, for which water is used.

Now, let it be observed, that the Holy Spirit gives us the fact, that "*there was much water there*," as a reason why John *was baptizing* in Ænon, It does not say that he was holding a meeting there, because there was

much water; but he was *baptizing* there, because there was *much* water.

My worthy friend has at last given us a very important piece of information! He says, that baptism, "the thing itself," is the "*application of water to a proper subject.*" Now I wish to know, if this is his *translation* of the word *baptizo*? — or is it merely his "commentary" again? Does he mean to say, that the word *baptize* means "*application of water to a proper subject?*" Does it mean "*ordinance?*"

I was not surprised to see my friend make so desperate an effort to evade the force of my argument, drawn from Rom. vi. 3-5, and Col. ii. 12. These passages are fatal to his *sprinkling* and *pouring*; and he seems to be aware of it. He is inclined to think baptism is not referred to. With him the whole affair is "moral or spiritual." Yet there are the plain words: "buried with him *by baptism,*" and, "buried with him *in baptism.*" *Baptism is referred to.* Is it not strange, that a man who can find baptism away over in the Old Testament, in the expression, "I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you," etc., can see no reference to *baptism* in these plain passages in the New Testament, where baptism is *twice named*? The trouble is, I apprehend, that there is no "sprinkle" in these passages, but on the contrary there is *burial*, and that implies *immersion*; and hence it will not do with him for baptism! There lies the trouble with him! He can find baptism in the word "*sprinkle,*" almost every where, even in the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience by the blood of Christ! He has been saying that I could find nothing but *immersion* in baptism; but I think I can say with more justice and propriety, that he can find nothing but *sprinkling* in it, though his creed teaches, and he is bound to admit, that *immersion* too is baptism! Now I did not say, that the Romans and Colossians were *literally* buried with Christ. Christ was buried in the tomb — they were "buried with him"—how? Let Paul say: "in baptism." Now if those persons had been *immersed*, they could understand Paul, but if they had been only *sprinkled*, as my friend here, they would have been utterly in the dark! — the whole matter would have been profoundly mysterious to them! —and, like my friend here, they would have been left to reason about something "moral and spiritual!"

No Christian, however learned, ever had any trouble on this passage till recently — since men have begun to claim Bible authority for sprinkling and pouring as baptism. This is a significant fact. It has happened within 300 years, that men have begun to claim Bible authority for sprinkling and pouring; and in the progress of the controversy that ensued, they have learned to *spiritualize* such passages as plainly teach or imply *immersion*! Now I can just literally overwhelm my friend, Mr. Logan, with proof, that all religious parlies have ever, till quite recently, looked upon these passages just as I do, and as all persons of ordinary capacity, who have no purpose to serve but to understand the truth, will look upon them, as referring simply to *baptism*. Dr s. Clark, Wesley, Grotius, Burmannus, Luther, Hammond, Sami. Clarke, Bp. Nicholson, Abp. Leighton, Stapferus, and a host of others, all of them Pedobaptists, are with me here, and against my friend! Besides, I have all the Confessions of Faith with me here, and against my friend: The *Confession of Sueveland*, of the church of England, of the *Methodist Episcopal church*, of the *Old Presbyterian church*, and worst of all for my friend, I have *his own Confession of Faith* with me here, and against him! How desperate must be the cause of a

man, when he is pushed to desert his own Confession of Faith, which he almost swore he would defend, when he became a preacher!! Before I would attempt to defend a theory of any sort, that would throw me upon such desperate courses, I would dash it from me, as unworthy a place in a Christian man's head or heart!

But my friend says, "those buried in baptism must be raised through the faith of the operation of God," etc. Well, what of it? Why, he thinks, that if I wait for those I bury in baptism to be "*raised by faith*," it might be dangerous to the subject! Let him recollect though, that I do not believe in "*faith only*" doing any thing. I suppose, my friend himself claims to "*walk by faith*;" but does "*faith only*" carry him through the world? We might infer from what we have seen, during this discussion, that he *works* a little, though he claims to "*walk by faith*!"

Because *water* is not expressly mentioned in Romans and Colossians, my worthy friend, as we have seen, in order to escape *immersion* in which the *burial* by and in baptism would necessarily involve him, discards the idea of water baptism there altogether, and has to resort to a "*moral and spiritual*" baptism, or burial! He says that the death, burial and resurrection mentioned by the apostle, must be all either literal and real, or "*moral and spiritual*." Now it is all easily understood and explained. As the crucifixion of our Savior was literal and real, so Paul, in Romans, by an easy figure of speech, represents the ceasing of the sinner from sin, or his death to it, as the crucifixion of the "*old man*;" and as the burial and resurrection of our Savior were real and literal, so the burial of the subject in the water of baptism and his rising from them, are emblematical of these, or designed to represent them. "*This*," says Mr. Wesley, "*our very baptism represents to us*." So too in Colossians, where the apostle only uses different language in connection with this baptismal burial and resurrection. The expression, "*wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God*," on which my friend took occasion to hang a quibble, in order to *evade immersion*, merely refers to the *faith of the subject* in the resurrection of Christ. It was that faith which caused him to be buried with Christ in the waters of baptism, and to arise from them. Had my friend quoted a little more, or a little further, this would have been obvious: "*wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead*," As to there being no mention of *water*, in the two cases, on which my friend seemed to lay so much stress, I can inform him, that the baptism is never spiritual, or that of the Spirit, unless it is expressly mentioned as such, and consequently must be that of water here. Besides, there is never any mention of a *burial and resurrection* with Christ, where the baptism of the Spirit is spoken of—the idea would be absurd, but is perfectly consistent with that of *water*—which leaves spiritual baptism out of the question.

What a pity it is, that a man of no mean talent, a man of learning, of standing, and of great influence with that respectable party, with which he doubtless esteems it an honor to stand identified, should labor so hard, spend so many of the golden moments of prime-life, be plunged into so many awful difficulties; and all this for nothing! He believes that immersion is valid baptism, has practiced it himself, and would again do so, I suppose; yet he labors and toils to establish a doubtful practice!—labors against the classics, against the Lexicons, against the impartial testimony of the "hon-

est Quakers," against his own learned and honest Pedobaptist brethren, against his own Confession of Faith, in his attempt to "spiritualize" the Bible; which shows that the Bible, as it reads, is against him!

My friend speaks occasionally of my "sinking cause," of my being "pushed," etc. What does he mean? Is there any debate about *my* practice? Is my practice called in question? The debate is all about *his* practice. I occupy ground perfectly safe.

As I see that I yet have a few minutes of time, I wish by a simple illustration to show you my friend's position on baptism. If I were owing him five dollars, and were to approach him before this vast audience with a five dollar bill on some bank in Illinois, a five dollar bill on the State bank of Indiana, and five dollars in gold, saying, "Bro. Logan, I owe you five dollars—take your choice of these two bills, or this gold piece." He takes up one of the bills and, looking at it, says, "this can be carried more conveniently than the gold—is it good?" I say, "yes, I think so," but one half of this audience, speaking out, say, "no, no — it is worthless." Then, he takes up the other bill, and precisely the same is said of that. Whereupon he takes up the gold, and asks, "is this good?" Every one in this house says, "*yes, perfectly good.*" Now which would bro. Logan, or any other sensible man, take? The *gold* certainly. Well, *immersion* just answers to the *gold*. Every body says, it is good; while *pouring* and *sprinkling* are repudiated by hundreds of thousands. And which, Ladies and Gentlemen, will you take? I beseech you to take the *pure coin*; my friend is here, urging you to choose this "wild-cat money," *pouring* and *sprinkling*! —[Time expires.

MR. LOGAN'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN? — As my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, denies the charge of having 'scrapped' from the writings of Dr. Wall, I must notice that matter in the first place. The manner in which he read the extracts he gave you from him, left the impression on my mind, and I have no doubt on the minds of this audience, that he was reading them in consecutive order — in connection with each other. But what are the facts? When we examine Dr. Wall's writings, where he read, and compare them with his extracts, we find that he has taken one extract here, on a certain page, and then another one there, on another page, some two or three pages further on; and gave them to you as though they followed each other in regular succession and order!—omitting passages that might have given those he read an entirely different meaning and bearing from what he attempted to give them! Now, as I have before observed, a man, by thus "scrapping" extracts from a writer, and tearing them out of their connection, may prove by him almost anything he pleases! I must most positively and solemnly protest against this system of *garbling* extracts from a writer, which my friend is in the habit of doing. In that way he is guilty of *slandering* both the living and the dead! Let him read what he quotes, in its full and proper connection, so as to give all the meaning of the writer, and he shall be welcome to all that he can make off of Dr. Wall, or any one else. But we want no perversion or misrepresentation.

Mr. A. Campbell, in his debate with Dr. Rice, says, that the quoting of these old authors is a very *licentious thing*. And why? Because those

who do it are so much in the habit of "scrapping" them, and *garbling* extracts from them, as my friend has been doing, to suit their own peculiar views about religion, and the particular purposes which they have in view, and adduce them to sustain. It is like the attempt to *force* a witness to give evidence against the facts of a case and his own honest convictions of the truth.

My friend referred you to my speaking of his cause as a "sinking cause," etc. Now, that cause must indeed be a very desperate one, and in a sinking condition, that requires such *garbling* of extracts from authors, such misrepresentation and perversion, to bolster it up, and sustain it!

My friend also seems to rely greatly upon the testimony of the Greek and Latin fathers, in support of his position on the question under discussion. I would like also for him to hear what Mr. Campbell has to say about them, for his comfort. He terms them *very weak* and *visionary* men! And yet these are some of my friend's main witnesses to prove his cause! He has then to depend on "very weak and visionary" witnesses to sustain him! And he cannot even quote them fairly at that, but has to "scrap" them, and garble from them, to make them do it! Truly, such a cause as that of my friend, must be indeed in a desperate and sinking condition, that requires such a course to sustain it! Now, I regard these fathers as good witnesses, where they testify to *facts*, to circumstances, occurrences, etc., coming within the sphere of their own personal knowledge; but their mere *opinions* on any subject, on the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as to what was the *practice* of the Church, in the days of the apostles, and before their time, etc., I regard as no better than those of any one else, under the same circumstances.

My friend affirmed at first, that the Greek Church had always practiced exclusive *immersion*, and I denied it. He has now backed down from that; and tries to get out of the difficulty in which he involved himself, by saying that the *Buie* in the Greek Church, contained in the *EUCHOLOGION*, or Ritual of that Church, requires *immersion*; but he has to admit that there are occasional *deviations* from that Rule, for the sake of convenience. This is sufficient; and shows that the *practice* of the Greek Church has not always been that of exclusive immersion, as he and his friends are so often in the habit of affirming, in the most positive and unqualified manner.

As my friend is so fond of quoting these ancient fathers, in order to **sustain his** position, and seems to regard them as such great authority, and as I have said that I can give him "tit for tat," as the saying is, and produce as much and as good evidence from them, in proof of my position, as he can in support of his own, on this question, I will here give him some. **ORIGEN**, one of these fathers, on speaking of Elijah's having water *poured* on the altar, when he put the false prophets of Baal to the test, calls it *baptizing the altar*. He says that Elijah *baptized the wood* on the altar. How did he perform the baptism? Did he take the altar and the wood, and **plunge** them into the water?! This he ought to have done, if the theory of my friend is correct, that *immersion* in water, and nothing else, is Christian baptism; and baptism is exclusive immersion, and nothing else. **But** what are the facts in the *ease*? Why, that Elijah had the water *poured* on the wood and the altar, and that *pouring* constituted the *baptism*. The *pouring* of the water on the altar is called by Origen, the

baptism of the altar. Here then, according to that ancient writer, we have ' a clear case of baptism *by pouring*.

My friend seems to rely greatly on what is termed the "majority argument," in sustaining his position: on producing a majority of witnesses in his favor, as he quotes from, and refers to, many; says he can "*baptize me in*" such testimony; and all that! Now, he knows, just as well as I do, that the majority argument, in such cases as this, is merely *presumptive* evidence, and no more. It is no *proof* of the *truth* or *correctness* of a thing. It is capable of being adduced in support of error, as well as of truth, as can easily be shown from almost numberless cases. As to any intrinsic value it possesses, it really has none—it is worth nothing!

As to the *authorities* my worthy friend has given, showing that the Church claimed the right to *change* the ordinance of baptism, I will say that he is mistaken in that. The Church never claimed such a right, nor did these authorities affirm any such thing. The Church claimed the right to *change the mode*, but not the ordinance itself; and in that I agree with the Church, and can cheerfully admit it. But we must remember, that the *ordinance* and the *mode* are two different things entirely. While *baptism* is the ORDINANCE itself, *sprinkling*, *pouring* and *immersion* are the *different modes* of performing it, any one of which is equally as valid as the other two. As these three were all valid modes, of baptism, the Church had the right, if she chose, to change from any one of them, or any two, to the others; as for instance, from *immersion* to *affusion*—just as a man in traveling has the right to change the mode of it from *walking* to *riding*, or from *riding* to *railroad*. Baptism is the ordinance itself; and as the *application of water* to a proper subject is the main thing in it, it matters not how he receives that application, whether by *sprinkling*, *pouring* or *immersion*, when performed by an authorized administrator, and in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; as the subject, if of adult age, has the right to his choice of any one of the three modes, which he may prefer; or, if an *infant*, its parents have the right to select for it any one of the three, they may choose. If *immersion* is preferred, then it is to be administered in that way; but if *sprinkling* or *pouring* is the choice, one of these is to be used. Hence, the Church has the right to *change the manner* of administering baptism from any one of these *modes* to another, but no right to change the ordinance itself for anything else in its place; or as the Quakers do, to reject it altogether.

My friend quoted from Dr. BOOTH, on the testimony of Dr. Edwards, to sustain his theory of *immersion* as the only baptism. Now, I will answer Mr. Booth, by Bishop NEWTON, who also quoted from Dr. Edwards, on my side of the question, which will completely rebut both Booth and my friend himself. If these men were honest men, in conceding *immersion* to be the ancient, and, consequently, *only* baptism, as my worthy friend contends, they would have *practiced* what they taught on the subject, and as their teaching was represented by my friend. But if they practiced *sprinkling* and *pouring*, as Bishop Newton shows from Dr. Edwards, then they were not honest, in thus teaching one thing and practicing another, and their testimony is to be rejected as worthless! My friend is welcome to as much such testimony as he can get, as it really weighs not a single cent in his favor!

My worthy friend adverts again to the case of the Savior being baptized *in* Jordan! I thought the controversy about "in" had been disposed of by both of us; but it seems that he is determined to hang on to the word *in*! It is "in Jordan," "*in* Jordan," all the time with him! This would not be so bad, if he would let the word *in* include all the *space* within the banks of Jordan — as I have shown that Mr. Carson admits—,so as to leave the people the dry ground of the bars or beach, to stand upon. But no, that will not do for him! "In Jordan," with him, is *in the water* of Jordan; or, it cannot be any where! He is fond of quoting learned authorities, where they testify in his favor; but if they are against him, as some of the ablest and most learned men of the theological world are, on this question, then they will not do — they must be thrown aside and rejected!

My friend was not satisfied with going to Jordan, but he must also go to Ænon again, and give us another learned criticism on that place! He does not pretend to controvert the rendering "many waters" as correct; but he ridicules the idea of "many springs." Now, his own authority, of his own Church, Dr. Barclay, represents the stream of Ænon, as being made up, or composed, of *many springs*; and had I not the right to use the language I used, which he attempts to ridicule as a rendering of the Greek? Most assuredly. But he thinks he can prove *immersion* there. He represents Dr. Barclay as saying, that there are pools of water in the stream, from a few inches to six feet deep. Now, I believe that something of the sort is said, in a foot-note in Dr. Barclay's work, the "City of the Great King." But what of it? If there are pools there, of the depth of six feet, could they not have been *worn* there, by the water in the long course of between *eighteen* and *nineteen hundred years*?— even without having been there, in John's day. I reply they could easily. We well know how the constant action of running and falling water, will wear even the solid rock, particularly where it is limestone, as is the case with most of the rock of that region of country. But I have amply proved, that the "much water there" did not necessarily imply that John immersed; as much water would have been required for other purposes. But my friend must have it *immersion*, whether there is much or little water! He has been censuring me for adducing Pedobaptist authorities, because on my own side; but we see that he can bring up the immersionist authorities of his own side, when it suits his purpose, as he has Dr. Barclay in this case!

I come now to Paul's baptism. The Lord appeared to him, on his way to Damascus, and told him that he would there learn what he must do. While he is waiting there, the Lord appears to Ananias, and tells him to "go into the street which is called straight, and enquire *in the house* of Judas, for one called Saul, of Tarsus: for, behold, he prayeth," etc. Then we are told that "Ananias went his way, and *entered into the house*;" and while there said to him, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." And then we are told, that he arose, and was baptized." Now, in all the accounts we have of these transactions, we have no evidence whatever, not a particle, that Paul left the house, until after his baptism. He must, therefore, have been *baptised in the house*; and, consequently, by *affusion*, as immersion there would have been out of the question. And what strengthens my position here is, that the Greek *verb anastas*, in the common version, "Arise," is

correctly rendered, "Standing up, be baptized," showing that Paul was *baptized standing up*, and therefore now by immersion.

In the case of the jailor at Philippi, we also have another account of baptism in a house. As the house of the jailor adjoined the prison, we have no evidence that any of them were outside of the buildings during the whole transactions; and the baptism must therefore have been performed by *affusion* in the house of the jailor. It would have been death by the Roman law, for the jailor to have taken them, or have let them go, outside of the prison walls. He brought Paul and Silas out of the inner prison, where they were; they then "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were *in his house*" and he was baptized, he and all his straightway." So we have no evidence whatever, that they were outside of the walls, until liberated the next morning by the magistrates; and, as I have said, the baptism must have been performed by *affusion* in the house. But though we contend for *aspersion* as baptism, against those who reject it entirely and contend for exclusive *immersion*, we do not contend for it to the exclusion of that. We are not contentious on this subject. Believing *sprinkling*, *pouring* and *immersion* to be all valid *modes* of baptism, we let people have their choice as to whichever one of these they may prefer.

There are some serious *objections* to exclusive immersion as baptism, which I must now notice here. And,

1st. It was only in the middle ages, that we find exclusive immersion adopted by any; and we find adopted along with it some of the most absurd and disgusting *fooleries*, as trine immersion or baptizing the subject three times, baptizing him naked or in a state of nudity, etc. Now those who adopt exclusive immersion must, to be consistent, adopt all these absurdities and fooleries along with it; and who would be willing to do this?

2nd A second objection is the great *inconveniences* attending immersion. There must be the shifting of clothing, both of the administrator and the subject, before and after baptism; the complete saturation with water, of the person and clothing of the subject, the partial saturation of those of the administrator; if in winter the effect of the chilling cold; and all this. Now none of these inconveniences; and dangers to health and life attend baptism by *aspersion*—there is no shifting of clothing required, no saturation of the subject and his clothing by the water, or of those of the administrator, no chilling, etc. All strangling by the water, danger of taking cold from wetting the person of the subject and his clothing, can be avoided by *aspersion* not to mention the great shock to the system, and the intense chilliness, in winter, when the ice has to be broken, and the greater, danger of taking severe cold, and even causing death itself, where *immersion* has to be performed! Can we suppose, then, that God in his wisdom, would require the practice of a thing so manifestly absurd and attended with so many inconveniences, to the exclusion of other modes of baptism, when they are equally as valid and effective, and unattended with all these inconveniences, dangers etc! and particularly when *immersion* would, in many cases, be utterly impracticable, as in barren, sandy deserts, and in high northern latitudes in winter when the water is nearly all frozen to ice?! It would be unreasonable to suppose so; as God never requires impossibilities and absurdities of his creatures. We find that, in the days of the apostles, people were always baptized *in the place where they were converted*, whether

in a house, or in the open air, etc., as Paul and the Philippian Jailor *in the house*; the people who heard the preaching of John on the banks of the Jordan, and about the fountains of Ænon, there; the people who heard the apostle Peter, in the house where the apostles were; and those who heard him at the house of Cornelius, in his house; and so on; and this is strong presumptive proof, that many or most of them must have been baptized by *effusion* as *immersion* would often have been utterly out of the question.

The manner of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, affords another strong proof of the correctness and Scriptural authority of *effusion* as Christian baptism, in opposition to that of the exclusive *immersion* of my worthy friend.

Our Savior said to the apostles before his ascension: "For John truly baptized *with* water; but ye shall be *baptized with* the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

Here the baptism was to be *with* water and *with* the Holy Ghost. Now as my friend is so fond of *substituting* the three words, denoting the modes of baptism, in order to render *aspersion* as ridiculous as possible to the audience, we will try his rule here, as to the word immerse: "John truly *immersed with* water—ye shall be *immersed with* the Holy Ghost!"

How supremely ridiculous would it sound! To *sprinkle with* water has some sense in it, but to *immerse with* water is perfect nonsense! Out Savior, as we have seen, told the apostles they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Now let us go to the day of Pentecost, and hear the apostle Peter explain it: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will *pour out* of my spirit *upon* all flesh."

This our Savior calls the *baptism* of the Spirit; and we see that the *mode* was that of *pouring*; which proves *pouring* to be a mode of Christian baptism. Again, in the case of the baptism of the Gentiles by the Holy Ghost, at the house of Cornelius, we hear Peter, in his rehearsal of the affair, saying: "The Holy Ghost *fell on* them as *on* ^{MS} at the beginning," showing that the *manner* of the baptism there was the same as on the day of Pentecost, that of pouring. (Acts xi. 15, 16.)

But there are some other matters, in my worthy friend's last speech, to which I must devote some attention. He is mistaken in representing me as saying, that there were persons living at Novatian's time who had seen the apostles. He will remember, that, speaking of Dr. Wall's "most ancient" oases, I said Wall did not mean that Novatian's case was the most ancient, but that he meant it was one *out of* them, and that I said, there were others of older date, extending to, or almost to, the days of the apostles. It was of these last I spoke, that there were persons living then who had seen the apostles or were cotemporaneous with them.

Again, my friend says that I have given up that *immerse* was the meaning of *baptizo*, as used by the Greek writers; speaks of my *surrendering* a little at a time; and talks of having me ready for *baptism*, or rather *immersion*, for that is what he means by it! Now I can assure him, that he is entirely mistaken. I am ready to admit that these writers conceded *immerse* to be *one* of the meanings of *baptizo*, perhaps its primary meaning but not its entire and only meaning. As to my *surrendering* any thing, my

friend is again as badly mistaken. I have not yet heard anything from him to induce me to surrender a particle of any thing I have advanced; but, on the contrary, all he has said has only tended to confirm me in my views on the subject of the mode of baptism. And as to his getting me ready for *immersion*, I can assure him and his friends in this audience, that I am, if any thing, further from it, than when we began this debate. Before he can succeed in doing that, he must bring to bear some heavier artillery than what he has been using! If I were fully *convinced* that *immersion* was the *only* apostolic baptism, I should not hesitate a moment in being *immersed*. But I have yet to be convinced of that; and until then I shall remain perfectly satisfied with my baptism.

My friend seems to be very fond of talking about my "quibbling," as he terms it. Now he has shown himself to be one of the greatest of *quibblers* in debate!—a complete adept in the business!—and he should not suppose, that because he quibbles I must also quibble, to be even with him! What are his arguments, many of them, but mere quibbling about the meaning of words, and things of that kind? Verily, he should quit quibbling himself before he charges it on others!

I showed from the New Testament, that John was represented as baptizing *in the wilderness*, and I affirmed that it must have been by *affusion*. But my worthy friend, not finding water enough there to *immerse* in, has to extend the wilderness over Jordan, and include that, so as to find water enough! He is so fond of Jordan that I do not wonder at this! But, unfortunately for him and his cause, the Bible does not speak of Jordan as in the wilderness.

My worthy friend was evidently a good deal troubled with my criticism on the subject of the *burial by* baptism, of the apostle, in the 6th chapter of Romans, and the *burial in* baptism, in the 2d of Colossians. He is much annoyed by the difficulty, in which he has involved himself, by making it a *literal* baptism in *water*, in order to establish his exclusive immersion! And in endeavoring to avoid one difficulty, he finds himself entangled in another! Hence, he has given us a long and labored criticism on the passages, to extricate himself, and show us what the apostle means. But in trying to get out of the difficulty, he only gets himself deeper in it; and has to leave it pretty much as he found it! He is aware of the *inconsistency* of having the illustration, *part figurative* or spiritual, and *pari literal* and real; and labors hard and flounders away terribly, to get it reconciled! But my criticism still stands untouched by him.

He insinuates that *sprinkling* and *pouring* are like the "wild cat currency" of certain banks, in order to excite as much *prejudice* against these modes of baptism as he can. My friend well knows how to play on this string of *prejudice* and ridicule, when it suits his purpose. Now, I would ask, what *resemblance* is there, between his different currencies and the three modes of baptism? But he knows as well as I do, that illustration is not argument, nor can it pass for it. He says, that while *half* the audience would reject *pouring* and *sprinkling*, all would receive his *immersion*. He is, however, very much mistaken; for, if the question were put, he would soon see how it would be decided; but not in his favor.

If the arguments which my friend has produced are the best he can bring forward to sustain his theory of exclusive immersion, he must certainly fail in sustaining it, if he has not already done so in the judgment of

this intelligent audience. He first went to the Greek pagan writers and Josephus, and he failed to do it from them; then to the lexicons, and there he failed again; then to the "honest Quakers," and they could not help him out of the difficulty; and last to the Bible itself, after my repeated efforts to get him there; and after going to Jordan he went to Ænon; then back again to Jordan; and then back to Ænon; trying to get our Savior into the water, when he could only get him and John to the edge of it; and attempting to find water deep enough at Ænon for John to immerse in, he had to leave the Bible and go to the, missionary of his Church, Dr. Barclay, to keep him out of the difficulty and get water sufficiently deep! In the mean time, finding that these were not sufficient for him, he has to make a trip way down in the *desert*, the last place to which a sensible man would go to find *water* at all, much less enough to *immerse* in, to Philip and the eunuch, and try to see whether he could get Philip to take him *into* the water, though he might not get him any further than the edge! Now, if my worthy friend has any "big guns" in reserve, let him bring them out, — [Time *expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My friend, in an apparently serious mode, enters his "solemn protest" against my "scraping authors," as he terms it; and says, that I thus "slander the dead," as well as the living, etc. He also accuses me of "garbling" Mr. Wall. Did I not ask him very politely to show wherein I had done injustice to Mr. Wall? Did he attempt to do it? He certainly did not — nor will he! I did as I have a right to do — read such portions of Mr. Wall's writings, as I thought proper to read, in the time I had. True, I might, if I had the time, read more; yea, I might have read a whole volume; but I did not deem it necessary. My friend very well knows, that Wall proves just what I introduced him to prove; and it is simply to evade the force of his testimony, that he tries to "kick up a dust" over the fact, that I passed over some sentences, and did not read them all. But now, here is the volume from which I read; and I will *allow him the time*, if he will read what I passed over, and show the audience, that it gives any "different meaning" to what I did read. Will he do it? I predict that he will not. I never "slander" either the living or the "dead" intentionally. I simply quoted as all writers and speakers quote authors; and Mr. Logan ought to know it. It will be time enough, and will come with much better grace, for him to talk about my "slandering the dead," when he is prepared to *show wherein* I have done so. But all his talk, I apprehend, was merely for *effect*, and to fill up the time; and will, I think, be fully appreciated by this intelligent audience.

The only reason or purpose, for which I have quoted the "Fathers," was to show that they used the word *baptizo*, in precisely the same sense with the Pagan and Jewish writers; and this I did, because my friend claimed, that that word has a different meaning from that attached to it by the Pagan writers, when used in a "religious sense." This quibble I exploded, by appealing to the early *Christian* writers, called the "Fathers." I did not ask these "Fathers" for their "*opinions*," as my friend would insinuate; but simply for the *use* of the word *baptizo*, in their time, and among Chris-

tians. In this matter they are competent witnesses, and have ever been so regarded by all, Baptists and Paidobaptists.

My worthy friend seems to be most desperately annoyed, because I am able and disposed to show, that only a short time ago, *affusion* was practiced *only upon the authority of the church*; and that those thus practicing, with great unanimity admitted, that the "ancient manner" of baptizing was by immersion, and that the *church* had "accounted *affusion* sufficient:" first, on account of the delicacy and weakness of children, and of "persons desiring baptism on a sick bed," etc. I have adduced only Pedobaptists to prove this, and they have abundantly sustained me; and this audience knows it; and my friend knows it; and the only possible way of escape he has, is, to look wise and talk largely about my "scraping authors," etc. I have adduced his own Pedobaptist champion, Mr. Wall, who has unequivocally stated, that the "most ancient" case of affusion on record, is that of Novatian, A. D. 251; and that his affusion "was accounted sufficient," *only by the church* at that time; and that was done without claiming any *divine authority* for it! All that my friend can say to this is, that I have "scraped Wall;" and this he says, without attempting to make it appear, wherein I have done so!

But my friend has concluded that Origen, one of these "very weak and visionary men," has used the word *baptizo*, in the sense for which he is contending. He says, that Origen calls Elijah's *pouring* the water on the wood and altar, *baptizing* them. Now I say, Origen never called that act of *pouring* a *baptizing*! I shall not accuse him of "scraping" Origen, for he never read him at all—he simply made an incorrect statement about what Origen said. My present recollection is, that there were *twelve barrels of water* poured on the altar and wood! So that it was *completely saturated*, whelmed! The "trench was filled," and it was all this, the saturation, whelming, etc., with the water, which was the *result* of such an abundant affusion of water, that Origen called the baptism of the wood on the altar, and not the act of pouring, which my friend has labored to make you believe. When twelve barrels of water were poured upon the wood and altar, they were as it were, overwhelmed, or immersed. If *twelve barrels of water* were poured upon a man, it would not be a strange thing, if some one describing it were to say, "the man was immersed." It might be considered hyperbolic language, and would be readily understood, that the man was, as it were, *immersed*! A man may be immersed by pouring, *if the pouring is long enough continued*; and yet the act of *pouring* would not be *immersion*; but immersion would follow as the *result* of continuous pouring.

My friend brings up the "Greek church" again, by saying that I, at first affirmed, that the Greek church had always "practiced exclusive immersion." Now my worthy friend is very much mistaken. I did not say, that the Greek church has always "practiced exclusive immersion." "Exclusive immersion" is my friend's own language, and not mine. But I have shown just what is sufficient for my purpose; and my friend has yet shown no disposition to deny it; *that affusion for baptism among the Greeks, is without canonical authority*. They practice *immersion*, and claim for it Bible authority; but for *affusion*, they do not claim *any authority whatever*.

My friend now says, that the church has never claimed the right to change the *ordinance* of baptism; but it has "claimed the right to change

the *mode*;" and that those men from whom I read, only prove that the "*mode*" had been changed. Now I was surprised to hear him say, after admitting, that the "church claimed the right to *change the mode*," that, "in that I agree with the church, and can cheerfully admit it." This was certainly magnanimous in my worthy friend, but was more than I was expecting. Let it be born in mind, that if the meaning of any word can be ascertained, I have shown that *immerse* is the meaning of *baptizo*. This I have shown;

1. By appealing to its use in the Greek classics; 2. By appealing to the Greek Lexicons; and let it be recollected, that every one of these were compiled by Pedobaptists, by men who were sprinklers, and interested in giving the meaning of affusion to it, if they could have done so.

3. By appealing to the impartial Quakers; 4. By appealing to eminent Pedobaptist writers;

Showing that they all, with great unanimity testify, that *baptizo* means *immerse*. And not only so, but they admit, that *immersion* was the *ancient* practice, and that *affusion* had been "accounted sufficient," *only by the church*, and was practiced *only upon its authority*, in their day. And now, my friend comes out most magnanimously, and admits that the church did make the change; and affirms that she had the right to do so!! Now this is what I deny, roundly and positively. Let him show, when the church got the right to change this ordinance, if he can. But he takes good care to inform us, that it was "not the ordinance" itself, that the church claimed the right to change; but the "*mode*" merely, that was changed! Now it is easy to see, that this is a mere dodge, in my friend, to keep himself out of trouble, into which he was aware this admission might lead him. If, as I have so abundantly shown, Jesus Christ *ordained immersion* as baptism, then when that was left off, and *affusion* brought in, the *ordinance* of Jesus Christ was *changed*. And let it not be forgotten, that my Pedobaptist witnesses testify, that *immersion*, not *affusion*, was ordained by Jesus Christ, and practiced by his apostles; and it was as late as A. D. 251, when *affusion* began to be practiced, and then only "in cases of haste, weakness, sickness, want of quantity of water," etc. Here the church *substituted affusion* on her *own authority*, not even claiming divine authority; and my worthy friend comes up, and endorses her conduct, and says that he "cheerfully admits" her right to do as she did!!

Now, the whole thing amounts to about this, in a few words: Jesus Christ ordained *immersion*, as the *only* Christian *baptism*; while the *church*, on her own authority, and without a particle of divine authority, not even the least shadow of it, of her own accord changed baptism from *immersion* to *affusion*; as the Roman Catholics say, "changing the manner a little, but retaining the substance." Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have got this thing before you, about as it should be. And you can see what *authority* preachers have for *sprinkling* and *pouring* as *baptism*; and that it rests on no higher authority than that of the church, of a body of un-inspired men, who made, the change from *immersion*, which previously had universally existed; and you can see that *immersion* was instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, who had all power and authority in heaven and upon earth given to him.

, I must now notice my friends *definition* of baptism. He says, "it means supply the *application of water to a proper subject*." But have I not shown

that this cannot be the meaning of baptism, as there may be a *baptism without one drop of water*. The *idea* of *water* is not in the word *baptizo*. It, as I have shown, expresses an *action*, that may be performed in *coal oil*, as well as *water*. It is true, that *Christian* baptism is performed in *water*; but that this was the design of our Savior, could never have been learned merely from the word *baptizo*. How, then, can *baptizo* mean simply "*the application of water to a proper subject?*" My friend says: "It matters not *how* he [the subject] receives that application." Would it be a proper baptism, if the subject were *drenched*? Would it do, if he were to "receive the application" on the great toe of the right foot? If my friend is correct in his definition of baptism, then I aver, that he has no more authority for applying the water to the *forehead*, than I have for applying it to the *heel*, if I choose! What a lax theory of baptism my friend Logan advocates!

I must go over to Ænon once more. I deem it entirely unnecessary to go by way of the Jordan, as my friend has about surrendered that post! At Ænon, he thinks, those pools six feet deep, might have "worn" since John was baptizing there. He made this look quite probable. But is it not quite as *probable*, that there were other pools there in John's time, that have been *filled up* within the last eighteen hundred years? I think it is. But he thinks I ought not to have read from Barclay, as he belongs to my side of the house. What did *he* introduce Dr. Barclay for? Why, to show that there was not a *sufficiency* of *water* there for *immersion*! And must I allow him to "scrap," and misrepresent the Doctor, and hold my tongue, simply because the Doctor is a member with me? I think not. When he does injustice to an author, I shall show wherein he does it; and then I think I shall have a right to talk of his "scraping" and "misrepresenting."

My worthy friend has informed us, that Saul was baptized "standing up." While I was wondering where he got his information, he let us know that the word rendered "arise," in this "good old Pedobaptist version," should be translated "*standing*;" and then the language of Ananias to Saul would be: "*Standing up* be baptized and as Saul was baptized "*standing up*;" and as it was done "*in the house*," it was by *affusion*, of course. Now on this I will remark:

1. The Greek word *anastas* does not mean "*standing up*;" and I think a scholar has to be pushed very hard, before he will say it does. It means simply and primarily, "*arise*," as here rendered, in this good old version, of which I will here give an example: The Spirit said to Peter on the house-top: "*Arise (anastas) therefore, and get thee down*;" that is, "*Standing up, get thee down!*"—according to my friend's translation.

2. That Saul was baptized *in the house* is a mere assumption. Paul was baptized; and I have shown that baptism is *immersion*; therefore Paul was immersed. But Paul has told us himself how he was baptized: "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," etc. (Rom. vi, 3. 4.) Here Paul includes himself with the Romans, and affirms that he was "*buried by baptism*;" and that is enough for me.

My friend says that the Jailor at Philippi was also "baptized in the house." I would like to see him make it appear, if he can. Let us go to the *record*. Here we learn, that after the earthquake had shaken the foundations of the prison, bursted loose the bands of the prisoners, waked up the Jailor, etc., he was about to take his own life, supposing the prisoners were gone, when

Paul told him to do himself no harm, for all the prisoners were there; — “Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas; and brought them out, [out of the inner prison,] and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were *in his house*. [Now, they were *in his house*.] And he took them [where? I do not know; I might assume that he took them down to that *river*, where Lydia was baptized the day before, but I shall not do it; but notice, “he took them”] 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*. [How could he *bring them into his house*, if he had not taken them out?] he set meat before them,” etc. Now, where is the evidence that this man was baptized in the house? Nowhere at all—it is nothing but mere, bare, bold assumption!

But my friend informs us, that it is out of the question to suppose, that Paul and Silas, with the jailor, left the prison that night—that it would have been a violation of Roman law, of which these men never would have been guilty! Now, here is another law, which my friend has shown he does not understand. I say that the jailor had the right to accompany Paul and Silas, just where he chose to go; and, consequently, if he chose, to take them the same hour of the night, and wash their stripes, and be baptized, there was no law to prevent him, or to prevent Paul and Silas accompanying him. True enough, Paul did refuse to be put off privately the next morning; but it was because he intended to have an honorable discharge. But does this prove, that he could not, and did not, honorably accompany his prison-keeper the night before to the water? I think not.

I confess, that it is hard for me to understand my friend. I think his colors are changeable. Sometimes he is laboring most vehemently, to prove, that *pouring* is the “Scriptural mode of baptism”— he shows that the Holy Ghost was *poured*, and says that was a *baptism* — assumes that the water baptism is a mere “outward figure” of spirit baptism, and therefore the water must be *poured* to represent it. But in a few minutes, he “evacuates” this position; and is off in search of some passage, that contains the word *sprinkle*. Here he labors awhile in good earnest, and with great courage. But again he “evacuates,” and is off talking about “washing.” Here he makes quite a struggle! But finally he says, “Believing *sprinkling*, *pouring* and *immersion* to be all valid *modes* of baptism, we let people have their choice.” How generous! My friend will lay aside all his learning, and all his profound reasonings, and let a boy or girl of thirteen years old, say how he or she will be baptized; and though he has spent half his life-time, trying to show that “there is not one clear case of immersion recorded in the Bible;” while “pouring is easily proven,” yet he will *practice immersion*, if required to do so by a boy fourteen years old, who never read one chapter in the Bible in his life! Thus, against his better judgment, he will practice, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, that indecent and inconvenient thing, called *immersion*, simply to gratify a curious boy or girl. What a pliable and convenient theory of baptism my friend’s is! But, after all, it strikes me it is “unworthy a *full grown man*.”

But "there are some serious objections to exclusive immersion," which I must now notice:

1. "It was only in the middle ages, that we find *exclusive immersion* adopted by any; and we find adopted along with it some of the most absurd and disgusting *fooleries*," etc. Now, all this amounts to just nothing at all. Mr. Logan did not have the face to say, that *immersion* "was not adopted by any till the middle ages but "*exclusive immersion*" was not till then adopted. I freely grant him, that there is nothing in the Bible, or in the history of the Church, for some time after the death of the apostles, about "*exclusive immersion*." But I have shown that *baptism* is *immersion*, by the clearest, most conclusive and indubitable evidence; that John the Baptist, and the apostles, *practiced* immersion; as did the early Christians uninterruptedly, till A. D. 251, when *affusion* was introduced, upon the *authority* of the Church. Until this time, there was, of course, nothing said about "*exclusive immersion*," or about practicing immersion exclusively; for the simple reason, that, *there was nothing to exclude*—no one claimed the right to practice anything for baptism but *immersion*. The talk about "*exclusive immersion*," all began after the Church "*counted affusion sufficient*." Then, and not till then, there was something to *exclude*. Is it a "serious objection" to *immersion* that *pouring* and *sprinkling* for baptism, not being introduced, were not opposed, and excluded by any from the beginning? I think not.

2. In the *practice of immersion*, there is the "complete saturation of the person and clothing of the baptized," by the water! as well as "the partial saturation of the person and clothing of the administrator;" and there is to the subject the "danger of strangling;" the trouble of "shifting clothing the "*going to the water*," etc., all which can be avoided by *practicing affusion*! Now, what right *lazy* person, too indolent and lazy to be immersed, would not be convinced by such profound reasoning! This is an *argument with the lazy*! A man who believes with my friend, that the Church has the right to *change* the *ordinance* of the Lord, and who is too *lazy*, to attend to it, as it was instituted, will, of course, very readily become an advocate of anything, more convenient and attended with less *labor* and "trouble!"

3. In the practice of immersion, in "*severely cold weather*," there is great danger of "*contracting cold, and even causing death itself*," is another one of my friend's "*formidable*" objections against immersion for baptism! Now, if God has commanded me to do a thing, I will do it, if it "*cause death itself*." A man who is afraid of death cannot be a Christian. Our Savior and Leader, 'being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself, and became obedient *unto death, even the death of the cross*." He has *commanded* us to be *baptized*; and I have shown that *baptism* is *inversion*. Now, shall anything, shall "*death itself*" prevent our obedience, and thus "*separate us from the love of God*?"

The gentleman informs us, that, "*in the days of the apostles, people were always baptized in the place where they were converted*." This is a sweeping assumption, and one that I am persuaded my friend would not make, if it were not that his cause has driven him into very great confusion! The Ethiopian eunuch was "*converted*" in the chariot—was he *baptized* in the chariot? Did he not go "*down into the water*" to be baptized? The Philippian jailor was converted in the house, but he "*took*"

the apostle Paul and Silas, and washed their stripes and was baptized." He *took them out of his house* too, for we are informed, that after his baptism, he "*brought them into his house,*" which he could not have done, had he not taken them *out* of the house before the baptizing.

But now I must pay my respects to what my friend has had to say about the expressions, "baptized *with* water," and, "baptized *with* the Holy Ghost." He allows that it would be "perfect nonsense" to say "*immersed with water,*" or, "*immersed with the Holy Ghost.*" Well, as he has so frequently taken occasion to expose the lameness of this old version of the Bible, he will allow me to say to the audience, that "*with,*" in both these expressions, comes from the Greek particle *en*, the primary meaning of which is *in*, as every Greek scholar will admit; and if there is any reason why *en* should not have its primary meaning in both instances, I am utterly unable to see it. I will be very much obliged, if he will inform us why *en* is here translated *with*, instead of *in*. The correct rendering of the passages then is, "*immersed in water,*" "*immersed in the Holy Spirit;*" and where is the "perfect nonsense?"

The gentleman is back at Jerusalem again, trying to prove that *pouring* is baptism, by the "outpouring of the Holy Ghost." Now, if he has proved to his own satisfaction, that *pouring* is baptism, I think he ought to stick to it, and leave off sprinkling and immersion. It is not well to undertake to prove too much. He says, the Holy Ghost was *poured out upon* the people; and that our Savior called this *pouring* a *baptism*. Now this *I squarely deny*. Our Savior never called this *or any other* pouring a baptism. Besides, there is no such thing as a *literal* baptism, either *with* or *in* the Spirit; and my friend has already admitted it. True, the Holy Spirit is spoken of as being "*poured*" as being "*shed on us;*" it is also spoken of as a "*river,*" as a "*well of water,*" as "*dew,*" etc. But I suppose that every Bible student understands that all such language is used in an accommodated sense—*accommodated to our way of thinking*—just as God is said to "*come down,*" "*look down,*" to have hands, feet, eyes, ears, etc. Now, I say, there is no more a *literal pouring down* of the Spirit, than there is an upheaving, or *welling up;* and consequently there is no more likeness between pouring a little water upon a person, and the influences of the Holy Spirit, than there is between immersion and the influences of the Spirit, *and not as much*. The materialistic notion, that there was a *literal pouring down* of the Holy Spirit, is not very old. It has originated since men have begun to claim Bible authority for affusion for baptism.

Bro. Logan says, that he is further from the notion of being immersed, than when he began the debate. Well, then, he cannot say I have not *moved* him; for he confesses that which implies that he is *moved*. This is truly hopeful! Whenever I can get a man to *moving*, I have more hope of getting him right, than if he were immovable. And if it is in order to report just now, Mr. President, I beg leave to submit, that I stand just where I did at the beginning of the discussion.

The gentleman seems to think his "*criticism,*" as he calls it, on the "*burial,*" in Rom. vi, chap. and Col. ii., gives me a "good deal of trouble." What was his "*criticism?*" What was there in all he said about that matter to "*trouble*" me? If I am in trouble, on account of saying that the apostle was "*alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by*

immersion," I have good company. I am with all the fathers; with the Methodist church; the Presbyterian church; and, what is worse for Mr. Logan, we have *his own creed and church along with us!* He is overboard! It turns out to be that "flounders away terribly!"

Allow me now to bring up two witnesses, and prove, by them, that these two passages (Rom. vi. 3, 5, and Col. ii. 12,) prove *immersion*; and my friend may impeach my witnesses, if he will. We will question Mr. Logan first. And we find, that, in his book on Baptism, he says substantially, that, "if these passages refer to *water baptism*, then it is immersion." Very well. Now we will hear *his creed*, which he is almost sworn to defend. It says that Paul, in these passages, refers to *water baptism*. My friend Logan says, "if these passages refer to *water baptism*, it is *immersion*"—*his creed* says, *they do* refer to water baptism. Now, which witness will my friend impeach: *Logan* or *his creed*? Certainly not his creed, for I have in hand a letter from his own hand, of recent date, in which he says: "I will defend all our book [that is, our creed] teaches on baptism." Come friend Logan, be as good as your word. Your creed says, these passages refer to *water baptism*. Now, come up, and defend all your creed teaches on baptism. Will you? Seriously, friend Logan, who is it that is in "trouble" here? Who "flounders away terribly?" Who is "much annoyed by the difficulty in which he has involved himself?"

The gentleman wishes me to "bring out my big guns." This was a *swell* to keep up appearances. I have not seen any necessity for larger guns than I have been using. He must be under the delusion, that *he* is "big game."

He has occupied some of his time, telling this people that I have made a great failure!" Of course, he means by this, that it shall be understood, that he has gained a victory! Now, I would very respectfully propose, that we go on with the discussion, and let the people make up their own minds. They are capable of deciding for themselves, as to the merits of this discussion, without our aid.—[*Time expires.*]

MR. LOGAN'S FIFTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — Mr. Sweeney has labored very hard to show you, that the cause for which I am contending was in a sinking condition—that *sprinkling* and *pouring* as baptism were an innovation, resting upon no higher authority than that of the church—and all this.

Now, so far from this being the case, and that they are not taught in the Bible, as he has endeavored to show, we find that in the ratio as the Bible is read and studied, the practice of *affusion* as baptism has *increased*, while that of *immersion* has decreased! Now, this speaks a language in favor of affusion, which should be heeded, and have its weight; as I have shown, that it is the *Bible* at last that is to decide this question, and not human authorities. And as to Biblical scholarship, I will ask if the Pedobaptists, the Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, etc., cannot show in their ranks an array of as great and profound scholars, as learned and pious men, as is to be found any where? Not only this, but I will not hesitate to affirm, that they can present, in their written and published works, a far greater mass of such learning, than their opponents can; and hence the latter have to be constantly drawing on their resources, and often pervert-

ing them to help them out! These are facts again, that speak loudly in favor of *sprinkling* and *pouring*, and against the *practice* of exclusive immersion! Indeed, there is not a clear case of *immersion* as baptism, in the whole Bible, from Genesis to the book of Revelation, while *affusion* is clearly taught there again and again.

My friend, and those with him in sentiment, often talk about persons becoming dissatisfied with their baptism, where it has been by *affusion*, and desiring *immersion*, and having to be *immersed*, and bring it up as an argument in favor of *immersion*, and *against affusion*. Now, what is the reason of this dissatisfaction? It is not because of these persons reading and investigating the Bible, as my friend and his party would have you believe; as I have shown, that in proportion as the Bible is read and investigated, it has been the other way, and *affusion* has increased in popular sentiment, and *immersion decreased*! I can easily give you the reason. It is because my friend and his party are eternally going about over the country, preaching and harping upon the subject of *baptism*, and trying to persuade everybody they can, who has been baptized only by *affusion* or *pouring*, that they have never been baptized at all, ridiculing it and calling it worthless, telling them they must be *immersed*, or there is no promise of salvation to them; and all that! That is the real cause of it. And as a proof of this, I will venture the assertion, that my friend, Mr. Sweeney, preaches on the subject of *baptism* at least *five times* to where any of our preachers preach upon it *once*!

My friend has adverted to my reference to what Origen says about Elijah's baptizing the altar by *pouring*; and denies that the baptism consisted in the pouring. He says, "that *baptism*, in the sense of overwhelming, was the *result* of the continuous pouring of the water;" and hence he says, "that the *act* of pouring was not what Origen terms the baptism of the wood on the altar." Now, Origen does not tell us particularly what the baptism consisted in, but leaves us to infer that it was by *pouring*. My friend says, that he will not accuse me of "scrapping" Origen, as I "did not read Origen at all; but simply made an incorrect statement about what he said." Now, I will inform my friend, that I have Origen's *original work*; and can substantiate what I have affirmed about him, if necessary to do so. [Here Mr. Sweeney said to Mr. Logan, "Please produce Origen's original work; as I would like very much to see it. I had supposed there was not a copy to be found in all this Western country."] Very well, sir, you shall see it in due time. I will here say, that my friend has not produced a single copy of any of the Pedobaptist works from which he has read, but has merely quoted extracts from them, as found in the works of Booth and Wall. Now I object to his reading these extracts from Booth, as he is on his own side of the question, and I believe a partial Baptist writer, who looked only on the *immersion side* of the question. As he has called upon me for the *original copy* of Origen's work from which I have quoted, let him produce the *original works* from which he has quoted; and then I will do so.

My friend, you know, has had a great deal to say about our Savior's being baptized *in the river*, in order to prove his theory of exclusive *immersion*; to which I must pay some more attention. And here I will quote the testimony of Dr. Carson, a Baptist writer, belonging to my friend's own side, and of course not disposed to concede anything more than he could

help to the cause of baptism by affusion. Mr. Carson says, that the Greek expression, *en potoma*, "in the river," means, "in the river, under the shelter of the bank"—that is, in the channel of the river, or including all the space within the banks, whether covered by the water, or not covered by it. In illustration, Mr. Carson quotes an expression, from Homer, or some other Greek writer, about soldiers, or persons, "lodging *in the river*, under shelter of the bank." Now, no one who has any knowledge of Greek, or his own language, would for a moment suppose or contend, that it was *in the water* where they lodged! Yet, according to my friend's theory, that "in Jordan" and "in the river of Jordan," necessarily means "*in the water*," they must have lodged *in the water all night*, "under shelter of the bank!"—and as they had so *wet* a lodging place, they must, those not drowned, have come out in quite a *soaking* condition, indeed soaked through and through, clothes, body, and all! Such must have been the inevitable result, if my friend's theory of the meaning of *en potoma*, "in Jordan," etc., is correct! There is no absolute proof, that *en* necessarily means in here, or any where else, where *water baptism* is spoken of, or referred to, in the New Testament. We have seen, that it means "*with*" in *connection* with both the *baptism of water* and of the *Holy Ghost*, as rendered in the common version of the Bible; and other cases can easily be produced in the New Testament, where it cannot be rendered *in*, without doing manifest violation to language! It has always to be rendered according to the context in which it occurs, the connection, and the circumstances of the case; and my friend is compelled to concede this. For instance, where the Holy Ghost is spoken of as being "*poured out*," it has to be rendered, "He shall baptize *with* the Holy Ghost," and where water baptism by *affusion* is referred to, as that of John at the *edge* of the water's of the Jordan, "I indeed baptize you *with* water," etc.

Well, my friend has gone to Ænon again, and I must pay some attention to what he says, in reference to my remarks on that celebrated place. He attempts to ridicule the idea about pools being formed there, of the depth of which Dr. Barclay speaks, in the time (upwards of 1800 years) intervening between John and Dr. Barclay; says that if formed, they might have been filled up, and such stuff as that! — yet admits the *plausibility* of it! This is singular logic indeed; and it looks like a man must be hard pressed when he has to resort to it! Now, I ask, why, out of all the multitude of travelers who, in all ages, since the days of John and the Apostles, have visited Ænon, as well as the places made celebrated by these inspired men, has not a single one of these travelers ever seen these pools, except Dr. Barclay; and he is an exclusive *immersionist*, of my friend's own church and school in religion, and seeking to establish *immersion*, by every argument, proof, and inference in his power? I have no recollection, that they are mentioned, or described by any other traveler, who has ever visited the place! If my friend is able, let him produce a single one, besides Dr. Barclay, who agrees with him there. It was a maxim of the Jewish law, reiterated and endorsed by our Savior, that "by the mouth of *two or three* witnesses every word shall be established," but my friend has produced but *one* witness, and he is from his own side of the question, and calculated to give only *ex parte* testimony! And as he is so fond of quoting Pedobaptist authorities against me, why can he produce only *one*, to corroborate the testimony of his friend, Dr. Barclay?! Well, I will present him one, not

however in corroboration of Dr. Barclay, but against him, as well as against my worthy friend, on this subject. It is that of the late Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, Mass., justly celebrated as one of the greatest Greek scholars, that ever lived, who wrote a work expressly on the subject of Baptism, on its *mode*, and produced all the Greek authorities that could be found, on the meaning of *bap*, *bapto*, and *baptizo*. Prof. Stuart says, the literal and real rendering of the "much water there," given as the reason of John's baptizing at that place, (Ænon,) is, "because there were *many*, *waters* there;" that these "many waters" consisted of *many springs*; anti) that John baptized there, not because of quantity and depth of water for immersing in, but because it was a place where plenty of water could be had for drinking, cooking, washing, etc., for such immense multitudes, as flocked to his baptism. Prof. Stuart enquires, if *quantity* of water for *immersion* was the object of John's baptizing at Ænon, why did not the account say, "because there was *deep water* there?" This it ought to have said, if that was the reason, and this no doubt it would have said. I will also here say that Mr. A. Campbell, of my friend's Church, endorses Prof. Stuart, as one of the greatest of Greek scholars.

The audience will recollect that I showed that Paul must have been *baptized in the house*, where Ananias went to him; and that consequently it must have been by *affusion*. I showed that the correct rendering of the Greek word *anastas*, translated "arise" in the common version of the Bible, is, "*standing up*, be baptized," etc. My friend seems disposed to, ridicule this rendering, by giving examples of the use of *anastas*, where it would be absurd to render it, "*standing up*," as in the case of Peter on the house-top at Joppa, when told by the Spirit to "arise, and get down," etc. Now it is a rule of scriptural interpretation, acknowledged by my friend himself, that the connection and circumstances always determine the correct rendering of a word in translation; and while it would be correct to say, "*standing up*, be baptized," it would be as correct to say, "*arise*, and get thee down."

Again, I also showed that the jailor at Philippi must have been *baptized in the house*, and of course by *affusion*. My friend would not at first quote all the passages, in reference to the case, and in their connection, while I have done it; and when he did quote them, it was for the purpose of endeavoring to show, that Paul and Silas accompanied the jailor and his family away off to a river, or some other place of water, and *immersed* them! How my friend can manage to do that, would be somewhat difficult to tell, as we have no reason to believe that they were, any of them, beyond the walls of the prison, during the whole transaction? If Paul went out to a river or any place, he must have *dissembled*, for we find him and Silas both still in the prison, on the next morning; and that they would not leave the prison, until the magistrates came themselves, and took them out. It is well known, that there were in the prisons of those times, two apartments, the "outer prison," and the "inner prison:" and also adjoining these, the jailor's house, in which he lived; all within the prison walls. This will easily account for all the coming out, entering in, etc., which we have in this case, without having to leave the prison walls. The jailor brought Paul and Silas out of the "inner prison," or dungeon where they had been put, into the "outer prison," and there enquired of them: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved ² And they said, *Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and

thou shalt be saved, and thy house." He then brought them from the "outer prison" into his house: "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes"—where? of course in his house — "and was baptized, he and all his *straighticay*"—where? of course in the same place, his house — "And when [or after] he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, *believing* in God with all his house." In all this we have no account, as there was no necessity, of their leaving the walls of the prison at nil, to seek some pond, river, or place of water; and the expression too, that they were baptized *straightway*, forbids the idea; particularly as there was plenty of *water* in the jailor's house, to baptize them by *affusion*; as we learn from his having water to wash their stripes with. Besides, if Paul and Silas went with the jailor and his family *out of* the prison, and away off from the prison walls to some place of water to *immerse* them in, they must from what we have seen, as I have shown, *dissembled*, as they refused to leave the prison, as we have also seen, until the magistrates came and released them.

As to Dr. Wall, to whom my friend must have recourse again and again, in order to try to sustain his exclusive *immersion* theory, I will say, that he *always* considered *affusion* as valid baptism, and regarded *immersion* too is valid, as a *mode of the application* of water in baptism to a proper subject; and the most of Pedobaptists agree with him. As to *Novatian*, to whose case my friend is perpetually recurring, in order to show that *affusion* had its *origin* with him, about A. D. 251, he never doubted the validity of his baptism.

In the *baptism* of the *three thousand* persons on the day of Pentecost, we have an example of baptism by *affusion*. Besides its being an impossibility to have *immersed* so many, in less than a day, in fact in but little over half a day, with the repetition of the formula of baptism, in each case, we have no accounts of any public pools or places of water in or about the city of Jerusalem, sufficient for the purpose! Besides, the *prejudices* of the Jews, against Christ and his apostles, were such as would cause them to forbid the apostles the use of their public and private pools and bathing-places, for the purpose of *immersing* these persons. And, as I have shown, it would have been an utter *impossibility* for *twelve* men, the number of the apostles, to have *immersed* such a large number as *three thousand*, with the time consumed in taking the *confession* of *each one*, according to the practice of my friend and his Church, and that consumed in the repetition of the *formula* of baptism!

My worthy friend is entirely mistaken, in supposing that I am "desperately annoyed," by his trying to prove that *affusion* originated about A. D. 251. I have shown, to my own satisfaction, and I trust to that of the audience, that we have proofs of its practice as valid baptism, long before that time. Because Dr. Wall happens to refer to the notable case of *Novatian*, A. D. 251, he (my friend) takes it for granted that it originated then! — and is again guilty of the *error* he committed in one of his past speeches, in saying that Dr. Wall made *Novatian's* case the "*most ancient*" one on record, whereas, as I have shown, he merely adduced it *out of* the most ancient, leaving the inference, that there were others still more ancient; and extending, as I have shown, back almost to the days of the apostles themselves. As to what my friend has said, in reference, to *Novatian's*

ordination being objected to on account of his baptism by *affusion*, I have shown to you, from Dr. Wall himself, that it was his *repentance* on a supposed death-bed, that was objected to, and not his baptism.

My friend seems disposed, from the general tenor of his remarks, to insinuate that I claimed for the church the right to *change* the *ordinance* of baptism. Now in this he is entirely mistaken. So far from claiming any such thing, I expressly disclaimed it! Regarding *sprinkling*, *pouring* and *immersion* as all *valid modes* of baptism, I stated that the church had the right to change from any one of these to either of the others, if she chose; from *immersion* to *affusion*, for instance, as might be most eligible to her; but that she had no right to *change* the ORDINANCE itself to anything else, to dispense with it entirely, as do the Quakers, etc. I expressly disclaim every thing of the kind.

My worthy friend attempts to ridicule the idea of baptism consisting in the *application* of water to a proper subject. Because I said, that it mattered not *how* the subject received the application, in allusion to whether he did so, by *sprinkling*, *pouring* or *immersion*, he asks whether it would do, if the subject were *drenched!* — or received the water on his *heel!* — or the great *toe* of the right foot! — and all such ridiculous stuff as that! Is it possible, that a man of my friend's apparent dignity, can descend to such tow and pitiful attempts at ridicule as this! Surely he must be hard pressed for argument, and his cause in a bad way, when he has to do it! He seems not yet to have learned the lesson, that there is *no argument in ridicule*. Were I disposed to retaliate, I might perhaps ridicule him and his arguments just as much.

My friend has had a good deal to say about my "quibbling;" but I think that his last speech will show about as much "quibbling" as is to be found any where, in the same compass of words. He is the last man in the world that ought to talk about quibbling! — Because I said that we gave people their *choice* as to the *manner* of being baptized, whether by *pouring*, *sprinkling*, or *immersion*, he says that I will lay aside all my "learning and profound reasonings," and let a girl of thirteen years old, or a boy of fourteen, say *how* she or he will be baptized! Now, I would ask, where is there any reasoning in all this! — where any argument or logic? It is true, that he will not baptize any one by sprinkling or pouring; but will he not go at any hour of the day or night, at the demand of a girl or boy of ten years of age, and take her or his "confession," and go to a creek or place of water, if a mile off, through snow or mud if necessary, and break or out the ice, and go into the water, and immerse them? And perhaps some one or more of these girls or boys, "have never read one chapter in the Bible in their lives!" Then why attempt to cast odium or ridicule upon us for our practice? There is a fair and manly way of arguing, without a man's *stooping* to ridicule, which never proves anything. And it is not true, as he charges, that I will "against my better judgment," *immerse* a curious boy or girl simply to gratify them. If I immerse any one, it is as a *religious* act, and not to gratify an idle curiosity; as he ought to know.

As to his idle talk about my "evacuating," it may go for what it is worth, which will be but little. I expect that he has "evacuated" fully as much as I have ever done; and may yet have to "evacuate" still more. I have not surrendered in the least a single point or position I hold; and it will re-

quire better argument and reasoning than the stuff and ridicule he has been, presenting to induce me to do so. It is a favorite method with some debaters, to ridicule what they cannot meet with argument!

My worthy friend, in his comments on my "objections" to the practice of exclusive immersion, very "gentlemanly" and "politely" insinuates, that it is *laziness* which causes myself and my Pedobaptist brethren to prefer *affusion* to *immersion*! Now he ought to know that there is neither truth nor justice in such a charge; and that we are generally as ready as he and his brethren, to perform any religious duty, that we conscientiously believe is required of us; and as to *practical* religion, as belonging to the life of the Christian, we are ready to compare with his brethren, as a religious body; and do not conceive that we can suffer any by the comparison. The very remarks my friend has been making, about our readiness to *immerse* any one that requires it, "any girl of thirteen, or boy of fourteen," will refute this charge! And so we pass it by; with what he says about *obeying unto death*, and all that, as mere idle, boasting talk, for effect and to make a show!

But one of the greatest blunders, or mistakes, of my friend, is where he attempts to bring up my little book on Baptism, to make me testify that water baptism, and exclusive immersion, are taught in, Romans, vi. chapter and Col. ii. chapter. Nothing was further from my mind, or from what I said! I said, not that these passages refer to water baptism, for I was opposing the idea, but that, "if these passages refer to water baptism, then it is immersion," and that I yet say. But was that saying that they *do*? By no means. Not being able to make the case out, he goes to "my Creed," as he terms our "Confession of Faith;" which he says that I am almost sworn to defend; and that says that Paul in these passages refers to *water baptism*!! Well, this caps the climax of absurd reasoning! Was ever such logic heard! I predicated *immersion* there on an "if" — "if these passages refer to water baptism"—and forthwith he seizes upon it, and runs over to the "Confession of Faith" to prove his position? But it so happens, that the proof there for him, is no proof at all—it is mere *marginal references* to Rom. and Col.—and while I am prepared to defend what the Confession teaches, I am not bound to accept these references, put in since the book was made, only so far as my judgment approves of them. Such is this valiant testimony—it all "ends in smoke!"

Now, in conclusion, I have never said that the *baptism* and *burial*, in these two places, (Rom. vi. 3, 4., Col. ii. 12,) are *synonymous*. The *burial* alluded to by the apostle, is, as I have shown, *moral* and *spiritual*, not real and literal, the effect or result of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, upon the heart, by which "the old man is crucified, that the body of sin might be destroyed." Paul has told us, how we are baptized: "*By one Spirit* we are all baptized into one body" — consequently it is a spiritual baptism. Now, in order to be "baptized into Christ," we must be baptized with the Holy Spirit. There is no other way.—[*Time expires.*

MR SWEENEY'S SIXTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — I suppose that Mr. Logan thought he was giving us some very important information, when he told us that, "in the ratio as the Bible is read and studied the practice of *affusion* as baptism increases." This was most beautifully and complacently

said. I have but one objection to it; and that is, it is not *true*. I have no doubt about the gentleman's sincerity in what he said; neither have I any doubt about his being sincerely in error. To say nothing of the increase of Baptists, I firmly believe that at the present day, at least one half of those of "riper years," received into the Pedobaptist churches in this country, are *immersed*. This was not formerly the case. The *children* of course are all *sprinkled*; they being incapable of choosing for themselves. And of all *sprinkled* at the present day, three-fourths are *infants*.'

I freely admit, that in the "ranks of the Pedobaptists" there are many "profound scholars" and "pious men;" and I have been showing that these "profound scholars" and "pious men" have, scores of them, conceded just what I claim and have shown in this discussion to be true — that we have Bible authority for immersion, while sprinkling and pouring for baptism rest only upon the authority of the church. This was admitted almost universally by these "profound scholars" among the Pedobaptists, down to the last two hundred years. And even much later we have the concessions of many illustrious Pedobaptists. such as Wesley and others, that the "*ancient manner* of baptizing was *by immersion*." Hence the "written and published works" of these eminent and scholarly men, of whom my friend seems disposed to boast, give him no little trouble, as we have seen, in this discussion! And this, I suppose, is one of my friend's "facts, that speaks loudly in favor of affusion!!"

Mr. Logan is complaining again, that we are continually baptizing their members, or persuading them to be baptized; and that we "preach five times as much about baptism" as any of their preachers. Well, I think we do preach five times as much about baptism as they; and we have five times the *reasons* for it, and *five times as much to say*, when we do preach about it. Indeed, if I occupied the ground my friend does, and had to remain there, I cannot see for the life of me, how I could preach on baptism *at all* — it would be too much like sailing against wind and tide for me! What can a man say *for affusion*? We have seen my friend fail to show, that the idea of *affusion* is in *baptizo*. His failure here has been perfectly obvious. He certainly cannot claim, that he has found any authority for it in the Bible; while I have shown, that his own learned brethren have admitted, that the "most ancient" case of affusion was that of Novation, A. D. 251; and "was accounted sufficient" *then only by the church*. I do preach, and expect to continue to do so, against this *innovation*; and so do my brethren; and we have *success* too in doing it; and that is what annoys Mr. Logan: By the way, I must notice what he had to say about "*original* books — my reading from Wall, Booth, etc. He objects to my reading from Mr. Booth's works, because he was a *Baptist*, and "looked only at the immersion side of the question." He calls for the "*original* works" of those Pedobaptists, from whom I have read extracts found in Booth's work on Baptism. Well, he will not get the original works from *me*; nor do I suppose that he will find them in the State of Illinois, at least all of them. Probably I may find the most of them by the time he produces the "original work of Origen," from which he quoted. I have not *pretended* to have in my possession the original works of all the men from whom I have quoted. Many of them I have never seen, and never expect to see. I do not expect to see Origen's book, from which my friend quoted, though I understood him to say he had it. I think he is under a mistake about

that. I guess that he will only produce Origen, as quoted by Wall. And I did not, nor will I, object to his using the quotation. I only said, I would "be pleased to see the original work of Origen," because my friend said he had it, as I understood him. Now the works of Wall, Gale and Booth, are about one hundred years old; and have been read and read again, and quoted, and reviewed by other writers. These works contain hundreds of extracts from works much more ancient, to which those men had access. Think you, that if those extracts had not been correct, it would not have been discovered, and those men exposed before now? Most assuredly, it would have been found out, and they exposed long since. Now, I have not read you what Mr. Booth himself said about baptism; for, of course, he would be objected to as a witness, he being on my side of the question; but I have simply read Pedobaptist authors, *as cited by Mr. Booth*. If Mr. Logan can show that Mr. Booth did not quote those men fairly and correctly, let him do so; and until he does so, I shall hold that his objection to my reading from his ancient work, is perfectly *boyish!*

He chose to read the *Lexicons*, as quoted by Mr. Rice, in the Campbell and Rice Debate. He had the right to do so. He has seen fit to read authors as quoted by Mr. Wall, a Pedobaptist. Let him continue to do so. All those great men had access to books, that he and I never saw. They were great men; and would not, even had they been disposed to do so, hazard their reputation, by quoting an author incorrectly. But all my friend has had to say about Booth, was, evidently to evade the force of the evidence drawn from the *many* learned Pedobaptists I have quoted.

The gentleman has gone back to Jordan again. He had a good deal to say in his last speech, about Dr. Carson's remarks upon "*en potoma*," "in Jordan;" and I might admit all he said, and yet my argument would be nothing affected by it. What if some writer did use the expression, *en potoma*, meaning simply, "all between the banks of the Jordan, without respect to the water?" Did I not show, that there was *water*, where John baptized "in Jordan?" Our Savior did not merely come up out of the *banks* of the Jordan—he came "up out of the *water*."

From Jordan my friend went over to Ænon again. I was surprised to hear him let down upon Dr. Barclay as he did, specially since it was he that *introduced* the Doctor, as a witness in this discussion, to show that there was not a *sufficiency* of water at Ænon for *immersion*. Now, because I happened to know, that Barclay says, there are pools of water there *six feet deep*, and read it, my friend turns about, and lets loose a tirade of abuse upon his *own witness!* — simply because I would not allow him to "scrap" and misrepresent him!

The Gentleman had a good deal to say again about baptizing *with* water, and *with* the Holy Ghost; and says he has shown that *with*, and not *in*, is the correct meaning of *en*. How did he show it? He has said nothing about *en*, but to *quibble* a little, during this entire discussion! When his cause demands it, *en* means "at" or "about;" and then, in the same speech, he has it to mean *with*, without any show of reason for his change! Now, have I not shown, by proof irresistible and overwhelming, that *baptizo* means *immerse*? — and who cannot see, that this very circumstance makes it necessary for *en* to be translated *in*, in the passages in controversy, where it occurs? Now, if I had not shown that the meaning, the unvarying meaning, of *baptizo*, is *immerse*; and if my friend had shown, that it some-

times even means *sprinkle*, then I would only have the advantage of the primary meaning of the word *en*, in these passages; but, as it is, I have not only the advantage of the primary meaning of the word, but of all the circumstances in the connection.

Again; having shown that *baptizo* means *immerse*, I have only to show, that the circumstances attending the administration of the rite, and the allusions to it, all harmonize with this meaning of the word; while my friend, to prove *sprinkling*, by the circumstances attending, and allusions to baptism, has to do so, directly in opposition to the unvarying meaning of the word! But unfortunately for him, he cannot show that *baptizo* ever means to *sprinkle*, or that any circumstance or allusion to baptism, favors his position! Every thing is against it! How comes it, that no writer in the Greek language ever used the word *baptizo* in the sense of sprinkle or *pour*? How comes it, that no (even Pedobaptist) *lexicon ever* gives *sprinkle* or *pour*, as even a remote meaning of the word? How comes the inspired page to speak not of *basins*, but of *rivers*; not of a *little*, but of *much* water; not of *bringing* water to the candidate for baptism, but of *going to*, and *into*, the water; not of *wetting*, or *moistening*, but of *burying* in baptism; when the administration or design of the ordinance is described?

But to help him out of trouble at Ænon, my friend read an *argument from his Presbyterian brother*, Prof. Stuart, of Andover, Mass, He had just as well read from his own little book on Baptism! Now, if I had introduced his Bro. Stuart, and had not read him fully, or represented him fairly, as he did Dr. Barclay, then it might have been expected, that he would read from Stuart sufficiently, to show that I had not done him justice, as I did when he introduced Dr. Barclay. But for him to introduce and read *his own brethren* against me here, is an indication of desperation! What would my worthy friend say, were I to read as authority here an argument from Mr. A. Campbell? But he says that "Mr. Campbell endorses Stuart as a scholar." True, he endorses him "*as a scholar*;" and so do I, and I also endorse "*as scholars*," those other Pedobaptists, whom I have read in this discussion; for, as scholars, they all admit that *baptizo* means *immerse*, but never means *sprinkle*; but when they '*practice affusion* upon the authority of the Church, I am unwilling to endorse them in it. Prof. Stuart, though a Presbyterian, "*as a scholar*" says, "*baptizo* means *immerse*;" and that, "*in this all scholars and critics of any note are agreed*." *As a scholar, we endorse him*. Will. Mr. Logan do so? But *as a Pedobaptist*, Stuart got the idea into his head, that it made no difference, "*how the subject received the application of water*," that being a "*non-essential*." Here we refuse to endorse Mr. Stuart, and here Mr. Logan heartily endorses him. Hence, you see, that my friend's own brethren, *as scholars*, are with us on this question. But they all seem to labor under the strange hallucination, that, though our Savior, when he commanded his apostles to *baptize*, used a word that always means *immerse*, and never *sprinkle* or *pour*, yet it is immaterial, "*how the subject receives the water!*" I hold that we should obey all the commandments of the Lord; and this can be done *only by doing the very thing he commands, and as he commands*.

My worthy friend still insists that Paul was baptized "*standing up*," notwithstanding *baptizo* means *immerse*, and notwithstanding Paul says he was "*buried by baptism!*" Well, I have determined to notice all these lit-

tle things. Now, he says, "I have shown that *anastas* means standing up." How did he "show" this? He simply *said* so—that's all! I "showed" that it did not mean "standing up," but simply "arise," as correctly translated in the common version. It is the same word from which the word *resurrection* comes, and means, primarily, *arise*. Now before Paul could be *baptized*, "*buried by baptism*"—be had to *arise*, but to have Ananias *pour* or *sprinkle* a little water upon him, it was not necessary that he should *arise*. Hence, that Paul *arose*, instead of being *for* my friend, is *against* him. But we are told, that Paul was not told to do any thing between *arising* and being baptized—that we are not told that he *went to the water*, or any thing of the kind. Neither are we told, that the *water was brought to him*. I suppose it was not at all necessary, that Ananias should tell Paul, "After you arise, you must go to the watery and after you go to the water, you must go down into the water, and you must be perfectly passive, and allow me to baptize you." All this Paul knew, he being acquainted with the practice of Christians. Now to make this plain, even to the satisfaction of Mr. Logan, I will suppose, that after a long, cold day's ride, he reaches the house of his bro. D., where he is kindly received, and proposes to spend the night. After being refreshed, his bro. D., conducts him to an "upper room," sees him comfortably ensconced in bed, and wishing him sweet rest, bids him "good night." My friend sleeps soundly until he is awakened by a *rap* at his door. It is bro. D., who says, "Bro. Logan, arise, and eat your breakfast;" and turns away, and goes down. Bro. Logan arises straight up in bed, and there he stands, cold as it is, profoundly reasoning: "Bro. D. did not say, 'Get off the bed, wash, and dress yourself, come down stairs, and into the dining-room,' etc. He simply said, 'Arise, and eat therefore I will await until he comes, and administers my breakfast to me *standing up!*'" [a laugh]. Ought he not reason thus?—The fact is, he would very well understand all about the *intervening preparations*, and would make them. So Paul understood all that was necessary to be done, before he could be baptized; and it was therefore wholly unnecessary for Ananias to be more particular than he was.

One word about the jailor's case as my friend will not *leave the prison*.—As he is my prisoner I will give him an "honorable *discharge*," so that he may leave. In the 32nd verse of this chapter, (Acts xvi,) we learn that *they were all in the jailor's house*. Then we learn in the 33d verse, that he (the jailor) took them (Paul and Silas) the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized. Now where he *took* them to we know not, nor can we learn it merely from the word "took." But the 34th verse says: "And when he had *brought them, into his house*," etc., which shows to any one capable of "*being cut safely*," that he had taken them out of his house. I have already said, and I repeat it, that there was no law to prevent the jailor from taking his prisoners out of the prison. There was nothing to prevent Paul from going with him to where *water* was to be found. As he was with his prison-keeper, and remained with him, and in his care, until he was honorably discharged.

But "in the baptism of the 3000 persons on the day of Pentecost," my friend says, "we have an example of baptism *by affusion*." Singular "example of baptism by affusion" this truly!

1. My friend is unable to prove that *three thousand* persons were baptized that day *at all!* 'We are told, that "they that gladly received the word

were baptized but are not told how many that was. True, it says that 3000 "were added unto them" but it does not say that *all* these were baptized that day.

2. How can this be "an example of affusion," when it says *nothing about affusion?*—*not one word!* "They that gladly received his [Peter's] word «ere baptiztd." Now the word "baptized" here is from *baptizo*, which, as I have shown, means *immerse*—my friend's own brethren admit it "as scholars"—the *idea of affusion* is not in the word!—How then, in the name of sacred reason, can this be an example of "affusion!" But, finally, if the whole 3000 were *baptized*, it could have been done in less time than a half day. But I will ask my friend, if he can get three thousand "through," on his plan of conversion, at the "mourner's bench," and take them into the church, as he does, in less time?

The Gentleman is not satisfied with what I read from *Wall*. He says: "Wall does not say, that the case of Novatian is the most ancient," but it is takes "out of" the "most ancient." Wall says no such thing. He says: "Out of the many *proofs* [that the ancients counted affusion sufficient.] I shall produce two or three of the *most ancient*." "Out of" many, he "PRODUCES two or three of the MOST ANCIENT" cases. Then he begins his "most ancient" cases with that of Novatian, A. D 251. In commenting on what I said about my friend's laying aside his learning, profound reasoning, etc., and permitting a girl of 13 years of age, or a boy of 14, to decide how he or she would be baptized, and going against his convictions of mind in immersing them where they demand it; he asks, if I will not go at such a demand, at any time, through any weather, etc.?

To this I reply, yes, I will go with any *believer*, "day or night, through mud or snow, cut the ice," if necessary, and *baptize* any such person. But I would not do it, if I did not believe, "there is a single clear case of *immersion* recorded in the Bible."

As my friend has complained about my insinuating *laziness*, in reference to him and his preaching brethren, as a cause of their opposition to immersion, (on account of its inconvenience and troublesomeness,) let me say to him, that if he does not wish me to "insinuate" any thing about *laziness* again, let him not again bring up the "objection to immersion," based upon *sheer laziness!*

He says, he is not bound to *endorse* the "references" in his creed; that it is only the *references* that teach, that Rom. vi chap. and Col. ii ch. refer to *water baptism*; and, he says further, that those references were put there since the creed was written. Now I must give him a little information concerning *his own creed*. His confession of faith is just the Old Presbyterian Confession of Faith, "with variations." The *doctrine* of his confession was taken from the Old Confession, with slight variations; and what he calls the *references*—more properly the *proofs* of the doctrine—were also taken from the Old Confession, with slight variations, just to accord with variations in doctrine. And they were all transferred by the same men, at the same time. And now if he can produce a copy of his Confession, that does not have these "references," let him do it, and I will stand corrected. We have here, in his creed, his *doctrine*, as transmitted to him by his Fathers; and in these notes, "references," we have the Scriptures, by which his fathers proved that doctrine; and to prove their doctrine on *water baptism*, they quote Rom. vi 3-5, and Col. ii 12; and

apply them to *water* baptism. The same *authority*, then, that he has for his doctrine, I have for saying that these passages refer to *water* baptism; and my friend himself says, "if they do, then it is *immersion*." So you see that by the testimony of bro. Logan himself, and that of his own creed, taken together, I *prove immersion*. Now, either the framers of his creed were wrong, or *he* is. Let him say which. But again, my friend admits that "if" the baptism referred to in these passages, is *water* baptism, then it is *immersion*. Well then, *whatever* baptism this is, it is *immersion*—is it not? Mr. Logan says, "Spirit baptism." Well, then, Spirit baptism is *immersion*. But this will not suit him; for when he wishes to prove *pouring* to be baptism, he goes up to Jerusalem, and shows that Holy Ghost baptism is a *pouring*! What a reasoner!

By the way, it now occurs to me, that my friend quoted from Corinthians: "*By one Spirit* we are all baptized into one body;" and said that it was Holy Ghost baptism also. He would make a pretty fair Quaker! He had us baptized *with* the Spirit by *pouring*; buried *in* the Spirit; and also baptized *by* the Spirit! Of course, it is "by one Spirit" we are baptized—by the *direction* of the Spirit of God, or under the *influence* of that Spirit, speaking by the word of God; but it is *in water*. And *his creed*, again says, that this passage in Corinthians refers to *water* baptism. So he has deserted his creed again! And what authority has he for saying, that any of these passages refer to any other baptism, than the "one baptism" of the Church, in water? Just none at all! Whenever any other baptism than that which was known of all, (water baptism,) was meant by the inspired writers, it was expressly *described*; so that we have no trouble in ascertaining when any other baptism than that in water is referred to—it *is always described*.

My friend takes occasion about once or twice, in each speech he has delivered, to inform this audience, that I am exceedingly hard pressed; am making a very great failure generally; and can do nothing but try to make his arguments look ridiculous, etc. Well, I suppose he *feels* that it is necessary to *tell* the audience that all this is so. Now, suppose he had undertaken to prove to this audience, that *sprinkling* is baptism; and I was in the negative. And suppose he had shown that the Greek word *baptizo* had always been used by all writers in Greek, in the sense of *sprinkle*; and I had failed to show a single instance in which it has been used in the sense for which I am contending. He has shown, (to go on with the supposition,) that all the *lexicons* give *sprinkle* as the primary meaning of the word, and I have failed to show a single *lexicon* that defines it to mean *immerse*. He has shown, that the impartial Quakers are all on his side; I have to confess it; he has shown, that my own brethren, "*as scholars*" are with him, and against me; I am unable to show to the contrary; he has shown, that many of the most eminent and learned of my brethren frankly confess that *baptizo* does not mean to *immerse*; and that the ancient manner of baptizing was *sprinkling*; and that *immersion* began first to be practiced, A. D. 251; and rests upon no higher authority than that of the Church? And suppose he had shown that the Scriptures speak of *basins* of water; of *bringing* the water to the subject; of being *wet* or *moistened* merely, by baptism; and I had failed to show any *going to*, or *into*, the water; had failed to show any allusions to baptism as a *burial*, etc. I say, suppose he had *shown*, and I had *failed*, as I have named, then what

would he think? And what would this audience think? Why certainly, that he had triumphantly sustained himself, and that I had made a great failure! But what is the truth? That the *reverse* of all that has been the case exactly, throughout the whole supposition I have made; and that it is I who have triumphantly sustained myself, and my friend who has made the great failure!

As I see that I have yet a few minutes of time, it has just occurred to me, that it will not be amiss here, for me to say a few words about *how* we are to *know*, when baptism is named in the Scriptures, *what baptism, is meant*. This is very necessary; for I see that my friend works by a rule, that is, in my judgment, unsound and licentious. I discover, that whenever baptism is alluded to in such a manner as to imply *immersion*. he cries out "Holy Ghost baptism" at once; though he may have, just before, been contending that Holy Ghost baptism is a *pouring*! Now, is there any way of ascertaining, *just what baptism is meant*, whenever it is named in the Bible? I think there is. If the Bible is the book I have taken it to be, it will not leave us to guess and conjecture on a matter so important. I will use an illustration to aid me in giving you my view of this matter:

Concerned in this debate, we have one Mr. Logan as one of the debataints. He, of course, figures throughout the entire debate. Now, should any one, in speaking of this discussion, mention "Mr. Logan," everybody would understand, that this veritable Mr. Logan, one of the debataints, was meant. But should any one, in reporting the debate, have occasion to notice any other Logan, he should so describe him, as not to mislead the reader, and this any thinking reporter would do. Well, to apply the illustration, and give my rule, the *first* baptism named in the New Testament is *water* baptism. The baptism of the Commission is *water* baptism. The baptism practiced by the Apostles—that all believers are *commanded* to submit to—is *water* baptism. This is admitted, by my friend, who is so nearly a Quaker, that he begins to *quake* a little! Now, where ever baptism is named, in the scriptures, without its being *described*, or *defined*, to be another kind of baptism, *water* baptism, this baptism that figures throughout the New Testament, is to be *understood*. But then there is what is styled a baptism of *sufferings*; and again, what is called the baptism of the Holy Spirit. And now I say, fearing no successful contradiction, that, *when any thing else than this first named, and commonly understood baptism, is called a baptism, it is always* SO DESCRIBED, *that we may know what is meant; but when baptism is named without any description, then the* FIRST NAMED—WATER BAPTISM—is *always to be understood*. I will call this a rule, and ask my friend to show, if he can, that it affirms falsely. —[*Time expires*.

MR. LOGANS SIXTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, and LADIES AND Gentlemen: — To attempt to follow up my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, in all he has said, through all his windings and twistings and turnings, and along all his various circumlocutions, would not only be an almost endless job, but would be as profitless as it would be prolix. I shall therefore pass by the most he has said, only noticing such matters in his speech as I shall deem worthy of

notice, and attend to my own arguments. And in doing this I shall speak just as I please, without regard to what he or any one else may say.

In illustration of what I am contending for, and endeavoring to sustain, as to the mode of baptism, I shall make a quotation from Mark, where *baptizo* is translated "*wash*," in the common version; as the Lexicons give "*wash*" as one of the meanings of the word in the original, and as we hold and teach, that baptism is a *religious washing*; and bears a relation to the Christian religion similar to that of the *sprinklings* and *washings* of the Jewish law. The account reads:

"And when they [the Jews] come from the market, except they *wash* [*baptize*] they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the *washing* [*baptism*] of cups, and pots, brazen vessels and tables."—*Mark vii. 4.*

The *washing* here, and the *baptizing*, are the same in the original. Now what are we to infer from this, and what are the facts in the case? Are we to suppose that the Jews, when they came home from market, went to a pool or place of water sufficiently deep, and there *dipped* or *immersed*, themselves, sousing all over head and ears, before they would eat?! Why. reason and common sense, as well as what we know of their customs on such occasions, would forbid the idea. They were fearful of becoming *unclean*, by touching something with their *hands* at the market, that might *defile* them; and hence before they would eat, would *wash* their *hands*, lest they might swallow something unclean. But the *washing* is spoken of as if it was that of the whole person—"except *they wash* they eat not"—without specifying particularly that it was only their hands. The same form of expression is common among ourselves. How often is it the case, that we ask a person, before eating breakfast, "*have you washed?*"—meaning, have you washed your *face* and *hands*?—not whether they have washed the whole person all over. And as this partial *washing* of the person is here called a *baptism*, in the original, so the *washing of baptism*, in the New Testament, "*having your bodies washed with pure water*," and the baptism of water, may all be merely a *partied washing* of the person, in the *application* of the water of baptism to a proper subject. We have a striking illustration of this, in the case of the priests under the Jewish law. Before they could enter into the Tabernacle, and officiate, they had to *wash* their *hands* and their *feet* at the laver; and this is spoken of, as though it was a washing of the whole person. Says the Lord to Moses: "*Let them wash*, that they die not," when they came in to officiate. This *washing* here, (of the Jews when they came from market,) was effected, we find, by *pouring* water on the hands; and as it is called a *baptism* in the original, it is a proof, or illustration, of the mode of Christian baptism by *pouring*. This is confirmed by what the learned Mr. Sears, a Baptist, says on the washing of the hands of the Jews, on such occasions, by the *pouring* of water on them.

We also have an illustration of this *pouring* of water on the hands, in the case of Elisha and Elijah, the prophets of the Lord, in the Old Testament. where Jehosaphat was enquiring for a prophet of the Lord:

"But Jehosaphat said, 'is there not here a prophet of the Lord, that we may enquire of the Lord of him?' And one of the king of Israel's servants answered and said, 'here is Elisha the son of Shaphat, which *poured water on the hands* of Elijah.' And Jehosaphat said, 'the word of the Lord is with him.'"—*2 Kings iii. 11, 12.*

Here we see too that the water seems to have been used in a religious

manner. Again, Paul, in speaking of the ordinances of the Jewish law, says:

"Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers *washings* [*baptisms*] and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation."—*Heb. ix. 10.*

Here the *washings* and *baptisms* are the same in the original; and we have seen, not only that they are the same elsewhere, but that the *pouring* of water on the hands was one of these *washings* or ordinances.

I come now to the baptism of the Israelites, in crossing the Red Sea, as another scriptural example of baptism by *affusion*:

"Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all *baptized* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—*1 Cor. x. 1, 2.*

Here we have the example of the *baptism* of a *whole nation* at one time, men, women and children, It will be impossible for my friend to make it out a case of *immersion in water*; for we are informed, in the account we have of it in Exodus and elsewhere in the Old Testament, that the waters "were congealed," frozen, and stood in a heap, a wall of ice, on either side; and that the children of Israel went over "dry shod." And yet it was a *baptism*—they "were all *baptized* unto Moses"—and to constitute it such, the use, or application, of *water* was necessary. The Psalmist has informed us how it was done. Speaking of the salvation of Israel from the Egyptians, in crossing the Red Sea, he says:

"The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid; the depths also were troubled. The clouds *poured out water*: the skies sent out a sound: thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven: the lightnings lightened the world: the earth trembled and shook. Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy foot-steps are not known. Thou ledest *thy people* like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron."—*Psalms lxxvii 16 20.*

Here we have the manner, or *mode*, of this national baptism; and learn that it was both by *sprinkling* and *pouring*. In the rain, which the Lord caused to fall on them to *baptize* them, we have *sprinkling*; and "the clouds *poured out water*." The Israelites here took Moses as their leader, and their mediator between them and God; and were thus, by this *baptism*, solemnly dedicated to God by the Lord himself!

We will now notice the baptism of the Holy Ghost, at the house of Cornelius, as an example of baptism by *pouring*:

"While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision [the Jewish brethren who came with Peter] 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. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, '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.'"—*Acts x. 44-48.*

Here the Gentiles were *baptized* first with the Holy Ghost, by *pouring*; and this was made the evidence of their acceptance with God, and a test of their fitness for *water* baptism; and as the baptism of the Holy Ghost was by *pouring*, consequently to keep up the consistency, that of water must have been by *pouring* too. Notice, that the apostle says, "Who *can forbid water*;" that is, to be applied to them in "baptism. He does not say, "W he can *forbid them*"—to be *immersed* in the water; which he ought to have said, according to my friend's theory; but who can forbid *water*? According to the immersion theory of my worthy friend, he has to *apply*

the people to the water — not, the water to the people, according to Peter's language! If the water baptism at the house of Cornelius was that of *immersion*, according to him, then the language of Peter, "Who can forbid water?" — would have been perfectly absurd and nonsensical!

The case of the baptism of the Eunuch is the only one, in all the New Testament, where there is any *show* of immersion.

We are first told, that "the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, 'arise, and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, *which is desert.*'" Let the hearer notice here, that the country where Philip was commanded to go, was a *desert*, consequently could have had no streams, and must have been scarce of water. Now let us hear the account of the baptism:

"And as they went ON their way, they came unto a certain water: and the Eunuch said, 'see here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?' And Philip said. 'if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.' And he answered and said, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the Eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing," — *Acts viii. 36-39.*

I am aware, that a great deal is said about this case, by my friend and his brethren, and that great stress is laid upon it, by them and immersionists generally, as a proof text in favor of exclusive immersion. In fact, it is relied upon by them as one of their strong holds, a Gibraltar that cannot be taken! They harp upon the circumstance, that they "came to a certain *water*;" and ask triumphantly, how could they have gone any further, without getting *into* the water, without noticing that it was *after* they came to it, that the chariot was commanded to "stand still;" showing that when they came to it, they still seem to have gone a little further, before they were exactly at it! So here goes one of the "outposts" of their Gibraltar; and we will soon see that the place itself is easily taken. Now, as much as they rely upon these passages, as proving immersion, I will affirm that my friend, Mr. Sweeney, cannot prove that Philip *immersed* the Eunuch. I will give some reasons for this:

1. In the first place, it was, as we are expressly informed, and as I have shown from the sacred account itself a *desert* country, and contained no place of water, no stream or pool, where any one could be *immersed*. So that *immersion* was utterly out of the question. There might have been, and no doubt was, a *well* or some such place of water: so that while *affusion* could have been practiced, *immersion* was entirely out of the question. As to any *stream* of water there, I defy my friend to show or prove that there was one.

2. In the second place, the Greek particles here used, on which immersionists rely so much, as making this such a clear case of *immersion*, are susceptible of other renderings, as I have already shown, which will go against the idea. The expression, "they went down both (*eis*) into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him; and when they were come up (*ek*) out of the water," etc., can be as easily rendered, "they went down both (*eis*) to the water—and when they were come up (*ek*) from the water," etc. *Eis* often means merely *to*, and not always *into*; while *eh* often means merely *from*, and not always *out of*. So down comes this Gibraltar of immersion!

Taking all these circumstances into consideration, it is much more reasonable to suppose that they merely went down to the water, and Philip there baptized the Eunuch by *affusion*, and they then came up *from* the water. As *affusion* is as valid baptism as *immersion*, there was no necessity for the latter, and no reason to suppose that Philip would have *immersed* the Eunuch, when *affusion* would have done equally as well, and been far more convenient and advantageous in every way.

Then there is the case of the jailor at Philippi, who, and his family, were baptized by Paul and Silas. Let us see how the account of that reads, as we have it in the New Testament.

We learn, that there was a great earthquake, and that the foundations of the prison were shaken, and the doors were opened, and the bands of the prisoners were all loosed; and that the jailor, awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the doors open, drew his sword, and was about to kill himself, supposing that the prisoners had made their escape. But Paul called to him with a loud voice, and told him to do himself no harm, as they were all there. Then comes the account:

"Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them cut, and said, sirs, 'what must I do to be saved?' And they said: believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.' And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to ail that were in his house. And hi took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes: and was baptized, he and all his straightway. And when le had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

—Acts xvi. 29-34.

My friend, Mr. Sweeney, agrees with me here, that there was an *inner* and an *outer prison*. Now what are the facts in the case? The jailor brought Paul and Silas only from the inner to the outer prison, where he enquired of them what he must do, and they replied to him, as we have seen. I agree that they went where there was *water*; but that was in the jailor's house, where he "*washed their stripes*;" for it is immediately added, "*and was baptized, he and all his, straightway*," which shows very plainly that it was there the baptism took place. And they were never until then in the jailor's house. Besides, as I have before shown, if they left the prison walls, and went off to a river, pool, or some such place, then Paul must have *dissembled* the next morning, in refusing to leave the prison until brought out by the magistrates! Paul and Silas never left the prison, from the time they were put in, until the next morning. Nothing is clearer than this. And if the jailor and his family were baptized within the prison, in his house, and they were baptized there, as we see, it must have been by *affusion*, as *immersion* was entirely out of the question!

As to the *burial by baptism*, in Horn. vi. 3, 4, on which my friend lays so much stress, as an irrefutable proof (to him) of *immersion*, and on which he has labored so hard, and long, and manfully, but in vain; I have shown that it must have been a *spiritual baptism*. If a *literal* baptism in water, then the *death* must have been *literal* too, to preserve the consistency of the figure. It is utterly impossible for my friend to make it *part spiritual* or moral, and *part literal*.

So too as to the *burial in baptism*, in Col. ii. 12, on which immersionists lay as much stress, and seem to rely as much as on the passage in Romans, to prove exclusive immersion. I have already shown, that the circumstances in connection, and the expression, "wherein ye are *risen* with him

[Christ] through the *faith* of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead," show it to have been a *spiritual*, and *not* a *literal* baptism. If *water* baptism, according to my friend, then it is the arm of my friend, and not the *faith* of the subject, by which he is raised! The idea of *water* baptism here is absurd and ridiculous; but that of the spirit, perfectly sensible, reasonable and consistent with the connection and circumstances. We see that this baptism was all by Christ himself, and not by man: "In whom [Christ] 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*" —how? — "buried with him in baptism," etc. Here we are expressly told that this spiritual circumcision and the baptism are synonymous, or the same; and consequently must be both spiritual; and that it is effected by Christ himself, and made without human hands! But the baptism of my friend is performed by human hands; and will not agree with that of the apostle?, which is "*made without hands.*" As the subject has to be raised by *faith*, if water baptism he would have to remain under the water until drowned! If raised by human hands, as well as buried by them, according to the theory of my friend, then it ceases to be by faith; and the *figure* of the apostle is entirely *destroyed*! We see here again his *inconsistency*; as he must have the circumcision spiritual, and the burial *literal*! — while I am consistent, in contending for its being *all spiritual*.

I have shown from the case of Ananias and Paul, that the baptism of Paul, from all the circumstances connected with it, took place in the house, and that consequently it must have been by *affusion*, and *not* by *immersion*; as we have no account whatever of their leaving the house, and going any where else, until after the baptism was over. As to Paul's "standing up," as the correct rendering of the Greek word *anastas*, we have an illustration in Acts ii. 14: "But Peter, (*anastas*) *standing up* with the eleven," etc. Again, a somewhat similar passage, in Acts xiii, 16: "Then Paul (*anastas*) *stood up*, and beckoning with his hand said," etc. Again, Acts xv, 7:— "And when there had been much disputing, Peter *rose up* (*anastas, standing up,*) said unto them," etc. Acts xi, 28: "And there *stood up* one of them named Agabus," etc. Not only have we all these illustrations, showing the meaning of *anastas* here to be, "*standing up* be baptized," but the condition of Paul was such as to entirely preclude the idea of his being *immersed*. He had been three days and nights without eating or drinking any thing, without taking any nourishment; and his extreme debility of body entirely forbids the idea of his going off any where to be *immersed*. — And it is not until after he was baptized, that it is said: "And when he had *received meat*, he was *strengthened*."

In addition to the mass of testimony which I have produced in favor of baptism by *affusion*, in opposition to my friend's favorite theory of exclusive immersion, which he has been laboring so long and so hard to sustain, but in vain, I have that of the Rev. J. A. Sess, Lutheran minister, in his baptismal controversy with the Rev. Dr. Fuller, of the Baptist Church, on the Greek Lexicons. Mr. Sess has produced at least three original Greek Lexicons, sustaining *affusion* as valid baptism. He was a man who resided in the Greek Church, or among its members; and he testifies, that the priest baptized out of a *basin*, and of course by *affusion*. He resided among the Greeks in Constantinople; and says, that while there, in all the cases of baptism that came under his knowledge, he never even heard of a

single case of *total immersion!* And yet my worthy friend made the sweeping assertion, as you will all remember, that the *practice* of the Greek Church has always been that of exclusive *immersion!*

I must bestow a little attention to some things in my friend's last speech, before my time expires. He makes me misrepresent Dr. Wall, in the case of Novatian, by my making *Wall* say, that these were not the "most ancient" oases of baptism by affusion, but eases "out of," or from, the "most ancient." Now I said myself, as my remarks will show, that it was "out of" them, and did not represent Dr. Wall as making the assertion.

As to my having the *original* work of Origen in my possession, my friend certainly misunderstood me, as I meant no such thing. I *meant* that I had the *original* of what I read or referred to, in authentic extracts from Origen's work; just as he had, in the extracts that be read from those ancient authors, the "fathers."

As to my letting off a *tirade of abuse* upon Dr. Barclay, I did no such thing, as my remarks will show, and as my friend ought to know. Dr. Barclay was all the witness that he could adduce, out of the multitude of travelers who had visited Ænon, to show the existence of pools of water there, six feet deep; and I called upon my friend to adduce some others, corroborative of the Doctor's testimony; and he did not, and I believe that he cannot, produce a single witness to corroborate it! If there are such pools there, it is strange that they have never been mentioned by any other visitor to that famous place!

And as to Prof. Stuart, of Andover, Mass., I did not read from him to show the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as my friend has tried to make the impression in his speech. I referred to his work on that, as an evidence of his standing as a critic and Greek scholar; and then gave his rendering of the "much water" not being mentioned as necessary for *immersion*, but for the other purposes, which would be required by such vast multitudes of people, as resorted to the baptism of John. But I will ask here, if, as my friend affirmed, Stuart admitted that the meaning of the word *baptizo* was *immerse*, (and he also gave other meanings of the word, which my friend was careful to *omit*, as it did not happen to suit his cause!) why did he turn right around, in the same connection, and affirm, that as the application of the water to the subject, was the main thing in Christian baptism, *affusion* was as valid as *immersion!*—But my friend, to explain it, says that these great Greek scholars and critics were beset by a strange "hallucination" of mind, because they could not see the subject just as it appears to him; and he can see nothing but *immersion* in the word! Singular logic this! My friend himself is probably beset by just as strange a "hallucination" as they were, only of a different character!

My worthy friend has labored very hard to make me *endorse* the *references* of the Confession of Faith, so that with them and my little work on Baptism, he may *extort* out of me, the admission, that *water* baptism is meant in Bom. vi. 3. 4. and Col. ii. 12; and that consequently *immersion*, and immersion alone, is there taught as the true baptism! But his labor has been in vain! It will be remembered, I affirmed from the first, that while I was willing to accept the Confession itself, and ready to defend all it taught, I stated that I never regarded myself as bound to accept *references*, as they are arbitrary, and were put in after the work was made. It matters nothing about their being *copied* from the Old Presbyterian Confession of Faith. If left out

entirely, it would not change the body of the work at all, as that would still remain the same. Had these *references* been woven in the work, then they would have made a *part* of it; and in adopting it, I would have adopted them. But such was not the fact; and I am not *bound* to *endorse* or receive them, only as I choose to do so.

I have now about done with the speech of my friend. I have proven every point I wish to prove, and sustained every position I have advanced. As I remarked, in the outset of my reply, I shall not attempt to follow him in every thing he has said; as I have not time, and it would be useless and unprofitable. He no doubt thinks that he has refuted all I have advanced, and is exulting in his mind at his supposed victory! He is welcome to enjoy the supposition. I shall leave him to his own self-congratulation!—[*Time Expires.*]

MR. SWEENEY'S CLOSING SPEECH.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—This speech and the reply will bring the discussion on the action of baptism to a close. And, had not Mr. Logan reserved until so late in the discussion, several passages of Scripture very confidently relied on by him and his brethren, as affording some proof of *affusion*, I could have devoted most of the time allotted me for this speech, in recapitulating the argument. I will confess, that, in reserving these passages until so late that I could notice them but once, and that very briefly, my friend did manifest some *ingenuity*; but how much *fairness* let the audience judge and decide. I purposely offered my arguments, few in number, and in good time for my friend to refute them, if he could.

But I will briefly notice what was new, and demands my notice, in my friend's last speech.

I will notice Mark vii. 3,4; where the Pharisees and Jews are said to eat not except they wash their hands, and wash when they come from market before they eat, etc. The word *wash*, in this passage comes from *baptizo*. It occurs here three times; and can be, and, in a strictly literal translation, ought to be, translated *immerse*, or by its equivalent *dip*. Always, before eating, the Jews were wont to *baptize*, that is, *immerse* or *dip* their hands for their cleansing: "But when they come from the market [where their persons had been exposed to *blood*, they did more than simply wash—by dipping—their hands] except they *baptize* [their persons] they eat not." It was their practice, when they had been exposed to blood, to *dip* or *immerse* themselves, for the sake of washing; as did Naaman the leper. The word is used here, that is used in the Septuagint to express the action performed by Naaman in the Jordan. The Jews also *dipped* their "cups, pots, brazen vessels," etc., for their cleansing. I have shown, that "*baptizo* means *immerse*, and to *wash* only by *consequence*—"by a metonymy of the end."

But my friend went back some *two thousand* years, and found where Elijah had water poured on his hands by Elisha; and that was sufficient evidence to him, that the Jews always, down to our Savior's time, washed *only by pouring*! When Naaman was commanded to *wash* himself, what did he do?—went and *dipped* him seven times in the Jordan. He understood how to *wash* himself without *pouring*. But when our Savior washed the disciples feet, we learn that "he poureth water *into a basin*, and began

to wash the disciples' feet," etc. These passages show, not only that *basins* were in use among the Jews, but that they washed by *dipping*. To say that, when the Jews "come from the market, except they *dip*, or *immerse* themselves in water, they eat not," makes good sense, and is just the meaning of the passage. But to say, "except they *sprinkle*, they eat not!"—or, "except they *pour*, they eat not!"—makes nonsense! Mr. Logan wants to find some authority for *sprinkling* or *pouring*. *Washing* is not his practice. One who has been *immersed*, has had his "body washed;" but not so with one who has only had his *forehead moistened*!

My friend refers us again to the "divers washings [baptisms]" of Heb. ix. 10. I have simply to say, in reply to him here, that these "divers baptisms" refer, not to the *rantisms*, but to the "divers baptisms" of the former dispensation. Did my friend deny that there were *divers immersions or dippings* under that dispensation? He did not—he dare not. Then how can he get an argument here?

He finds "in the baptism of the Israelites" another "example of baptism by affusion!" I know not what to look for next! I guess he will find in the case of Naaman, or in Rom. vi. chap., "an example of baptism by affusion," before he is done ' Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2: "Our fathers were all *under* the cloud, and all passed *through* the sea; and were all *baptized* [immersed] unto Moses, *in* the cloud and *in* the sea." Notice—they were baptized "in the cloud and in the sea." The sea being on either side, and the cloud above them, they were completely *overwhelmed*, *immersed*. And my friend gives us this as "an example of baptism by affusion!" Well, I suppose he could say, "Such as I have give I thee!" But he says, they went through "dry shod." Well, that is what I had supposed about it. But how could that be, if the "clouds *poured* out water" upon them? Now, I have repeatedly said, that, there could be a *baptism* without a drop of water. I do not suppose that the water touched the Israelites at all. The cloud was above, and the sea on either side of them — they passed through, and were overwhelmed "*in* the sea and *in* the cloud." It would be amusing to see my worthy friend try to show, that the passage he cited from the Psalms, (where it is said "the clouds poured out water,") has any reference to the case in hand. It has no more reference to this case than it has to the *flood* of Noah's time! But if, in the world's history, there has been any water — or any thing else — "poured," or "sprinkled" my friend will have it in this discussion, in order to prove affusion! But, admitting for mere argument's sake, that this case of the "clouds pouring out water," etc., took place at the passage of the Red Sea, by the Israelites, what then? Why, it would be a storm of lightning, thunder and rain, sent by the Lord to *complete* the *destruction* of the Egyptians, after the Israelites had all passed over safely! The cloud that overshadowed the Israelites, was not a rain cloud at all, as we expressly learn. It was a "*pillar* of cloud by day," spread as a canopy above them in the "wilderness," or desert, of Arabia, to shield and protect them from the scorching heat of the sun, and "a *pillar* of fire by night," to give them light. It was also a *guide* to them in their sojournings; for we learn, that their movements were governed by it; as the cloud moved they took up their tents and moved, and where that stopped, they stopped too, and remained with it. Their *baptism* was a figurative, or metaphorical

baptism, "in the cloud and in the sea," without a drop of water falling upon them.

My friend goes again to the house of Cornelius; and shows that Holy Ghost baptism is a *pouring*. Why, did he not, on last evening, take the ground, that the *burial* of Rom. vi. ch. and Col. ii. ch. was Holy Ghost baptism? Did he not admit that it was *immersion*? How he sheds light as he goes! I have shown:

1. There is no *literal pouring* of the Spirit. You may as well talk literally of *pouring out* God himself, as He is Spirit! My friend admits this.

2. The "*shedding*" or "*pouring*" of the Holy Spirit, *is nowhere called a baptism*. The *minds* of all persons, who have ever been the subjects of the baptism of the Spirit, were completely *whelmed* in, or imbued with the power and knowledge, or wisdom of God; so that they "*received power*" to speak in tongues hitherto unknown to them, and to perform miracles. What is *figuratively* called a *pouring* is not that which is called the *baptism*, of the Holy Spirit. The Savior, in promising that baptism, said to his apostles: "But ye shall *receive power*, AFTER that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," etc. This "*receiving power*" is what is styled the *baptism* of the Spirit; and was "*after*" the *pouring*, or *coming* of the Spirit. The fact is, that we have but *two* instances of this baptism on record in the whole New Testament; *one* on the day of Pentecost, on the occasion of the opening of the kingdom of Christ to the Jews; and the *other* at the house of Cornelius, on that of opening it to the Gentiles; and they were both *miraculous*; consequently, we can have no such thing now. Besides, and which should settle the question of that baptism, where the subject of baptism is mentioned in the New Testament, the *baptism* of the Holy Spirit was a *promise*, and to be administered by Christ himself—"he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit"—and a *promise* cannot be *obeyed*; while all the other cases of baptism recorded, as in Rom. vi. 3, 4, Col. ii. 12, etc., were in *obedience* to the *command* of Christ and his apostles. This, if nothing else, should settle the question, and does settle it in the minds of all unprejudiced persons.

But my friend says, the baptism of the Spirit "is an *evidence* of acceptance with God," and of "fitness for water baptism." Was it such to the apostles, on the day of Pentecost? Is it such to infants? What a miserable farce!

One more little thing I must notice again, before proceeding to recapitulate the argument; and that is concerning the "*references*" in my friend's creed. I have shown that his Confession of Faith manufacturers, *when* they extracted his Confession from the Old Presbyterian Confession—*not afterwards*, as he would have you believe—referred the reader to Rom. vi. 3, 4, to prove their doctrine of *water baptism*. And hence it is the sense of his creed, that that passage refers to *water baptism*. And my friend, Mr. Logan, says: "if it does then it is *immersion*!" Now, either *his creed*, or *he*, one, is wrong here; or Rom. vi. 3, 4, refers to *water baptism*, and to *immersion at that*. This is the dilemma my friend is in before this audience; and he evidently feels it. Every word therefore he says against my saying that this passage refers to *water baptism*, is equally against the founders of his sect; and the founders of every sect known to him or myself, the Quakers only excepted, who reject all *water baptism*. He says,

if the *references* were "left out entirely, it would not change the body of the work." Well, it would only leave "the body of the work," as the most of it is *in fact* — *without any proof!* I shall now proceed to briefly recapitulate the argument:

I. I appealed first to the Greek writers, who wrote before, in the time of, and after Christ, to learn the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, as *baptize*, in the common version of the Bible, is merely *baptizo* anglicized, and not translated. The meaning of every word must ultimately be settled by an appeal to its *use* among the writers and speakers in the language to which it belongs. This is a law, if you please, to which even the Lexicographers are subject. We found that all Greek writers used the word *baptizo* in the sense of *immerse* or its equivalent, and never in the sense of *sprinkle* or *pour* once. I called upon my friend to show where any one, writing in the Greek language, ever used the word in any other sense than that of *immerse*. This he failed to do—in fact, he did not attempt to do it. He was the man to do it, if it could be done. But he *failed*, and his failure here was certainly fatal to his cause. He claimed, however, that the Jews, and our Savior, used this word, in a "religious," an "appropriated," and "different" sense from that attached to it by "classic Greek writers." This (call it yourself) I exploded by an appeal to Josephus, the *Jew*; and to *Christian* writers in Greek, showing that they used the word precisely as the Greeks themselves. He then said, that "words *change* their meanings." This I showed, was true only of *living* languages. *Baptizo* in Greek, was used in the sense for which I contend, as long as the Greek language was spoken. *Every body*, in our Savior's time, understood *baptizo* to mean *immerse*. Then when our Savior told his apostles, to go, teach the nations, *baptizing* them, *how would they understand* him? The answer is in your minds.

II. I appealed, in the second place, to the Lexicons, all on my friend's side of the question, *practically*. They, with great unanimity, give *immerse*, or its equivalent, as the meaning of *baptizo*; and with but *two* exceptions, *both quite modern*, they give *immerse* as the *primary* meaning of the word. The very best that Mr. Logan could do here, was to show that *wash* is given by the Lexicons, as a secondary meaning of *baptizo*. But this I showed, was not given by any, but the two excepted as any thing more than a secondary or tropical meaning. I showed that some of these Lexicons were so particular as to add—when they define *baptizo* to mean *wash*—"*by consequence*." *Wash* is the meaning of *baptizo*, only as washing is the *effect* or *consequence* of *dipping* in pure water. So, "*color*" is given as its meaning, simply as it is the consequence of *dipping* in a dye. *But not one of all Lexicons gives sprinkle or pour as even a remote meaning of baptizo*. Here again, my friend's failure was one that was fatal to his cause?

III. In the third place, I introduced many learned and "honest Quakers;" and it would seem that my friend has been, at least, "*courting*" in the family; and they all tell us, with great unanimity, that *baptizo* means *immerse*, and their *Holy Spirit* baptism is *immersion*; and not only so, but they tell us, that when *water* baptism was *practiced*, it was *immersion* only. This testimony derives its importance from the fact, that the witnesses may be regarded as *disinterested* in our controversy; and therefore *impartial* witnesses.

IV. In the fourth place, I showed, that until recently, Pedobaptists themselves admitted that the *ancient manner* of baptizing was by *immersion*; that the meaning of *baptizo* is simply *immerse*; that *affusion* was introduced by the Church, A. D. 251; and that it rests simply upon the *authority* of the Church. Here my friend made quite a struggle. He finally concluded, that he would try to *insinuate* something against the book from which I read so many extracts. I read from Booth's work on Baptism, a book *one hundred years old*; and that has been read and reviewed before *hi*, was born; but the *correctness* of Mr. Booth's *quotations* have never been questioned by any of his opponents. It is quite an easy matter to *say* that Mr. Booth quotes incorrectly; but a little more difficult to *prove* that he did. Now I hold my friend at defiance, to show wherever Mr. Booth has been accused of *misquoting* authors, even by an opponent. Mark the prediction, that *he will not attempt to do it*.

V. In the next place, I showed, that in the Greek language, there are fitting words to express the *actions* my friend is contending for, *sprinkling*, *pouring*, etc., and that they were *never used* by the Savior himself, or any inspired writer, when speaking of the rite of baptism. *Baptizo*, as I have certainly shown, means *immerse*. My friend will not deny it. No Greek scholar will say, that it means *pour* or *sprinkle*. *Cheo*, another word altogether, means *pour*; and *rantizo*, still another, means *sprinkle*. Now *every time* the rite in question is referred to literally in the New Testament, *baptizo* is used. Strange—passing strange—this indeed, if my friend is right. And if baptism is simply “a *washing*, without reference to mode,” then why did not the Savior use *louo*, which means *wash*?” This argument my worthy friend never even noticed! I suppose that he thought it merited no reply, of course!

VI. My next argument was drawn from the expressions, “*baptized of him in Jordan*” and, “*baptized of him in the river of Jordan*.” These passages beautifully harmonize with the *meaning* of the word *baptizo*, and imply *immersion*. My friend's twistings and turnings here are doubtless fresh in your memories yet! But did he give us a satisfactory reason for John's baptizing *in the river*, upon the supposition, that he *sprinkled* the people? Or did he satisfy you, that it is *not true*, that John did baptize *in the river*? I think not. Now what sense is there, in talking about people's being “*sprinkled in a river*?” — or “*poured in a river*?” *Nonsense!* But is it sensible to say, they were “*immersed in the river*?” I think it is—and such was the case, as the *meaning* of *baptizo*, and all the attendant circumstances abundantly show.

VII. My seventh argument was drawn from the record of our Savior's baptism, Matthew says: “And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *out of the water*.” True, “*out of*” here comes from *apo*, which means primarily *from*; yet it often means “*out of*,” as here rendered; and this is one of the instances, in which it does, as I showed from the fact, that Mark says: Jesus was baptized of John *in Jordan*.” Whether or not my friend, Mr. Logan, refuted this argument, I am willing this people shall judge and decide.

VIII. My *eighth* argument was drawn from the reason given for John's baptizing at a certain place, as follows: “John was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, *because there was much water there*.” I am perfectly willing to submit this argument, with all that has been said on it, to the audi-

ence; with the request that they notice particularly that the existence of "much water there," is given as the reason of John's baptizing at that place, which was necessary for *immersion*, but by no means for *affusion*, which requires but "little water."

IX. My ninth argument was based upon the record of the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch. Here we find, that Philip and the Eunuch "came unto a certain water;" and after they had come to the water, they went down, both into the water;" and he baptized him; and they came "up out of the water." I shall not have time to repeat my remarks upon "into," and "out of." Suffice it to say, that I asked my friend to show a single instance, in all the Greek language, where *ek* (translated "out of" here) means simply "from." He never attempted to do it! We had all sorts of twisting and turning here; but my argument stands untouched. By the way, I am reminded, just now, that my friend, in his last speech, said there was no stream of water in that country. Now I say, that any school-boy in this town, can show upon the map of the country, that there are several streams of considerable size, crossing the rout from Jerusalem to Gaza. But if my friend proves there was no water there, he will not only correct all History and Geography, but he will have the Holy Spirit in a close place! For it language can do that thing, the Spirit has said that which implies that there was considerable water there. But I will submit this argument also, without further remarks.

X. My tenth argument is, that the Scripture explanations of baptism, show it to be *immersion*. Paul says, Rom. vi, 4: "We are buried with him [Christ] by baptism;" and, Col. ii, 12: "Buried with him in baptism." These passages explain baptism to be *immersion*. All the fathers understood these passages as I do. No man ever attempted to explain them away, or to *spiritualize* them, as my worthy friend has done, until very recently—until since men have begun to try to find Bible authority for *affusion*! My friend here got himself into a most desperate condition, in his attempt to *spiritualize* these passages! He took strong ground against all the creeds and commentators, not excepting his own creed, which he is sworn to defend! And not only so, he admitted "Spirit baptism" to be *immersion*, after arguing for a whole day, that it was *pouring*! He got completely lost here; as was perfectly apparent to the audience. But it now occurs to me, that my friend made a new twist on the passage in Col. ii, 12, in his last speech, which I must notice here. He says: "Baptism here is the *Spiritual circumcision*, which is made without hands — it cannot be water baptism." This is the argument, as I understand it. Now, I deny, that the "circumcision" of the 11th verse, is the baptism of the 12th. It is a work in the heart, that is done "without hands;" and precedes the baptism. I wonder if my friend will argue, that "Holy Ghost baptism" is the "*spiritual circumcision*," when we come to the infant baptism question? We shall see whether he will or not. Now, let it be observed, that I have shown first, and beyond all controversy, that the word always used by Christ and his apostles, where speaking literally of the rite in question, means *immerse*. My worthy opponent has made no attempt to prove, that it means *sprinkle* or *pour*. Then, when we came to the Bible, I had only to show, that all passages found there, referring to baptism, were in harmony with the unvarying meaning of the word. Has my friend produced a single passage, containing the word *baptize*, that will

not admit of translating that word *immerse*? He certainly has not. He undertakes to prove *sprinkling* or *pouring* by the Bible, in *direct opposition to the unvarying meaning of the word*. Has he produced one single passage of Holy Writ, which *necessarily* implies *pouring* or *sprinkling* as baptism? Notone! Have I not produced several passages that *imply immersion*, and where the substitution, or supposition, of *sprinkling* would make *nonsense*?

But what has my worthy respondent been doing, during the discussion of this proposition? He has neither been still nor silent. He has been "*dodging*" all the while; and engaged in attempting to evade the force of my arguments! He has told us that the Holy Spirit is said to be "*poured out*," and "*shed*" on us, etc. We knew this before; but it was no proof that *baptizo* therefore means *pour*. But he says, Holy Ghost baptism is a *pouring* — that what is called a *pouring* in one place is elsewhere called a *baptism*! But in this my friend is simply mistaken. Then again, to avoid *immersion* in water, he says, "if Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12, refer to *water* baptism, then it is *immersion*;" but he proves that those passages refer to spirit baptism, thus making Spirit baptism *immersion*!

Then again, he tried to prove that Paul was "baptized standing up;" and *in the house*, at that; but did he *prove* it? I am perfectly willing that his effort, with my reply, shall be submitted to the judgment and decision of this audience.

When he made his last effort to prove that the jailor was baptized in the house, I thought I could see that he was conscious he was failing; and I am certain that the audience saw it.

Then Ie went to another passage, in 1 Cor. x. 1, that says, our fathers "*were baptized in the cloud and in the sea*," to prove baptism by *affusion* '.

But now I must close, and will do so, beloved friends, by exhorting you, as you prefer *pure gold* to *suspected currency*, to be baptized, that is, *immersed* — all you who, as penitent believers, have not "*obeyed the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*," by having been "*buried with Christ in baptism*," in order to rise and walk in newness of life. Then you will have no misgivings, as to whether you have been baptized, or not. Even Mr. Logan will then have to admit, that you are properly baptized. And still better, you can then say, I have been "*buried with Christ in baptism*:" I have had my "*body washed with pure water*." This you can never say in truth, until you are *immersed* in water, "*in the name of Jesus Christ*."—[*Time expires*.

MR. LOGAN'S CLOSING REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—As I am now on my closing speech on this proposition, I shall take my own course, in the remarks I have to offer, and not attempt to follow up my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, in what he has been advancing, any further than I see proper. As I am on the *negative* of the proposition, it has not been my business to *affirm*, but that of my friend, and mine to deny. He has had to *affirm* and *prove*. I have been under no obligation to either affirm or prove any thing. How far he has sustained himself, in trying to prove his theory of exclusive immersion, this intelligent audience will be able to judge.

My friend has had great use for Mr. Booth, often quoted from him, and seemed to rely greatly upon his authority, as to the extracts he made from him. But let me here say that all Pedobaptists call Booth in question, and accuse him of *garbling* the extracts he makes from the different authors he has quoted. Authority of such character as this, it would seem to me, is very doubtful, and not much to be relied on. The authorities I have quoted from, if they *are* on my own side of the question, as my worthy friend charges, are such as are *reliable*, and to be depended on, and are generally received as such.

My friend, as you will recollect, called on me to produce the original work of Origen, from which I read, or to which I referred, in the case of Elijah's baptizing the altar; as I affirmed, as before stated, that I had the *original* of what I referred to. Now! did not mean, as I have said, that I had the *original work* itself of Origen, containing the extracts, but what was equivalent, the extracts themselves as quoted fairly and correctly from Origen's work. I trust that this statement will be satisfactory, and settle the matter, without further notice.

My friend has attempted, according to my understanding of the drift of his remarks, to call Prof. Stuart's authority in question, on the subject on which I quoted him. He quotes him as saying that *baptizo* means to *immerse*; and then, because Stuart admits *affusion* to be valid baptism, he turns right around and says that he was beset by a strange "hallucination" of mind, a sort of mental aberration, I suppose, that would invalidate his testimony, and cause it to be called in question!

I adverted to the case of Paul's baptism, as you recollect, and showed that the proper rendering of the passage is "*standing up, be baptized,*" etc. Against this my friend adduced the case of Peter, at Joppa, on the housetop, when told by the Spirit, "*Arise, therefore, and get thee down,*" etc. Now the cases are not analogous, and his quotation here will not do, as an illustration of the use of *anastas*, in Paul's case. Paul was not told to arise, and get down, or go any where, but to "*be baptized,*" and his baptism immediately followed his arising, or "*standing up,*" as that was the next thing he was commanded to do. The facts of the case, and the circumstances, correspond too precisely with this: "*and he received sight, and arose, and was baptized.*" (Acts ix. 18.)

My friend, I must say, did not read or quote Dr. Wall fairly, as to the case of Novatian. According to his representation of it, Wall is made to say that the case of Novatian, A. D. 251, was the *most ancient one* on record of baptism by *affusion*; whereas, Wall says, that he would give two or three *of* the most ancient, that is, *out of* the most ancient, which would be only a short time after the time of John the apostle. Dr. Wall, vol. ii, page 386 says—[Here Mr. Sweeney objected to reading from Wall, as introducing new matter, which he could not reply to, and as against the rules of the debate.] Well, it was only about 100 years after the apostles, we find baptism by *affusion* spoken of as practiced. So you see, that my friend has been guilty of *garbling* from Wall, in these matters.

As my worthy friend has made a rule for *immersion*, I could as well make one for baptism by *affusion*, that would be just as good, and hold equally as well; but there is no need for me to do so.

You will recollect, that I tried very hard to get my friend to the *Bible*, and that it was a long time before I could get him to come to it; though I

told him that this question would have to be decided by the Bible at last. But he refuses, as you have seen, to take the English Scriptures as the whole testimony to decide this question, while I am willing to abide by them, as far as I am concerned. He must have the Greek writers, and the Lexicons, and the Quakers, and I know not what all, lugged into the controversy, to help him out; when it has to be decided by the *Bible* at last! Well, he must take his own course, go his own way, and abide the consequences.

We have another illustration of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, in the 3d chapter of John, in the nocturnal conference of Nicodemus, the Jewish ruler, with our Savior. Our Savior told him, that, "except a man be *born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Being perplexed to understand this new birth, our Savior said to him again: "Except a man be *horn of water and of the Spirit*, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Here we have this spiritual baptism presented under a figure of the birth—that a man must be *born of the Spirit* before he can enter the kingdom of God. Hence our Savior said still further to Nicodemus: 'That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is *born of the Spirit*, is spirit"—it is the flesh that is born of the flesh, and the *spirit* of man which is *born of the Spirit* of God. And again: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and you hear the sound there of, but cannot tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Here we have beautifully and forcibly presented this baptism of the Holy Ghost, for which I am contending, under the figure of the new birth.

My worthy friend has had a good deal to say about our Confession of Faith; and has labored hard to make me accept the scriptural *references* in it, so that he may force me by it and my little work on Baptism, to acknowledge his theory of exclusive *immersion*. Now I have already said, as you have heard, that while I am willing to receive and defend all contained in the Confession, I do not consider myself bound to receive the *references*, any further than as I choose to do so. I am perfectly willing to endorse all it teaches on the subject of *water baptism*; but am not bound to receive the *references* made in it, on that subject. As this is my closing speech, and my friend will have no opportunity to reply, I will get him to answer just now from the floor this question, if he will: Do you endorse the references in your reference Bible, as of equal authority and importance with the body of the word? [Here Mr. Sweeney replied: "I do not; but if those references had been put there by the same men, and at the same time, with the body of the work, as in the case of your creed, then I would endorse references and all, or none at all."] You discover that my friend refuses to answer directly the question. He always manages to evade the plain question put to him!

As to the case of Cornelius, while Peter asked: "Who can *forbid water*, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"—there is not a single word said about the *quantity of water* to be used, but merely, "who can forbid water? —showing that the water had to be brought to the subjects of baptism, and not that they had to go, or be carried to the water! The baptism seems to have been administered right there, in the house of Cornelius, where they heard Peter's preaching; where the Holy Ghost was poured out on them; and where they were converted to God. This is plain from ail the circumstances; for just as

soon as the Spirit was poured out on them, showing their acceptance with God, Peter asks the question, "who can forbid water?"—and it is immediately added: "And he commanded them to *be baptized* in the name of the Lord"—every circumstance going to show that the baptism was by *affusion*, and *not* by *immersion*.

I have also shown you, that the baptism, mentioned in Col. ii. 12, was a *spiritual*, and not a *water* baptism; and that the "*burial* in baptism," has no reference whatever to *immersion* in water; and that this is plainly shown by the expression that follows: "Wherein ye are risen with him *through the faith* of the operation of God, who hath raised him [Christ] from the dead." As the *raising* was by faith, the *burial* must have been of the same character; and consequently neither of them literal, but ail of it moral or *spiritual*. But my friend denies that the circumcision and baptism are identically the same; and says that the circumcision *precedes* the baptism. He must have forgotten what Paul says in Rom. ii. 29, about this circumcision: "But he is a Jew, which is one *inwardly*; and *circumcision* is that of the *heart, in the Spirit*, and not in the letter [law]; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Now here we have the circumcision to which my friend refers. But that in Col. ii. 11, is evidently the same with the baptism of the 12th verse, as the context shows: "In whom [Christ] 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 Christy* How? By the *spiritual* baptism: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God," etc. And now notice what follows, confirming the views I have given of these passages: "And you, being *dead in your sins*, and the *uncircumcision* of your flesh, hath he *quickened* [made *spiritually alive*] together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." This shows the whole—the circumcision, baptism, and all—to be *spiritual*; and that there is no literal, or *water* baptism about it at all! My friend has labored very hard to get *water* baptism in Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12, so as to prove his theory of exclusive immersion; but all in vain, as he has not been able to get *water* into either at all!

I come now to make some *recapitulation* of my replies to the arguments of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, on this proposition, though I have already anticipated much of it by what I have been saying.

I have shown you that the word *baptizo* does not mean *immerse*, and that exclusively, to the rejection of any other meanings; but that it also means, not only to *dip, submerge, overwhelm*, etc., but to *wash, purify, cleanse*, and even *sprinkle*. This I have shown from several Greek Lexicons I quoted from, of high authority. And nearly every Lexicon gives it an *appropriated* meaning, as used in the New Testament in reference to the rite of Christian baptism, different from that of its use by the Greek writers. My friend has endeavored to show, that *two* of these Lexicons, that define the word in the sense for which I am contending, those of Wall and Greenfield, are of quite recent date and modern origin; so as to invalidate their testimony, by showing that they define the word so to favor baptism by *affusion*. But I affirm that they are not so modern, and of such recent date, as he would have us believe, but can rank as to antiquity and authority, with the most of those from which he has quoted. I have shown from the Lexicons, that there were various modes of *washing* contained in

the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as by *pouring*, *sprinkling*, etc. The leading idea in the word is that of *washing*, *purifying*, *cleansing*, etc., and *sprinkling*, *pouring*, etc. the *modes*. I have given you good authorities for *sprinkling* and *pouring* as meanings of the word, as used in the New Testament, in reference to the rite of Christian baptism.

I have also shown you, that Mr. Carson, the great Baptist authority, says that all the Lexicons are against him here, in his definition of the word, as meaning primarily to *immerse*; and shown you that some of the Lexicons give *immerse* as the *secondary* meaning of *baptizo*. I have also shown you, that Mr. Carson says, the Greek particle *apo*, rendered "out of" the water, implies no more than that John and Christ went to the *edge* of the Jordan—to the *edge* of the *water*—leaving the inference that the baptism was by *affusion*. He acknowledges that there is no authority for John and Christ going *into* the water; and admits that the expression, "in Jordan," implies all the space within the banks, including the *beach*, and "bars" as we call them.

I have shown you, that our Savior, in using the word *baptizo* to denote the rite of Christian baptism, chose a word that did not convey the idea of exclusive *immersion*, but that meant to *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*, etc. My friend contended that Josephus, the Jewish historian, used *baptizo* in the same sense in which our Savior used it; and that as Josephus used it in the sense of *immerse*, consequently our Savior must have used it in the same sense. But I have shown you, that Josephus used the word in precisely the same manner and in the same sense, in which the Pagan Greek, writers used it; and, that consequently his testimony is entitled to no peculiar weight here, and ranks no higher than that of any of those writers.

I admit that Mr. Wesley said as my friend affirmed, in his note on Rom. vi. 3, 4, that "the ancient manner of baptizing was by immersion;" but what does that signify? We know, and my friend is bound to acknowledge, that Mr. Wesley also believed in, and practiced by *affusion*, as well as by *immersion*. He held our views on the subject, that *sprinkling*, *pouring* and *immersion* were all valid *modes* of baptism; as the *application* of the water to the subject was the main thing in baptism.

My worthy friend tells you, that *immersion* is the *pure gold*, and exhorts you to accept that; while, I suppose, *sprinkling* and *pouring* are the "base metal," the counterfeit currency, to be rejected. Really, we should be under great obligations to him, for graciously giving us this important information! But we are willing to leave the decision of that matter to the audience, without his aid. I will merely affirm, that he has not been able yet, with all his labors and investigations, to show one clear, unequivocal case of *immersion* as baptism, in the whole Bible; and the Bible, as I have said again and again, is to decide this question at last. I am perfectly willing to be governed by its authority, and to abide its decision. [Here Mr. Logan said, that though he had seven minutes of time left, he would close.]

SECOND PROPOSITION.

The Infants of Parents, one or both of which are Believers, are Scriptural Subjects of Christian Baptism.

[MR. LOGAN AFFIRMS.]

Gentlemen Moderators, and Ladies and Gentlemen: — As I am the affirmant on this proposition, it devolves upon me to open the discussion, which I shall do in my own manner, and pursue the course in discussing it, that I shall deem to be most eligible. You have heard the proposition read, that “the *infants* of parents, one or both of which are believers, are scriptural subjects of Christian baptism.” This is what I have agreed to affirm, and which I shall endeavor to prove. Some advocates of infant baptism affirm that *all* infants are scriptural subjects of baptism; but my position is, as you have heard, that it is only those of *believing parents*, where one or both of the parents are believers, that are scriptural subjects of the ordinance. The difference between, them and myself, however, is one of minor importance; for if they are fight, I am consequently right too, as their position embraces or covers mine.

In the discussion of this proposition, I shall go to the *Bible*, and that alone, to decide the question; as that Divine volume is the great arbiter, which must settle all religious questions. If they can stand that test, then they will do; if they cannot, then they are worthless, and of no more value than “sounding brass or tinkling cymbal.”

We find that infants were placed from the very first in the Church; and are therefore scriptural subjects of Christian baptism; which is an ordinance belonging to the Church; and consequently they must be proper and legitimate subjects of it, as much so as any others. I shall begin with the covenant which God made with Abraham; and from that point argue their right to membership. In Genesis we read as follows on this subject:

“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 Abraham; for, a father of many nations have I made thee And I will make thee exceedingly 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 thy 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.”—Gen. xvii. i.8.

Here we find the Lord making a *covenant* with Abraham, which we learn was to be “an *everlasting covenant*”—betweea the Lord and him. and his posterity after him, “in their generations.” And we find that the

Lord changed his name from Abram to *Abraham*, which means "a father of many nations." Now we learn from Paul, that this covenant was never abrogated or annulled:

"Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's *covenant*, yet it it be *confirmed*, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham land 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, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect"—Gal. iii. 15,17.

Now, here we are positively told by the apostle Paul, that this covenant was "confirmed of God in Christ;" was never annulled by the Jewish law, or any thing else; and was consequently extended on down to the Christian dispensation, so as to include that; which was merely an enlargement and remodelling of the same covenant. Paul has also given us the *confirming* of this covenant:

"For when God made *promise* to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear 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 show 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 on the hope set before us," etc.—Heb. vi. 13,18.

Here we are informed, not only that this covenant was extended *from* Abraham on down, so as to embrace the Christian dispensation, but that it was *confirmed* by the *promise* and *oath* of God, "*two immutable things*, in which it was impossible for God to lie."

And as every covenant of God with man has its *seal*, so has this, which is described as follows:

"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* [seal] 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 the 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."—Gen. xvii. 9, 14.

Here we see that the token or *seal* of this covenant, which God made with Abraham, was *circumcision*. As I have affirmed, that every covenant God has made with man, has a *seal* belonging to it, we have a forcible *illustration* in the case of Noah, after the Deluge. The Lord said to him:

"And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, 'And I, behold, I *establish my covenant* with you, and with your seed after you,' etc. 'And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.' And God said.

'This is the *token* [seal] of the *covenant* which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I *do set my Bow in the cloud*, and it shall be for a *token* of a covenant between me and the earth.'"—Gen. ix. 8-12.

Here we have the *rainbow* as the *seal* of the *covenant* between God and Noah, that He would never again destroy the world with a Deluge. And this covenant has remained from that time down to the present. And thus

we have *circumcision* as a *seal* of the *covenant* which God made with Abraham: and we have seen that Paul says, this covenant was not to be annulled, or added to, by man—by mere human authority. Now let us hear what Paul says on this seal of circumcision. After saying, "that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness," while in uncircumcision, he says:

"And he received the *sign* of *circumcision*, a SEAL of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the *father* of all that *believe*, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised."—Rom. iv. 11, 12.

Here Paul calls circumcision a *sign* and a *seal* of Abraham's righteousness of faith; and consequently, as we have seen, of the covenant God made with Abraham, and his posterity. In proof that this covenant was to be continued, extended and enlarged so as to embrace the Christian dispensation, we have the testimony of both Peter and Paul. Peter at the beautiful Gate of the Temple, a short time after Pentecost, said to the Jews:

"Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the *covenant* which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed [Christ] shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."—Acts iii. 25.

And Paul to the Galatians, when on the same subject, and in the same chapter in which he speaks of this covenant not being annulled, or added to, as we have already seen and quoted:

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ: their is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus: and if ye be Christ's, *then are ye Abraham's seed*, and *heirs according to the promise*."—Gal. iii. 26—29.

That is, "heirs according to the promise" God made to Abraham, when he made the covenant with him, and the promise to him, that through his seed, "which is Christ," all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

After God had made this "everlasting covenant" with Abraham, and given circumcision as the "token," or sign and seal of it, we are told:

"And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house; and *circumcised* the flesh of their foreskin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him." Gen. xvii. 23.

Now here we have the beginning of this covenant, which God made with Abraham, with the "token" or seal of it. We find that *circumcision* was an *outward sign* of this covenant, a *mark* placed in the flesh, to distinguish the descendants of Abraham; and of such importance, that every male *uncircumcised* was to be *cut off* from among the people! And as all these things were of a *typical* character, circumcision must have had its antitype, or counterpart, in the Christian dispensation.

I am aware that my worthy opponent and his friends, in order to evade the argument here in favor of infant membership in the Church, contend that this *covenant* which God made with Abraham, merely embraced *temporal blessings*, and extended no further; and that it has nothing to do with the Christian dispensation, which is embraced by an entirely new covenant, that took the place of the old covenant, which was done away by our Savior. Now while I am willing to acknowledge, that the Abrahamic covenant embraced *temporal blessings*, as we have seen, I contend at the same time

that it also embraced *spiritual blessings*. This I have already dearly shown, from several passages I have quoted from the New Testament. One of the principal and most important *promises* pertaining to it, which God made Abraham, was, that "*through his seed.*" which Paul says "was Christ," *all the nations of the earth should be blessed.*" Hence we find that Christians, as we have seen, are called the "*children of Abraham,*" in reference to his faith and this. Let us hear what the apostle further says, on this subject:

"Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the *children of Abraham,* 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."—Gal. iii. 6—9.

And Paul says again, (Rom. ix. 8,) "*the children of the promise* are counted for seed." These scriptures are sufficient. Thus we have "line upon line," in both the Old Testament and the New, going to establish the *identity* of the Abrahamic and the Christian covenants, and showing them to be one and the same, based upon the same promise, and embracing the same spiritual blessings.

I shall now proceed with my argument. I affirm then, that as *children* were *members* of the Abrahamic and Jewish Church, the *seal* of which was *circumcision*; so they are members of the Christian Church, the *seal* of which is *baptism*. Both the Jewish and Christian Churches are based upon the *same covenant*, that which God made with Abraham. Hence the Christian is only the enlargement and remodelling of the Jewish. And before you can exclude children from the Christian Church, you must exclude them from the Jewish. The Church has therefore been the same in all ages; as the covenant has been the same. And God makes the same covenant with every Christian that He made with Abraham. Before my worthy friend can get infants out of the Christian Church, he must show that the *law* of infant membership has been *repealed*, if he is able to do so.

I have shown that the old Jewish Church is essentially the same as the Christian, it being *based* on the *same promise* that God made to Abraham; and it will devolve upon my friend to prove that they are not, and that the Jewish Church was done entirely away, and superseded by the Christian Church, which is an entirely new and different one. That the Church was the *same*, under both the Jewish and Christian dispensations, we learn from the following;

"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 *apostles* and *prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."—Eph. ii. 19—20.

Here we have presented the *prophets* of the old Testament, and the *apostles* of the New, as the *one foundation* of the Church, showing its sameness and the *identity* of it under both dispensations. This is a strong and conclusive argument, which my friend cannot overturn, and around which he cannot get! Here we have the Jew, of the old dispensation, and the Gentile brought together on the one foundation, in one body in Christ.

We find that the old dispensation ruled and reigned until the day of Pentecost; and now let us notice the language of Peter on that occasion.

After commanding the penitent Jews, who enquired what they should do, to "repent and be baptized, every one of them, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," we hear him saying to them:

"For the *promise* is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."—Acts ii, 39.

What *promise!* Why the promise that God made to Abraham, of which We have been speaking. Peter, in harmony with the principle of infant membership, under the old Dispensation, tells them that the promise was *unto their children*, as well as unto them; and also to the Gentiles, or "as many as were *afar off*, even as many as the Lord their God should call." The apostle here, speaking as he was "moved by the Holy Ghost," recognized *children* as members of the Christian Church; and on what principle and by what authority, I would ask, can we exclude them?

We see from this, that the old Dispensation is the same with the New, and identical with it. It was not necessary, in changing the Dispensation, that every thing under the Old should be re-asserted and re-enacted under the New—just as it is not necessary, when the Constitution of the State of Illinois is revised or changed, that the laws of the State, made under the Old Constitution shall all be *re-enacted* under the New one, in order to be binding. The law of infant membership under the Old Dispensation, still remained in as full force as ever; and, as I have said, my friend cannot show that it has ever been repealed. And, as I have shown, that God has never made a covenant, without a corresponding *seal* to it, as the *bow* in the cloud which was a *seal* of the covenant with Noah, and *circumcision* which was the *seal* of the covenant with Abraham; so he has made *baptism* the *seal* of the Christian covenant.

But my friend and his party contend against the identity of the two covenants, and against infant baptism as the seal of the new Dispensation by saying that as circumcision was confined to *males*, under the Jewish, this would *exclude females* under the new, or Christian Dispensation! To meet and obviate this objection, I will remark, that the Christian Dispensation, with the change of the seal from circumcision to baptism, was so enlarged as to embrace *females*. Besides, the seal, baptism, was of a character that would admit its application to females as well as males. The new dispensation was intended to embrace the whole world, Gentile as well as Jew, female as well as male. The apostle says that in Christ Jesus "there is neither Jew nor Greek, [Gentile,] there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female."

Our Saviour himself, while on earth, recognized this law of infant membership. We hear him saying: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God." Here he says expressly, that *of such* is his kingdom He does not say, that his kingdom is *like such*; but by saying "*of such*" he shows that it is composed, in part at least, of *children*, and consequently they are proper subjects of it, and entitled to the *seal*, baptism. Now my friend must admit, that this kingdom our Saviour speaks of, is either the kingdom of Christ here, or the kingdom of glory. If he admit that it is the kingdom here, then he must admit that children are in it; but if he take the ground that it is the kingdom of glory, then he must admit that they are fit for that kingdom; and if fit for that, they are fit for the kingdom here, and consequently proper

subjects of baptism. This is the dilemma, in which he places himself by rejecting infant baptism!

Every covenant which God has made with man has embraced *children*. We are informed, in reference to the covenant which he made with the Jews at Mt. Sinai, that:

"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 [covenant] which God hath enjoined to you."—Heb. ix. 19, 20.

Here we see that all the people, of course *including children*, were dedicated to God, in the dedication of this covenant, by the *sprinkling* of blood and water. And we have also seen, that the covenant of God with Noah, included all mankind, *children* as well as adults.

We also get another argument from the commission, as recorded in Mark xvi, 16: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." My friend and his party argue from this, that *infants* are *excluded* by the terms of this commission, because our Savior says, "he that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved." But the expression, "preach the gospel to *every creature*," shows that they are *included*, as they are capable of being taught. So we have an argument here in favor of infant membership.

In addition to this, the old covenant was in full force up to the very time when this commission was given, as we have no account of its abrogation before.

We learn also, that *proselyte baptism* was in existence then, and long before; and *all* Gentile converts to the Jewish religion, including *children*, with them, had to be *washed* or *baptized*, to initiate them into the Jewish religion. Consequently the apostles would understand from the commission, that this had to be *continued*; and that *infants*, to initiate them into the New Dispensation, must be baptized.

I come now to the commission in Matthew, which reads as follows:

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," etc.—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Here let us notice that there are *two* teachings mentioned. The first is from the Greek word *matheteuo*, and means "disciple." The correct rendering therefore would be: "Go ye therefore and *disciple* all nations." How?—"baptizing them," etc. They were to make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them; and then the teaching follows: "*teaching them* to observe all things," etc. Now as the expression, "*all nations*," includes all, *infants* as well as adults, they are consequently included among those to be made disciples by *baptism*, as that was the *act* of *discipling*. So that the commission here *includes infants* as proper subjects of baptism. The term "disciple" means a *learner*; and *infants* are capable of being taught, and becoming learners. This view is confirmed from the fact, that the discipling by baptism comes first, and the teaching afterwards. No teaching seems to have been necessary to the discipling—*nothing but baptism*—as the word *matheteuo* merely means to *disciple*—consequently *infants* are proper subjects of baptism, and *included* in the *commission*.

But my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, will urge the objection here

against infant baptism, that it destroys the free agency of persons. He will tell you that baptism must be for the "answer of a good conscience toward God and that as the baptism of infants is not voluntary on their part, it cannot be for the answer of a good conscience to them; and that, consequently, their free agency is destroyed! Now this objection is more plausible than real. If persons can have the assurance from good *testimony*, that they have been baptized and dedicated to God in infancy, their baptism will be just as much the answer of a good conscience to them, as if performed after they come to the years of maturity. It will rest upon the same sort of evidence as that of their *faith*, that of authentic testimony; and who would think of throwing a way his *faith*, because he was not a witness of the facts, upon which it is based? For instance, I was baptized in infancy, and brought into the church, and am assured of the fact by authentic testimony; and hence my baptism is just as much the answer of a good conscience to me, as if I had been old enough to remember it. So this objection loses all its force.

The fact is, if God has placed infants in the Church, as we have shown, then no authority in the world can take them out. It will require an authority to exclude them, just as great as that which placed them there. I am aware that my worthy friend and his party are in the habit of slurring over, ridiculing the subject of *infant baptism*, because they do not believe in it; and are disposed to cast all the odium they can upon it! But I would ask, if this is not wrong? Is it not contrary to the Spirit of the Christian religion? We should discuss all subjects pertaining to that religion, whether we believe them or not, in a frank, kind, open and Christian spirit. This is not only in accordance with the spirit and temper of our religion; but it is the only way in which to elicit the truth on any subject of discussion. As I have before remarked, ridicule contains no argument, and is no test of truth; as the *truth* itself may be ridiculed, as well as *error*, and a good man may be exposed to it, as well as one that is had.

Not only have I shown, that infant baptism is included in the *commission*, which our Savior gave his apostles; but that the apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, in carrying out that commission, included it, when he said to the Jews: "For the *promise* [God made to Abraham] is unto you, and to *your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Now, unless we admit that their children are entitled to baptism, then the promise *fails* in reference to them!

Again, at the house of Cornelius, we have it included, in the, opening of the kingdom of Christ to the Gentiles. The Gentiles were those "afar off," and as the *promise* was to them, as well as to the Jews, of course their *children* were included. God made promise to Abraham, that through his seed, CHRIST, all the nations of the earth were to be blessed; and hence their *children* were to be *discipled by baptism*, according to the commission in Matthew, and brought into the Church. Accordingly, the whole family, or "house," of Cornelius, including *children*, must have been baptized on that occasion. Peter commanded that they should *all* be baptized in the name of the Lord."

We also have another example of infant baptism, in the case of the passage of the Red Sea, by the Israelites. The account reads as follows:

"Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our

fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were *all baptized* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—1 Cor. x. 1, 2.

Here we have the *baptism* of a *whole nation* at one time—a case of *national baptism*. That their *children* were *included*, cannot be denied, as they *all* passed over equally with all the rest.

Now the apostle calls this a *baptism*—"were all baptized"—and my friend cannot get around its being one, were he to try to do so. Neither can he get around *infant baptism here*, as the *infants* as well as the adults were *baptized* at the same time. Here then, we have at least one clear, unequivocal, indisputable case of *infant baptism* recorded, despite of all that may be said to the contrary. The apostle says that this, as well as other things he mentions there, "*were our ensamples*"—and this is our *example* of *infant baptism*. If you make this out a *figurative baptism*, then I would say, that as infants were in the *figure*, they must be in the *reality*.

I have one more fact to present here, and that is, all history states most unequivocally, that *infant baptism* was practiced by the Church, in every century, from the apostles downwards. This fact speaks volumes in its favor; and around which fact my worthy friend cannot get. Let him show from history, if he can, that it was *not practiced* in every century, before he can succeed in invalidating this argument drawn from history. We have the testimony of Dr. Wall, in his learned and able work on *Infant Baptism*, that for the first 1100 years after Christ, there was no voice raised against *infant baptism*—another fact that speaks volumes in its favor. For the first 1500 years after Christ, none but a sect called the *Petrobrusians*, ever disputed the validity of *infant baptism*; and they were of unimportant and insignificant character. And there are authentic documents, that go to show the *practice* of *infant baptism* during that time. All Pedobaptists admitted, advocated and practiced it. Dr. George Campbell, Dr. Macknight, Dr. Doddridge, Luther, Calvin, Wesley and a host of others, were all in favor of *infant baptism*.

It is contended by those opposed to *infant baptism*, that the Church had become *corrupted*, and that that was the way in which *infant baptism* was introduced — hence, that it is without any divine authority, and a mere *corruption* of the Christian religion. Now, while I am willing to admit, that the Church had become corrupt, very corrupt, I will not admit that *infant baptism* grew out of its corruptions. I have shown that it existed *before* that time — that it originated with the apostles, and has been practiced in the Church during every century since their time. We are able to trace it back to the apostles themselves. *Justin Martyr*, who wrote about A. D. 140, says:

"Several persons among us of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes, who were *discipled* [or made disciples] to Christ, *in or from their childhood*, do continue uncorrupted."—Wall, vol. i. p. 70—from *Justin Martyr's Apology*, 1.

On this Dr. Wall says:

"St. Justin's word, *ematheeteuthesan* 'were discipled, or made disciples,' is the very word that had been used by St. Matthew in expressing our Savior's command, *matheeteusatate, disciplete*" [or, make disciples] *all the nations*. And it was done to these persons, Justin says, *in or from, their childhood*."—Wall, vol. i. 70.

Again:

"And Justin wrote but *ninety years* after St. Matthew, who wrote about *fifteen years* after Christ's ascension. And they that were *seventy years old* at this time must have been made disciples to Christ in their childhood," etc.—Wall, vol. i p. 71,

So we see that we can trace *infant baptism* back to the apostles — to persons, who say that they were baptized in their infancy. We can go back to the *household baptisms*, recorded in the New Testament, where there must have been infants. God send the day, when all may come Scripturally into the Church, and bring their infants with them! What our opponents say *against* infant baptism, are mere *ad captandum* arguments, without real foundation, and calculated to deceive the people! I am aware that my friend will say that it came from Rome, in order to excite prejudice against it!—[*Time expires.*

MR. SWEENEY'S FIRST REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — You discover that our *relations* to the question in debate are *changed* from what they were, in reference to the first proposition. My worthy friend, Mr. Logan's relation to the present question is *affirmative*, while mine is *negative*; and consequently the burden of *proof* comes upon him; while it is my business to examine the proof, or supposed proof, that he may see fit to adduce. It is unnecessary for me to *affirm* any thing to-day; as I simply believe that *penitent believers* are *Scriptural subjects* of Christian baptism; and this my friend does not deny; though his *practice* goes directly to put an end to all such baptism, as I shall show as we proceed.

I certainly concur most heartily with the gentleman in all he said, as to the spirit we should manifest, in the discussion of this, and all such questions. Scattering and foreign to the question under debate, as was the speech to which we have just been listening, I have no objection to the spirit in which it was delivered. If it were necessary that I should do so, it would certainly give me no little trouble, to hunt up, and give attention to all the gentleman has said. He began with Genesis, and went nearly to Revelation—went back to Genesis again; and if he had spoken a few minutes longer, he would no doubt have gotten through again! And where, I ask, are his *arguments*? Where is argument No. I, No. II, or No. III, to which I am to reply?

I shall, however, notice a few things in his very fragmentary speech; and will then proceed to argue this question "in my own way."

My friend has discovered that there is a slight difference between his own position here, and that of "some other advocates of infant baptism." Now, I should think so myself. But he thinks that difference "is of minor importance." I think not however. These "other advocates" of infant baptism tell us, that "*all* infants are *Scriptural subjects* of baptism;" and Mr. Logan says: "If they are right I am consequently right too, as their position embraces mine." He and I reason differently about that. I take it, that if these "other advocates" are right, that "*all* infants are proper subjects of baptism," then my friend is wrong, and guilty of *refusing to baptize some Scriptural subjects of Christian baptism;*" that is, all the infants of *unbelievers*. And this is precisely the charge he brings against me. I refuse, like he, to *baptize some Scriptural subjects* of Christian baptism; that is, all the infants of *unbelievers*, and also those of *believers*. If these "other advocates" are right, then my friend and I are *equally* guilty of the *same* charge—that of refusing to baptize proper subjects of baptism. The only difference between us is, that I refuse a *few more* than he does.

The gentleman talks very largely about going to the *Bible*—about going “to the Bible only for proofs,” etc. This is all for effect, for mere show! Let him go to the Bible as much as he pleases, and I will be with him there until his soul is satisfied!

Upon one very important point, my friend seemed to me, at least, to be rather “smoky;” so much so, in fact, that I confess I utterly failed to see his position; and must, therefore, ask him to explain a little for me. At one time he seemed to think that infants “were placed in the Church at the beginning;” and being now “in the Church are therefore entitled to baptism;” and then again he had a good deal to say about “*bringing our children into the church with us by baptism.*” Now, if they are born in the Church, I can see no fitness—it may be on account of some mental obtuseness—in talking about “*bringing them in by baptism,*” or by any thing else whatever! My friend will then, for my benefit, if not for that of the audience, please explain—are infants of believing parents *born in the Church?*—and is this the *ground* of their baptism? Or are they *born out* of the Church, and *brought in* by baptism? It is important that we have this matter properly before us, as I conceive, so that it can be clearly understood by the audience.

I am inclined, however, from all that he said, and from the use he made of certain passages of Scripture, to *think* that he holds the position, that infants are *in the Church*, and are therefore *entitled to baptism*. And to this I shall object.

1. In the first place, I deny that any *unconscious babe* is a *member* of the Christian Church; and,

2. In the second place, I deny that there is any divine authority for *baptizing any member* of the Church.

Let my friend prove that *infants* are *members* of the Christian Church, and then let him prove, that *members* of the Church ought to be *baptized*, if he can. A person who enters the Church, or kingdom, of Christ, comes to the institution of baptism *just before* he enters: “Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot *enter into* the kingdom of God.”—
JESUS.

My friend said, and read, a good deal concerning the “Covenant with Abraham.” His object in all he had to say, was evidently to show that the Covenant made with Abraham, recorded in the 17th chap. of Genesis; and which, in Scripture language, is styled “the covenant of circumcision,” and the *Christian Church*, are *identically one and the same Church*; and as infant children were recognized in that covenant and circumcised; so they should now be recognized as members of the Church, (which he thinks is the same,) and *baptized*; as baptism is now the *seal* of the covenant, instead of circumcision. And hence he submitted this astounding proposition: “The Church has therefore been the same in all ages, as the covenant has been the same!” And one still more absurd was, that, “God makes the same covenant with every Christian, that he made with Abraham!” Well, let us see:

1. God said to Abraham: “I will multiply thee exceedingly.” Then God “will multiply exceedingly” every Christian!

2. God said to Abraham: “I will make thee a father of many nations.” Is every Christian “a father of many nations!”

3. God said to Abraham: "I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee." Does he thus covenant with all Christians?

4. God promised to Abraham and his (*natural*) seed "the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." Does *every* Christian get so much *land*?!

5. God said to Abraham: "My covenant shall be in your *flesh* for an everlasting covenant." Is God's covenant in every Christian's *flesh*?! How absurd!

Because this covenant of the 17th chapter of Genesis, was a *fleshly* covenant, promising certain *temporal* blessings to Abraham's *fleshly* seed, God commanded, that the of the foreskin of every male child should be circumcised. And this *fleshly* affair my friend engages to prove, is the same with the Christian Church! But this he can never do. And if it is identically the same with the Christian Church, (which I will admit only (i» argument's sake,) this affords no proof of infant baptism; for there was no such thing as infant baptism known in Abraham's family! There was no infant baptism in the "covenant of circumcision." so we see that "identity" is not what my friend wants! He thinks that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, as the seal of the covenant. So here he admits one change, and consequently a *difference*. But now that we have baptism instead of circumcision, as the seal of the covenant, he must have still another change, and consequently another difference; for formerly *only the males* were "sealed" with circumcision; and he wants to baptize *all both male and female!*

Again, male infants were circumcised, without any respect to the faith of their parents; but he is unwilling to seal any with baptism, except those that have either a believing father or mother! So here is another *difference*. The fact is, he admits that the covenant has been changed vastly; and only wishes to maintain, that they are alike, in that both have *infant membership*. He says, by way of illustration, that the Constitution of Illinois might be changed, and yet not all her former laws annulled—yet she would be the State of Illinois. This is true. And it is also true, that the law regulating *citizenship* in Illinois might be changed, and yet she would be Illinois. So you see, that I might admit the *kind of identity* he contends for, and yet ask him to show, that under the *new constitution* infants are to be recognized as members; and this he might fail to do. But the fact is, the Christian Covenant is a *new one*, and a *different one*, from that of circumcision; as I will show before I am through.

But to prove this *identity*, my worthy friend quotes from Paul to the Ephesians, ii. 18, 19: "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 apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," etc.; and he adds: "Here we have the *prophets* of the Old Testament and the apostles of the New, [what does he mean by "*Old Testament* and _____ as the one foundation of the Church." Now I flatly and positively *deny* that the "*prophets*" here spoken of, in connection with the foundation of the Church, were the *Old Testament* prophets, at all. If this were so, why does Paul place the apostles *before* the prophets, in order? Why did he not say, "prophets and apostles," instead of "apostles and prophets," if my friend's position here is correct? If you will turn to one of his letters to the Corinthians,

(1 Cor. xii. 27, 28,) you will learn. Speaking there of the Church of Christ, under the figure of a body, he says:

"Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the Church, *first apostles, secondarily prophets,*" etc — 1 Cor. xii. 27, 28.

Here, we learn, that in the Church of Christ the apostles rank above the prophets officially. There are then "apostles and prophets," all of the *New Testament*.

Again, the expression "apostles and prophets," occurs only twice in the *New Testament*: once as read by my friend, in Paul's letter to the Ephesians, and once again in the same letter, and but a few verses from what he read; and when Paul uses the expression the second time, he explains what he means by "apostles and prophets." Speaking in reference to the same subject that he was on, when he used the expression, as quoted by my friend, his knowledge in the mystery of God, "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs," and, "fellow-citizens," with the Jews, upon the same terms, in the Church or Kingdom of Christ, he says:

"Which in *other ages* was not made known unto the Sons of men, as it is *now* revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the spirit." — Eph. iii. 5.

This, I deem, is all-sufficient to show, that the "apostles and prophets," of whom Paul speaks, in the passage which my friend relies upon, as one of his strongest proofs of the identity of the Jewish and Christian Churches, were the apostles and prophets of the *New Testament*. The very language Paul uses, "*now* revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets," shows the correctness of my position here, as, if revealed *unto* these prophets, it was impossible for it to be the prophets of the *Old Testament*. And hence the strong argument of my friend here for identity is gone; and the very Scripture he quoted is against him; for the foundation of the Church is called the "foundation of the apostles and prophets;" not because the Church rests upon them, but because they *laid* the foundation by preaching *Christ*, which "in other ages" was not done. This view is fully confirmed by the apostle Peter, in speaking of the Christian salvation -

"Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls: of which salvation the [Old Testament], *prophets* have enquired and searched diligently, who *prophe-sied* of the grace that should come unto you. * * * * Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us ["his holy apostles and prophets"] they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them [us apostles and prophets,] that *have preached* the gospel unto you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into." — 1 Pet. i. 10, 12.

This places the whole matter in its true light; and shows that these "prophets," connected with the apostles, and placed *after* them, were not the prophets of the *Old Testament*, but a class of *New Testament* prophets, who occupied a peculiar position in reference to the Christian institution, among the "extraordinary" officers of the Christian Church, and one that ranked next to that of the apostles themselves. I have elaborated this subject, and dwelt longer on it than I should have done, because of the great reliance placed upon it by my friend, as one of his strong arguments for "identity," and also because of the popular error on the subject, in making these prophets those of the *Old Testament*. I think that I have here "taken the wind out of his sails and his strong argument falls to the ground!

I must now notice the remarks of my worthy friend on the commission. He informs us, first of all, that the Jews made proselytes to their religion,

before and in the time of Christ, by *baptizing* them—that they baptized *infants*—that of course the apostles would have “understood from their commission, that they were to baptize infants *also* as they were not forbidden to do so. Now I deny, that there was any such thing in existence, either before or in our Savior’s time, as “proselyte baptism.” If my friend is able to prove it, let him do so. I think I know just what can be proven, about this matter, and what has to be *assumed*.

Then my worthy friend informs us, that, in the commission, as given by Matthew, we have “two teachings;” and that the first is from *matheteuo*, and means simply to “disciple.” Then, this same friend, Mr. Logan, who so much desires to have the whole matter settled by the testimony of the *common version* of the Bible, informed us, that a correct version of the commission would give us this reading: “Go, *disciple* all nations, by *baptizing them*, teaching them to observe all things,” etc. So he concludes that, “the infant should first be disciplined by *baptism*, and then taught afterwards.” Now, if this is the commission, then will he have to *disciple* “adults” toes by baptism, anal teach them afterwards! Will he do it? But I affirm’ that the commission does not mean to *disciple* merely by baptism. The word *matheteuo* itself, as here used, embraces the idea of *instruction*; and my friend, as a professed Greek scholar, ought to have known this, if he did not. The commission requires, that all nations shall be *taught, instructed, and before baptism* at that. Mark settles this question; for he says, the Savior commanded the apostles to “*preach the gospel* to every creature,” and baptize such as *believed*:

“Go ye into all the world, and *preach the gospel* to every creature: he that *believeth*. and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”—Mark xvi. 16.

By turning to Luke’s record of this commission, you will find that he mentions another item in it, which was not expressly mentioned by the other historians—that of *repentance*. Taking this commission as recorded by all four historians, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, it contains as follows:—1. *teaching*; 2. *faith*; 3. *repentance*; 4. *baptism*; 5. *salvation* or remission of sins to those who receive and comply with its terms; and, 6. *damnation* for those who reject it. Now I need not mention, that the *whole* of the commission applies to every person, to whom *any pari* of it applies. This is perfectly obvious. Now, the question to be determined is, did our Savior mean that this commission should reach *infants*? I answer unequivocally, *no*. They are all incapable of being *taught, of believing, of repenting*, as eves my friend, Mr. Logan, will agree. They are not *sinners*, and therefore need no “remission of sins and consequently, the “*damnation*” of the commission cannot pertain in any way to them. What part of this commission, then, does my friend, Mr. Logan, wish to apply to infants? Not the *teaching*, not the *faith*, not the *repentance*, not the *remission of sins*, (for he will not say they are *sinners*.) nor yet the *damnation*, for he will not agree, that they will, in any case, be *damned*. What then will he get in this commission (or *infanta* I Only the *water* of baptism, and *precious little of that!* So far then as infants are concerned, we may set Mr. Logan down as a water alone man!” He is the man who is making the ado over “water” to-day He inveighs against me for making so much noise about a *good deal* of water, in connection with other things, but he is going to-day to be quite noisy for a *very little water, by itself at that!*

But as I wish you to see the exact position my friend occupies, I will try to get it before you by an illustration. We will suppose, for illustration, that my worthy friend himself receives a commission from Washington, to go into Illinois, and enlist 10,000 men for military duty in the present war. In that commission it is specified, that such persons shall be enlisted, as are "free white men," "able-bodied," and "between the ages of 18 and 45 years." He comes here to Whitehall, and commences operations under his commission. And suppose we see him taking persons only fifteen years old, what shall we think? Why, either, 1. that he is doing that which he is not *commissioned* to do, and that he has no *authority* for; or, 2. that he has *another* commission, than the one noticed before. Well, now, to apply the illustration, I hold here the commission, which our Great Commander-in-chief has given, and under which we all profess to be operating. It says: "Go ye into all the world"—requires that the people shall be *taught*—that they shall *believe, repent, and be baptized*; and then promises remission of sins. Now, here, is my worthy friend in Whitehall, professedly at work under this commission; but he is enlisting persons, who are not, and cannot be *taught* do not *believe,* and cannot *repent* and who cannot *fight the good fight of faith* when they are enlisted! Now, what shall we think of his conduct? Either, 1, that he is doing that for which he has no authority; or, 2, that he has *another* commission. Come, friend Logan, let us see that *other* commission, that gives you authority for enlisting these *babies*?

But, lastly, on the commission: *do not the very terms of the commission prohibit the baptizing of infants?* They certainly do.

My friend quotes from our Savior: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of God." There is no proof of his proposition in this Scripture. It does not say that our Savior *baptized* little children, or that he said they were Scriptural *subjects* of baptism. Neither does it say, that they were members of his Church (he had none then); and if it did, that would not prove that they were scriptural subjects of baptism, as I have already shown. If the Lord had been in the habit of *baptizing the children*, where he went, why did his apostles "forbid" these to come to him? Can my friend tell?

My friend next quoted Acts ii.39: "The promise is unto you, and to your *children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." I suppose he quoted this simply because it contained the word "children." "*Infants,*" however, is the word he wants. "*Children*" are not all "*infants.*" 1. My friend failed, to show, that the "*promise*" here is *baptism*; and, 2. that "*children*" here means "*infants.*" How then, I ask, does this passage afford any proof of his proposition? Just no how! But you will observe, that the promise here named, is to just "as many as the Lord shall *call.*" Persons are *called* to this promise. How are they *called*? Paul says, "*by our Gospel.*" Hence the Savior said, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature; he that *believes* and is baptized shall be saved." Thus we see people are called in accordance with the *commission* we have already noticed. Are *infant* children capable of being thus called? They are not. But were there any infant children baptized on the day of Pentecost? Let us ask the Holy Spirit how many were baptized there: "*Then they that gladly received the word*

[their "call"] were baptized." Did infants "gladly receive the word?" I suppose not.

My worthy friend thinks, "we have an example of infant baptism," in the baptism of our "fathers in the cloud and in the sea." (1 Cor. x. 1, 2.) Well, I suppose the infants were "in the cloud and the sea," and were overwhelmed. So also doubtless were the cattle, sheep, pots, kettles, skillets, and *cats* and *dogs*, if any they had; but does it follow, that all these are, therefore, "scriptural subjects of Christian baptism?" All these were "in the cloud and in the sea," and were doubtless baptized, but not "unto Moses." "Our fathers" were "baptized unto Moses." They knew Moses, recognized him as the sent of God for their deliverance, and, in obedience to his command, they went into the sea, and were "baptized unto Moses." Every unconscious thing in the cloud and in the sea was baptized, but not "unto (or into) Moses," as their Leader. So, a child, a cow, a sheep, one's clothes, may now be baptized, but not "into Christ;" for they are not "scriptural subjects of Christian baptism." So we see that this passage affords my friend neither aid nor comfort.

I shall reserve what I have to say on "household baptism," until my friend delivers himself more fully on that subject.

The gentleman made rather a surprising statement about the "history of infant baptism." It was substantially, that "all history states most unequivocally, that infant baptism was practiced by the Church, in every century, from the apostles downwards." *This I squarely and flatly deny.* Now, we will try this "Bible alone" man a little in history. I state fearlessly, that he cannot find "infant baptism" mentioned in any book or work, in the first two centuries. Again, he says: "there was no voice against infant baptism for the first 1100 years." Now, is it possible, that my worthy friend has not learned, that *Tertullian* opposed infant baptism in the *third century*? I hardly think it possible! It must be that his memory is at fault. I affirm, that the very first mention we have of infant baptism was in *opposition* to it.

It is true, that for two hundred years, and more, there was no voice raised against this practice. And it is also true, that during this time, there was no voice raised against "granting indulgences," "counting beads," the "mourner's bench," etc. And all for the same reason—that such innovations then had no existence.

But now, having given thus much attention to my friend's speech, I propose to give you my reasons for opposing infant baptism. And first, I will show you, that the Christian covenant is a *new* one, and not the old "covenant of circumcision," as my friend would have us believe.

We will read Jeremiah xxxi. chap. 31-34 verses:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; (which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Here we learn, that 1351 years *after* the "covenant of circumcision"

was made with Abraham, God says, "Behold, the days come, that I *will make a new* covenant." This shows that, whatever covenant is here referred to, it was *not made* at that time, which was 1351 years later than the "covenant of circumcision." Now, if we can show, that this "new covenant," promised 1351 years *after* the "covenant of circumcision" was made, is the *Christian* covenant—then away goes my friend's "identity" forever! Then let us hear Paul, Heb. viii. 6-13:

"But now hath he [Christ] obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better covenant*, which was established upon better promises. 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: 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 minds, 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."

Here we discover that Paul quotes the promise made in Jeremiah; and makes the Christian covenant the one promised; and which was *not made* 1351 years after my friend's "covenant of circumcision." He also calls the Christian covenant a "new" and "better" one. It is then clear as a sunbeam, that 1351 years after the covenant of circumcision was made, the Christian covenant was still *future*—unless my friend can make it appear, that "*will make*" means "*have made*, 1351 years ago." Can he do this?!

Let us notice, that this "new covenant" was to have distinguishing characteristics. Those entering this covenant were to be "all *taught* of God;" so that all in this covenant should "*know* the Lord, from the least of them to the greatest of them." How beautifully this harmonizes with the commission our Lord gave his apostles, when the blood of the *new* and everlasting covenant had been shed. He says, "Go, *teach* all nations." But my friend *disciples* simply by *baptizing*; and therefore it is, the *least* in his Church do not "know the Lord!"

But in further proof of this position, let us hear our Lord himself, Matt. xvi. 18,19:

And I also 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. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

This forever settles the question about "church identity," with all who will take the word of the blessed Lord "at its face." He says, when he was in the world: "I will *build* my Church." Had this church been builded hundreds of years before—in Abraham's day—our Lord never would have used such language.

Let us now hear Paul about the church. In his letter to the congregation at Ephesus, (Eph. ii. 14,1-5,) he says:

For he [Christ] 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."

One "new man" here is simply *one new church*. Upon this passage Dr. Clarke, one of those "other advocates of infant baptism," says: "To make one *church* of both people, which should be considered the *body* of which Jesus Christ is the *head*. Thus he makes one new man, *one new church*." (See his commentary on the passage.) And observe further, that before this *new church* could be formed of both Jews and Gentiles, it was necessary that the "enmity between" them should be "abolished," which Christ did "*in his flesh*." Now, how could this have been done *before he "was made flesh"* and dwelt among men? Was this new church made in the days of Abraham?

I. My first objection to the practice of infant baptism, then, is, that the *very terms* of the commission prohibit it. The commission requires, that those baptized shall first be *taught*: but infants cannot be *taught*; therefore infants cannot properly be baptized.

The commission requires that all who come into this new church—this new covenant—"shall be taught of God so that all in this church "shall know the Lord, from the *least* of them to the greatest of them." How beautifully this fulfills what the Lord said, as we have seen, when he *promised* this "new covenant?" My friend's church does not answer to the description.

II. My second objection to the doctrine, or practice, as you please, of infant baptism, is, *that it is not once mentioned in any shape, in the whole revelation of God to man*. The Bible, on *infant baptism*, falsely so called, is as silent as "the night of the grave!" If I had said, and were to say, not another word on this question, while this is true, my friend can never establish his proposition. By the way, he talks very largely about "going to the Bible only" for his proof. But he will have to go somewhere else this time! For "infant baptism" is language unknown to the Holy Bible, But my friend only relies on *inference* and *deduction*; and where he is peculiarly unfortunate again, is, there is nothing in the Bible to *infer* or *deduce* authority from, for his practice! What an unenviable position he occupies, in the discussion of this proposition!

III. My third objection to the practice contended for by my worthy friend, is, that it *sets aside all human agency and accountability*, in both being baptized and becoming members of the church—which is anti-Scriptural and anti-American. "*Whoever will*," is the language of Christ, in reference to this matter; and not, whoever has a "believing parent," and *cannot help itself!* "To whom ye *yield yourselves* servants to obey, his servants ye are," is a principle running throughout the entire Will and Testament of Jesus Christ, And consequently *imposing* religious ceremonies upon helpless persons, has no countenance there! You must therefore go to the book of "human tradition" for authority for "infant baptism." "infant communion," "counting beads," etc.

IV. This practice, by human tradition, sets aside completely the command of God to "*be baptized*." There is nothing plainer in the New Testament, than that every *believer* is commanded to be baptized. But where the practice for which my friend contends, prevails, believer's baptism is completely set aside, and only *infant baptism*, so called, is practiced. And

when the infants so baptized grow up, are "*taught of God,*" and *believe*, if there were no preachers but Pedobaptists, they could never be baptized, should they desire to do so. How *shocking* to hinder voluntary obedience to any commandment of God!

V. Baptism is the answer of a good conscience; but infants have no conscience in the matter; therefore infants cannot properly be baptized. How can baptism be the answer of a good conscience, in any sense, to an *infant that is not, and never can be conscious of the fact?*

But here I am reminded, that my friend, anticipating this "stumbling stone" in his way, spent some time, preparing to "fall easy." He informed us, that when infants, that are sprinkled, grow up, and are told that they were baptized, they *believe* it upon the testimony of their friends; and then it becomes the answer of a good conscience to them. But it happens to be true, that the things which we receive only upon the *testimony of others*, are things of the existence of which we are not *conscious*, and never can be. Matters of *consciousness* are not matters of *faith*. I know a young man, whose family is divided as to whether he was ever baptized, or not! Is his baptism the answer of a good conscience?!!

VI. This practice of "infant baptism," so far as it goes, sets aside all *heart work*, in obedience to God. We should obey God in baptism "from the heart"—therefore he requires *faith* as it is with the *heart* we believe; and therefore when the Ethiopian Eunuch asked; "What hinders me to be baptized?" Philip said, "If thou *believest* with all thine *heart* thou mayest" — but *infants* have no *heart* in the matter, no *conscience*, no *faith*, no any thing but *water*, and not much of that; and therefore they cannot properly be baptized.

VII. Baptism is worthless, without the work of the spirit. It is useless to have a birth of *water* without the spirit. Will my friend say, that when an infant is baptized, it is born of water *and of the spirit?*" I suppose not, hardly. And as infants are not born of water *and the spirit*, it is wholly useless, and folly to baptize them! [Here Mr. Logan said: "My friend is arguing the *design* of baptism, and therefore out of order." After the exchange of a few words between the two gentlemen, spoken with a kind spirit and in a courteous manner, Mr. Logan withdrew his objection, and Mr. Sweeney proceeded with his remarks.] I am glad to know that my worthy friend understands John iii. 5, to have an important bearing upon the *design* of baptism. I certainly said nothing about the *design*, more than simply to refer to that scripture. But, if I choose, I have a perfect light to argue *from the design* of baptism, that infants are not proper subjects.

But as my time is about out, I will close with a question, that I would be truly glad to have my worthy friend answer for my benefit, and that of our audience. It is this: What blessing has God promised to bestow upon a *baptized* infant, that he will *not* bestow upon an *unbaptized* one? In other words, "What doth it profit" an infant to baptize it?

I do not wish to dictate to the affirmant on this question, as to the course he should pursue; but as a favor, I ask, if he believes that our Savior or the holy apostles any here expressly authorized the practice for which he contends, that he *select* that passage that so authorizes. I promise him that I will risk the whole issue on the passage of his own selection. Will he do it? We shall see.—[*Time expires.*]

MR. LOGAN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GHNTLEMEN:—The first thing I shall notice in the speech of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, to which you have just been listening, is what he said about my taking the Bible, and that alone, as the testimony in deciding the questions we have under discussion. Because I have said, that I was willing to take the Bible alone, and be governed by it in this discussion; and have appealed to it, and quoted from it to sustain my positions; he charges upon me, that I have gone from Genesis almost to Revelation; and then back again to Genesis, and then on towards Revelation again! He says, that I affirmed I was willing to take the Bible alone; and then soon went out of it! Now,

I deny this charge of my worthy friend, that I have gone out of the Bible.

I have adhered to it all the time, as my speeches will show; and where I have referred to any thing else, it has only been by way of illustration, or in confirmation of what I have advanced from the Bible itself. I expect that I have stuck as close to it as my worthy friend himself has done.

My friend wishes to know of me, what good *baptism* can do *infants*?—if they are *born into the church* of what *advantage* baptism can be to them? As my friend has requested of me to define my position here, I will do so for his satisfaction, if it will afford him any for me to do it. I affirm, therefore, that the infants of believing parents are born within the pales of the Church; and are therefore *entitled* to *baptism*, the *seal* of the Christian covenant. Baptism is, therefore, of the same advantage to them under the Christian dispensation, as was *circumcision* to *infants*, under the Abrahamic covenant and Jewish dispensation, a *seal* which entitles them to membership under these, and the advantages and privileges belonging to them.

My friend says, that baptism is not an ordinance of the church, and does not belong to those within it. Now, I would ask, if it is not an ordinance of the Church—of the house of God—where does it belong, and of what house is it an ordinance?

My friend has labored very hard to show, that he Abrahamic covenant has been entirely *changed*, and that the Christian covenant has taken its place. Now I affirm that it has not been changed, but remains in as full force as it ever was. I have shown from *the Bible* that the covenant God made with Abraham, has never been annulled or abrogated; but has remained in as full force ever since, as it ever did. It was to be an "*everlasting* covenant;" and embraces the Christian dispensation, as well as it did the Jewish; and my worthy friend has not shown, and he cannot show from the Bible, that it has ever been repealed or *abrogated*. It is true, that it contained *temporal advantages* and *blessings*, as the promise of the inheritance of the land of Canaan to Abraham's posterity, a numerous seed, or posterity, etc., which promise was fulfilled in the Jewish nation; but then it embraced the promise of *spiritual blessings* too—that "through his [Abraham's] seed," which Paul says was Christ, "*all the nations* of the earth were to *be blessed*." Hence we have, in the Abrahamic covenant, the promise of *two seeds*, or posterities: a *literal* seed, in the Jewish nation, and a *spiritual* seed, embracing Christians, who are in consequence called the "*children of Abraham*." I have shown, that Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, recognized the Abrahamic covenant as still in force, or as not abrogated. He says, as I quoted in my first speech: "Though

it be but a man's covenant, yet *if it be confirmed*, no man disannulled, or addeth thereto;" and I have shown that it was *confirmed*, according to the apostle, by the *oath* and *promise* of God. Hence he says, as we quoted:

"Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the *heirs of promise* the *immutability* of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by *two immutable things* [the oath and promise of God,] 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," etc.—*Heb. vi. 17, 13.*

Here the apostle, after affirming that the Abrahamic covenant was not to be disannulled, or added to, says, that God, in order the more abundantly to show to Christians, "the *heirs of the promise*" he made to Abraham, "the *immutability*," the *unchangeableness*, "of his counsel," had confirmed it by these "two immutable," or *unchangeable*, "things," "in which it was impossible for him to lie," or *falsify* his word and promise, we Christians "might have a strong consolation," etc. But *immutable*, as it was to be, my worthy friend very gravely affirms that this Abrahamic covenant was *changed*, and gave way to another! In confirmation of what I have said, the apostle, after saying that it was not to be disannulled, or added to, immediately adds:

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the *promises* [not promise, but *promises*] made;" and that this seed "is Christ." These *promises*, as we have seen, were those of a *literal* posterity, the Jews, and a *spiritual* seed, Christians; and the *temporal blessings*, in reference to the former, and *spiritual blessings*, in reference to the latter. And the apostle still further says, as we have before quoted, of this Abrahamic covenant:

"That which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the [Jewish] law, which was [given] four hundred and thirty years after, *cannot disannul*, that it should make the promise of none effect."—*Gal. iii. 17.*

Hence this covenant which God made with Abraham, has continued in force ever since it was made. But my friend will have it disannulled, changed, and done away, in spite of all the apostle says! And we learn in this same epistle, chapter, and connection; when the Christian dispensation came, the Abrahamic covenant was, in accordance with the *promise* of Christ, and the introduction of the new *seal of baptism*, enlarged and extended, so as to include *females* and the *Gentiles*. Hence Paul, after saying that God gave the Christian inheritance "to Abraham by *promise*," says:

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and *heirs according to the promise*."—*Gal. iii. 27-29.*

Now here we have presented the *seal* of the Christian covenant, *baptism*; and learn that under that, all distinctions between Jew and Gentile, between male and female, (as they existed under the Jewish law,) were to be done away in Christ. The Abrahamic covenant then, was never changed. It was only these *circumstances* connected with it, that were changed. If it was *changed*, as my worthy friend contends, how comes it that Paul says, every believer is a *child of Abraham*?

We have seen, that the apostle says, it was not abrogated or annulled by the Jewish law. And he has told us for what purpose this law was given;

"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was *added* because of transgressions, till the *seed* [Christ] should come to whom the promise was made."—Gal. iii. 19.

He then enquires:

"Is the law then *against* the *promise* of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law."—Gal Hi 21.

The apostle then goes on to tell the Galatians, that "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith;" that is, it was the *instructor* of the *Jews* to bring them to Christ; "but after that faith [or Christ] is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." (Gal. iii. 24, 25.) He then goes on to represent the Jews under the law as minors, "under tutors and guardians until the time appointed of the Father" for Christ to come. (Gal. iv. 1, 2.)

Hence we see from all this, that the Abrahamic covenant was extended and enlarged so as to include the Christian dispensation; that as *circumcision* was the *seal* of the Abrahamic, so has *baptism* become the *seal* of the Christian covenant; and that as *children* were *members* of that church, and *entitled* to the *seal* of circumcision, so are they *members* of the Christian church, and *entitled* to the *seal* of *baptism*. Thus we prove *infant baptism*. from this *identity* of the two covenants, and the circumstances connected with these. I am perfectly willing to admit, with my friend, a *change* from the *Jewish* covenant to that of the Christian; and that the old Jewish covenant gave way, and was *abrogated*, and superseded by the new, or Christian covenant; but I contend that this does not affect the argument a particle, as it is the *Abrahamic*, and not the *Jewish*, we are talking about. The Abrahamic covenant embraced all; and circumcision as we learn, was "a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised"—why?—"that he might be the *father* of all them that *believe*, [of all Christians,] 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"—(Rom. iv.

11, 12,) thus including all, Gentiles as well as Jews, females as well as males. The Abrahamic covenant, then, is *our* covenant too; and we are under it as well as under the Christian.

I come now to the *prophets* as a part of the *foundation* of the Christian Church; and here my worthy friend utterly astonished me, as I expect he did the most of the audience, not excepting his own brethren, by taking the position, in opposition to the whole Christian world, that the *prophets* spoken of by the apostle Paul, in connection with the *apostles*, (as I quoted from Ephesians,) were not the prophets of the Old Testament, but a class of prophets, that lived *after* the apostles. Now I deny this; and affirm that they were the prophets of the Old Testament, who are here presented by the apostle as a *part* of the *foundation* of the Christian Church. Peter says of them, that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." These are the prophets—of the Old Dispensation—to whom Peter here refers. We find these prophets even before the law of Moses; as we are told by Jude, that "Enoch, the seventh from Abram, *prophe-sied*," etc., as also other prophets. I admit that these prophets, as the passage reads, are placed *after* the apostles; but what of that? The arrangement is *arbitrary*, as we often find to be the case in reference to

other things; and the circumstance does not show, that they were a *new* and *different class* of prophets from those of the Old Testament. I here ask my friend, where were these prophets after the days of the apostles? Will he explain to us, *who* they are, and *where* they are to be found? Here then, in this *apostolic* and *prophetic foundation* of the Christian Church, we have another strong argument for the *identity* of the Abrahamic and Christian covenants.

You will recollect, that my worthy friend has, from time to time, been charging on me, about quoting from *Pedobaptist* authorities, because they were on my own side of the question! But I ask, if I had not quoted from *them*, what would I find to quote from? I had no others to go to, since nearly all the authorities were on my own side of the question!

I come now to the act of *discipling*, as spoken of in the commission in *Matthew*, about which my friend has had so much to say, in his speech. He has labored very hard, as you have heard, to show, that the Greek word *matheeteuo*, includes the idea of *teaching*, in order to get that in *before* baptism, and thus exclude *infant baptism*! I will here adduce the authority of Mr. A. Campbell himself, which is *against* the position of my friend here. He renders it, (in the *Christian Baptist*, page 630): "Go, convert the nations, baptizing them," etc. According to this, it is the *act* of *baptism*, that makes the *disciple*, without any reference to previous teaching. My worthy friend has merely *affirmed*, that *matheeteuo* embraces the idea of teaching; but he has not given a particle of *proof* that it does. Let him give us the *proof*, as his *mere assertion* is not sufficient here. I hold that children are to be *drained* as soon as they are born, and are capable of being trained morally and religiously. The apostle, in his epistle to the Ephesians, says to parents:

"And ye fathers, provoke not *your children* to wrath: but *bring them up* in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,"—Eph. vi. 4.

Here parents are exhorted to train up their children, "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The apostle does not tell them how soon they are to begin it; but the inference is, from birth, or just as soon as they are capable of being thus trained.

My worthy friend has quoted the commission in Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved;" in order to show that *faith* must necessarily *precede* baptism; and that thus *infants* are excluded from being baptized. If his position is true, it would *damn all infants*, as they *cannot believe*, and are incapable of exercising faith; and he "that *believes not shall be damned*." Now I would ask, who can receive a doctrine so monstrous as this, that would *exclude infants* from baptism and salvation, because they cannot believe?—for no act of their own!

My friend says that my theory only needs *water*, and but precious little at that; in order that he may throw ridicule on infant baptism. But ridicule is no test of truth or error, and contains no argument. If I can succeed in showing, that infant baptism is *Scriptural*, as I trust I have in the most clear and conclusive manner, it is sufficient for my purpose, and to sustain my position on this question; let him endeavor to ridicule it as much as he may. As to the *quantity* of *water*, whether much or little, so it is *Scriptural baptism*, it matters nothing.

My worthy friend admitted, by the way, that the 3000 were baptized on the day of Pentecost. This he did by admitting that "they that gladly

received his [Peter's] word *were baptized*: and the *same day* there were *added unto them about three thousand souls*." Now, they were *baptized first* as we here learn; and then *added to them* on the same day; consequently they were *all baptized on that day*.

My worthy friend has called on me to make out a case of infant baptism, to select a single passage of Scripture, in which it is taught, either directly, or by implication—and that he will stake the issue on the passage I may select. Now, I will say to him, that I can find more passages than one, in which it is taught; but that I am going to argue the question in my own way.

I have no doubt that my friend is very glad he is on the *negative* of this question; and that he has nothing to affirm and prove. He had had the "laboring oar" long enough, on the preceding question; and had doubtless become very tired of wielding it, and was glad to get rid of it.

My friend, as you heard, brought up the commission which our Savior gave Peter, when on the coasts of Caesarea Philippi in order to destroy the *identity* of the Abrahamic and Christian covenants and Churches. Because our Savior said to Peter, "upon this rock I *will build my church*, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; he argues that the church of Christ never had any existence before that time! Now if there was no Church until then, where were Abraham, Isaac, etc. Where was "the church in the wilderness," of which Stephen spoke? Where was the "house," or church, over which Moses was? The fact is, that God has always had a Church, in every age of the world; and the Christian Church is only the enlargement of the Jewish Church, so as to embrace the Gentile world and include females.

As I anticipated, my worthy friend has labored very hard to show, that *infant baptism* sets aside *free agency* in religion, and excludes all teaching of children. He has made this as one of a long string of *objections* to infant baptism. But I have already shown, conclusively and satisfactorily, that it does no such thing. The person who has been baptized in infancy, is as much a *free agent* in religion and every thing else, as if he had never been baptized; and this he ought to know as well as I do. I would ask him, in what way does it destroy a person's free agency? As to the *teaching* of children, so far from excluding that, it lays parents under obligation to teach their children the knowledge of the Bible, and to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." *Dedicating* children to the Lord *in baptism*, is one of the most effective means of accomplishing this important work. My friend says, that we *impose* baptism upon infants, without their consent and against their will; and alleges this as an *objection* against infant baptism. But, I ask, do we not also *impose going to school* on them, frequently as much against their will and consent? Most assuredly; and this will meet his objection here on this point.

If infant baptism is what my worthy friend endeavors to make it—as destitute of all Scriptural authority, as he endeavors to make it out, and as full of evils as he tries to impute to it—why, I ask, did God place children in the Church, as *we find he did* from the first?

Another *objection* which my friend brings up against infant baptism is, that baptism is represented as "the answer of a good conscience," and infants cannot have that answer. I am aware that the apostle Peter, speaking of the salvation of Noah and his family, in the ark, from destruction by the waters of the Deluge, says:

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."—1 Pet. iii, 21.

Now any one who will closely examine this passage, will see that this answer of a good conscience," has nothing to do with *water* baptism. The apostle, after saying that the "like figure," or antitype, of the salvation of Noah in the ark, "even baptism," saves us by the resurrection of Christ; then puts in a parenthesis, that it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," as a Jewish ordinance, "but the answer of good conscience toward God." If the answer of a good conscience, how can it be *water* baptism? — which has nothing to do with that! But the apostle Paul sets this matter at rest, by showing that it is *by faith*, and not by baptism:

"*By faith* Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house: by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is *by faith*."—Heb. xi. 7.

Here we see that it was "*by faith* and that *water* baptism is not concerned in the *antitype*, and has nothing to do with the salvation. Besides, if we are saved by "the resurrection of Jesus Christ," how, I ask, can it be by *water* baptism? Again, how are persons represented as obtaining a good conscience, in becoming Christians? Paul has told 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 [under the Jewish Dispensation;] how much more shall the *blood of Christ*, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, *purge, your consciences* from [Jewish] dead works to serve the living God?"—Heb. ix. 14.

Here we learn, that it is by the *blood* of Christ, "the blood of *sprinkling* that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel," and not by the *water* of baptism, that the conscience is purged from sin, and "the answer of a *good conscience*" obtained. Again, in the same epistle the apostle presents this obtaining "the answer of a good conscience," and *water* baptism together, and shows the contrast:

"Let us draw near [the throne of God] with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our *hearts sprinkled* from an *evil conscience*, and our bodies *washed* with pure *water*."—Heb. i. 22.

Here we see that it is by the *blood of Christ* the heart is cleansed from an *evil conscience*, which is accompanied, or preceded by the *application* of the *water* of baptism to the body, as the visible *seal* of the Christian covenant.

I come now to what Paul says about parents and their *children*, where one is a believer and the other an unbeliever:

"For the unbelieving husband is *sanctified* by the [believing] wife, and the unbelieving wife is *sanctified* by the [believing] husband: else were your children *unclean*, but now are they *holy*."—1 Cor. vii. 14.

It is true, that the subject of *water baptism* is not mentioned expressly here; but the baptism of children, or their *membership* in the Christian Church, is the clear *inference*; as *membership* in the Church is the subject the apostle is upon. A question had arisen in the Corinthian Church, it seems, whether, when a husband or a wife, one of them, became a Christian, and the other remained an unbeliever, they should separate, or continue to live together; and out of this sprang another question, whether in such a case their *children* were *entitled to membership* in the Church. The apostle, by saying, "but now are they *holy*," shows that children are *enti-*

ted to membership, and consequently to baptism, when only one of the parents is a believer. And hence the doctrine of our Church, and in the Proposition under discussion, of which I am in the affirmative: "The infants of parents, one or both of which are believers, are scriptural subjects of Christian baptism."

My worthy friend has quoted largely from, and commented extensively on, the prophecy of Jeremiah, and its repetition by Paul, in the viii chap. of Hebrews, where the Lord said he would make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and of Judah, etc. and has endeavored to show that the Abrahamic covenant was abrogated, and gave way to this new covenant, the Christian. But he has "missed the figure" here entirely, as a little attention to the connection will show. The Lord says:

"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."—Heb. viii. 9.

Here we see plainly, that it was *not* the *Abrahamic covenant*, that was to be done away; but the *Jewish*; which I am ready to admit, and have admitted, was done away, and superseded by the *Christian*. So that this, and all the arguments and ingenious sophistry of my friend, leave the Abrahamic covenant untouched and in full force and obligation.

We find also, that when the *passover* was instituted, God made a *covenant* with the Israelites. The old Jewish covenant was made, when the Jews came out of Egypt, but the Abrahamic *before*.— [*Time expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S SECOND REPLY.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I will notice Mr. Logan's last remark first, while it is fresh in our minds. I showed clearly, that God promised by the mouth of Jeremiah, to make a "new covenant;" and that this promise was made 1351 years *after* the covenant of circumcision was made; which shows that the "new covenant" cannot be the covenant of circumcision. Then I showed, that this "new covenant" promised, was the *Christian covenant*. This set aside his "identity" argument. But he knew it would never do, not to refer to the passage in Jeremiah at all; so he went there, and showed, that this "new covenant" was to be, "not according to the covenant I made with their fathers," etc.; and then most vehemently contended, that the covenant referred to in this passage, as "made with their fathers," was not the Abrahamic covenant. Well, now, suppose I grant him that—what of it? Does it follow, that when God says, "*I will make*," he means, "I have made?" I said nothing about the *covenant* referred to in this passage. The point I made was, that the covenant which God here says, "*I will make*," is the *Christian covenant*; and, consequently, it was not made at that time; and, consequently, cannot be "identical" with the covenant of circumcision. And this is the very point my friend shrewdly "let alone."

Now, let my friend show, either, 1, that "*will make*" means "*have made*" here; or, 2, that the covenant promised in this passage, is not the Christian covenant; or, 3, he is stranded!

I am very much pleased that my friend has so unequivocally defined his position, as to the *ground* of infant baptism. He says: "Infants of believing parents are born within the pales of the Church; and are therefore entitled to baptism, the seal of the covenant." Then I hope we will have

no more talk in this discussion, about "bringing our children into the Church with us." I do not wish to be considered more than moderately inquisitive; but I must ask my friend, now, if he would baptize the infants of such parents as were converted *after* their children were born? Such infants, you know, would be "infants of believing parents;" yet, their parents being unbelievers when they were born, they were not "born within the pales of the Church;" and are not, therefore, I suppose, "entitled to the seal," baptism!

I want my worthy friend to show his authority for baptizing real, *bona fide*, members of the Church! Baptism is not an ordinance *in* the Church; but it is an ordinance to which every one comes, *before* he gets into the Church. My friend has a good deal to say about baptism being the "seal of the Christian covenant." And I now enter my protest against any such undue exaltation of water baptism! We know that it is the "seal" that gives efficacy and validity to a document. And is it *baptism* that gives *efficacy* to the Christian covenant? I deny that it is. This is making entirely too much of a little water, for me and my brethren. "With my friend it is *water, water*, all the time!"

The gentleman tells us, that "baptism is of the same advantage to infants now, that circumcision was formerly" — it is a "seal which entitles them to membership," etc. Now, I thought it was the "faith of the parent" that entitled them to membership! But then, I now recollect, that such children as were not circumcised formerly, were "cut off;" and I suppose, that it is to prevent children, "born within the pales of the Church," from being "out off," that he baptizes them! Mr. Logan will soon be a good, old-style, Pedobaptist, baptizing children to *save them!*

He desires to know, "if baptism is not an ordinance in the house of God, of what house is it an ordinance?" Such a question as that will be in order, when he proves that baptism is an ordinance in any house. As the laver, with brazen foot, sat at the door, *outside* the Tabernacle, so baptism is *outside* the Church; and as my friend professes to be in the Church, I wonder he did not see it, and learn its position, as he same in!

I shall not notice much hereafter, what my friend has to say about "covenants;" as I consider it a settled point, that the Christian covenant is a new, a better, spiritual, and a different covenant, from that of circumcision. What if the covenant of circumcision is called an "everlasting covenant?" Was it not to be "in *their flesh*," for an "everlasting covenant?" Is my friend contending for a *fleshly* covenant? It would seem so indeed! But now, not that there is any special necessity for it, but that you may see that my friend does not understand the passages of Scripture he has brought forward to establish "identity," I will notice one he has quoted from Galatians. Paul there says, "That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in [concerning] Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the *promise* of none effect." Now this covenant, or *promise*, which was not to be "disannulled," or "made of none effect," was made four hundred and thirty years before the Law was given; and this, my friend contends, is the "covenant of circumcision;" and, consequently, it is not to be "made of none effect." But I deny, that the covenant of circumcision was made four hundred and thirty years before the Law. Four hundred and thirty years from the Law, will carry us back to a *promise* God made to Abraham, "concerning Christ,"

while Abraham was in his *seventy-fifth* year, recorded in the xii chap. of Genesis; while the covenant of circumcision, recorded in the xvii chap. of Genesis, as read by Mr. Logan, was made when Abraham was *ninety-nine* years old, and, therefore, only *four hundred and six* years before the law.

God made the promise concerning Christ to Abraham, *twenty-four* years before my friend's covenant of circumcision, that, in him the nations of the earth should be blessed; and Christ is the "seed" of Abraham; and we are "the children of God, *by faith* in Christ Jesus and, "if Christ's, then are we Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the *promise*." What promise? Why, the promise God made to Abraham, *long before the covenant of circumcision was made*. My friend confounds the *promise concerning Christ*, of which Christianity is a development, with the *promise concerning Canaan*, which circumcision accompanied, and of which the Law was a development. This is his error. What a confounding of *flesh and spirit!*

I was amused at my friend, gathering up the scattered fragments of his "strong argument for identity," drawn from the expression, "foundation of the apostles and prophets!" He was evidently so completely *bewildered*, by my reply to his "strong argument," that he imagined every body in the Christian world was perfectly "astonished," not even excepting my own brethren! My brethren and I will have no trouble here; nor is my position so *new* to my brethren as to Mr. Logan. But I did not say as he represented, that the "prophets" in this passage, were "a class of prophets that *lived* after the apostles." These prophets lived *cotemporaneous* with the apostles. Paul places them after the apostles, in *order* merely, as they ranked below them *officially*. Did I not show, that there were set in the church, "*first* apostles, and *secondarily* prophets?" But now I have got to show my friend *where* and *who* these "prophets" were. Very well. "Now there were in the Church at *Antioch*, certain *prophets*; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called *Niger*, and *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, and *Manaen*, which had been brought up with *Herod the tetrarch*, and *Saul*." (Acts xiii, i.) Will that do? That tells "*where* and *who*" those "prophets" were.

My friend comes back to the commission; and after referring to some remarks of Mr. Campbell on it, says: "According to this, [what Mr. C. had said] it is the *act of baptism* that makes the *disciple*, without any reference to previous teaching." Now, Mr. Campbell never advanced any such sentiment as, that disciples are made by baptism alone, "without any reference to previous teaching," in all his writings. And *if he had*, still I would deny it. But I know that Mr. Campbell has taught to the contrary; and I think my friend, Mr. Logan, knows it too. But will Mr. Logan *baptize* an "adult" person, to make him a *disciple*, "without any reference to previous teaching?" I hardly think he will. And this shows that *he* does not believe, that disciples are made by *baptism alone!* It is wholly useless for me to *prove* that *mattheetwo* includes the idea of instructing; though I could do it abundantly; for Mark has it, "*preach the gospel* to every creature; be that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved," etc. What Matthew calls "*teaching* all nations," Mark calls "*preaching the gospel* to every creature." The commission affords no authority for baptizing any untaught person. I had as soon go there for authority for baptizing a *cannon*, as for authority for baptizing an untaught, unbelieving, unconscious babe!

Every thing in that commission applies to every person, to whom any

part of it applies. Infants cannot *believe*, cannot *repent*; Laving no sins, they need not the salvation promised; and hence, if we baptize them, we give them the *water alone!* This is perfectly obvious to all unbiased minds.

Next, my friend—I know Dot what he meant by it—quoted: “And ye fathers, provoke not your *children* to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” (Eph. vi. 14.) I certainly concur with him, that children should be “trained up” in the right way; but I have supposed it could be done without baptizing them. Does “bring up your children,” mean, *baptize* your children? I think not. Or, is there any infant baptism in the expression, “provoke not your children to wrath?” Will it “provoke them to wrath,” not to baptize them? It strikes me, that, if this expression has any reference to the question at all, it is rather against infant baptism; as it almost invariably “provokes children to wrath,” when the preacher put3 water on their faces!

My worthy friend thinks, that if my position on the commission is correct, “it will damn all infants, as they are incapable of exercising faith, and he that believeth not shall be damned.” Well, we will suppose *his* position on the commission to be correct, then, will infants be capable “of exercising faith?” He will not say yes. Then infants do not believe, according to his theory; and “he that believeth not shall be damned.” So we see, that, it matters not whose position on the commission is correct, his or mine, infants are not *believers*; and if the commission applies to them, they will be damned, for it says, “he that believeth not shall be damned.” But have I not unequivocally said, that this commission does not *apply* to infants? I certainly have; and hence, if my position here is correct, the damnation of the commission does not apply to infants. But my friend, Mr. Logan, says, this commission *does* apply to infants; and then, of course, if they believe not, they will be damned. Now, who is it that holds “a doctrine so monstrous” as to damn infants, “because they cannot believe? for no act of their own!” “Thou art the man,” Mr. Logan!

The gentleman asks me, if the Church of Christ was not built before the time he said to Peter, “Upon this rock I *will build* my Church,” etc. “Then where were Abraham, Isaac, etc?” There is a question back of this, which, when my friend answers, I will answer his, most cheerfully: If the Church was organized when Abraham was *ninety-nine years* old, then where were Enoch, Noah, etc.? And if this gives him no trouble, he will please answer another: If John the Baptist was in the kingdom, or Church of Jesus Christ, how is it that the very least in that kingdom is greater than he?

My friend also asks, “where was the church in the wilderness?” I suppose it was “in the wilderness,” and what of it? Does it follow, that it and the Church of Christ were therefore “identical?”

I did not say, as my friend represents me, that baptizing children in infancy, destroys entirely their agency. I only said, it sets aside moral agency, in both *being baptized* and in *becoming members* of the Church; and it does; and this my friend himself will not deny. Mr. Logan thinks, one who has been “baptized in infancy is as much a free agent as one who has not.” This may be true; but it can never be true, that such an one *was baptized* as a free agent. He had no more agency in his being “ded-

icated," [as my friend has it,] to God, than the cannon, that was baptized down East not long since!

Mr. Logan thinks, we may as well "impose" the ceremony of baptism upon children, as to impose upon them the duty of going to school, and *training* generally. But I think there is a difference. It is *our* duty to "bring up our children" in the right way—we are commanded to do this—but it is *their* duty to be baptized, when they *believe* the gospel, *for themselves*; and we are not commanded or authorized to do it for them. Under the gospel, every one must "yield himself" a servant to the Lord.

I am surprised, that my friend, in the same speech in which he defined his position to be, that, infants of believing parents are born within the pales of the Church, and are therefore entitled to baptism, should wheel right about, and go to talking about "dedicating children to God" in baptism! Now, will he be so kind as to tell us, what he means by "dedicating children to God?"

I must give some attention to my friend's lengthy dissertation upon 1 Pet.

iii. 20, 21. And before I do so, I will read the passage. The apostle is speaking of the ark, and says :

"Wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure [antitype] whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

1. It is here said, " eight souls were saved by water." This I understood my friend to deny squarely, asserting that they were " saved by faith." Well, they were saved by faith. And this I say, without *disputing Peter's word*, when he says, they "were saved by *water*." I can see how they were saved by *both* faith and water. But my friend, Mr. Logan cannot see, it appears, how Paul and Peter both told the truth; when one said the eight souls were saved by water, and the other that they were saved by faith. With him, it is either "*faith only*," or "*water only*!" It must be all one thing, or the other! And in the antitype, he cannot see how it can possibly be true, that "baptism also now saves us," because we are said to be saved "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." He asks, will; an air of profound wisdom, ¹¹ If it is by the resurrection of Jesus Christ how can it be by baptism?" And with as much wisdom he might ask "If we are saved by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, how can we be saved by faith? — or, by the blood of Christ? — or, by grace?" And if our consciences are purged by the blood of Christ, he cannot see how it can possibly be true, that baptism can have any thing to do in the matter! It must all be done by the blood of Christ *alone*!

2. In this passage Peter explains *how* "baptism now saves us"—"not [by] the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but [it is] the answer [seeking for] a good conscience toward God." Still my friend cannot see how baptism has any thing to do with the conscience whatever! He cannot see why any thing without any conscience at all may not be baptized as properly as any person seeking a good conscience!

But I understood my friend, in his first speech, to take the ground, that baptism was the answer of a good conscience to those baptized in infancy. He argued that, when such persons grow up, they *believe* that they have been baptized upon the testimony of their friends; and thus it becomes to them the answer of a good conscience. But when I exploded this little

dodge, by showing that we are not *conscious* of what we *believe*, merely, upon the testimony of others, he wheeled right about, and denied that baptism has any thing whatever to do with the conscience! I am constrained to call all this most desperate *quibbling*—I do so for want of a better name to give it. Whenever a man abandons in one speech a position, taken in a former, without the acknowledgment of his error, he proclaims to his audience, that he has become a quibbler, to save a sinking cause!

Next, my friend quoted 1 Cor. vii. 14, to prove, by inference, something about "infant membership," "infant baptism," or infant something else. But I am certain there is nothing in the passage to infer any thing from, which will afford him any assistance whatever. We will read the passage:

"If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean, but now are they holy."—1 Cor. vii. 12, 14.

Now I suppose my worthy friend wishes to *infer* infant baptism from the expression: "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." But what is *there* to infer it from? Paul tells the brethren their children "are *holy*"—and what of it? Why, it follows that the doctrine of hereditary depravity" is *false*! That's all! But I suppose my friend's logic runs thus: Now are your children *holy*; therefore, they are Scriptural subjects of Christian baptism! What logic! Angels *are* *holy*, therefore angels are Scriptural subjects of Christian baptism! Why, this passage proves *angel* baptism too! These advocates of infant baptism are rather hard to take. You cannot tell one day, where you will find them the next! The most of the great men who have written upon the subject, as well as almost all the popular creeds, have taken the ground, that infants are *sinners*—are guilty of original sin—and should be baptized to wash away this sin. But now I find my friend contending, that infants are *holy*, and should therefore be baptized? There is nothing plainer to any one, tolerably read in the history of infant baptism, than that it grew out of the doctrine of total hereditary depravity. The fathers all reasoned, that as infants are sinners, and as baptism is for remission of sins, infants should therefore be baptized. This was the ground of infant baptism as late as John Wesley's day. He came out boldly, and took the ground that infants must be baptized, to wash away original sin! And as I before said, nearly all the popular Creeds make original sin the ground of infant baptism. And I confess I can see some consistency in the man, who believes infants are guilty of original sin, and that it is washed away by baptism. But why a man, who believes they are *holy*, and are born in the church, should contend for their baptism, is something in which I can see no sense, or consistency. What good will it do them to baptize them? What loss will they suffer, if not baptized? Will he—can he—tell? It will not suffice for him to say, that it does them just as much good, as circumcision did the *fleshly* seed of Abraham; for we all know, that God made promise of certain temporal blessings to the seed of Abraham, according to the *flesh*: they were to possess the land of Canaan—and become a great nation, etc.; and circumcision was a mark put *in their flesh*, whereby they were to be distinguished from other nations and peoples. Is this the office of baptism? Certainly not. Then, I insist, that my friend, Mr. Logan, shall tell us

what blessing a baptized child will receive, that an unbaptized one will not? Or, what curse, or loss, an unbaptized child will suffer, which the baptized one will escape? If he will not do this, I shall then insist, that he is contending for a mere *empty ceremony*, and that he is convinced that it is such! He does not pretend that he can prove infant baptism otherwise than by inference or deduction; and when he has inferred or deduced authority from the Bible, as he supposes, for his practice, he will not tell us what good there is in it!

I am surprised no little, that my friend should introduce this passage from Corinthians, to prove his proposition. Let us give it our attention again for a moment. Paul here decides that, "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away, [that is, let him not decide that she is "unclean" in such a sense, that he should put her away, simply because she is not a member of the church.] And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him, [simply for the reason, that he is not a member of the church with her. Then Paul gives his reason for this decision in the case:] For the unbelieving husband is sanctified [*set apart*] by the wife, [to be her husband,] and the unbelieving wife is sanctified [*set apart, or selected*] by the husband, [to be his wife;] else [that is, if you decide otherwise than I have decided. I? you decide that the believing husband shall put away his wife as "unclean"— unfit to live with—simply because she is not a believer—not a member of the church, though the husband has lawfully set her apart to be his wife,] were your children [not *their* children, but *your* children—the children of *you to whom I write*] unclean; [that is, unfit for you to live with, not being believers, or members of the church] but now are they holy." The apostle simply decides, that if the Corinthian brethren should make Bro. A. put away his wife, as "unclean," simply because she was not a believer; then, as their own children were not believers, they would have to put them away loo.

But now, as I have yet a few minutes left, I will talk a little more about a matter, in which my friend, Mr. Logan, seems all himself, and perfectly at home; about "covenant seals." My friend is fully committed to the position, that, circumcision was the seal of the covenant, during the old dispensation; but *since* Christ—that is, in the Christian dispensation—*baptism* is the "covenant seal." Or, in other words, that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, as the covenant seal. It would, of course, be entirely out of order, as well as impertinent, for me to ask my friend for a little *authority* for this! He must be allowed coolly to *tell* us that this is all so; and then we must proceed, just as if he had read it to us, in a half dozen places in the New Testament! But I must ask my friend to explain one little matter for our benefit. It is this: If baptism comes in the place of circumcision, as the covenant seal, then, *why did John the Baptist, as well as the Apostles of Christ, seal with baptism, such as had already been sealed with circumcision?* They certainly did baptize the Jews, who had been circumcised; and my friend being right, all such persons were *twice sealed!* And yet the Church of Christ, as I have shown, was not established! So these persons were twice sealed, and not yet in the Christian Church! Then, there was Nicodemus, a regular *bona fide* member, in full fellowship and high standing with the Jews, *sealed* the eighth day by cir-

cumcision, whom our Lord told, he could not enter His Church, except he was *baptized!*

But now I must show my worthy friend a slight difficulty his cause has led him into, and I shall show him also that I am not to blame for it. He certainly has not forgotten, that, while debating the other question, I quoted Col. iii. 12, to prove immersion; and that he took the position, against me, and against even his own Creed, that Holy Spirit baptism was referred to there; and that *Holy Spirit baptism was the circumcision of Christ*, "made without hands." Now, he has *water baptism*, the Christian circumcision!! I then reminded him, as he will doubtless recollect, of this very difficulty; but notwithstanding my gentle and well-meant warning, here he is in the difficulty: one day contending, that *Spirit baptism* is the circumcision of Christ, and the next day contending, that *water baptism* is the circumcision of Christ!!—[*Time expires.*]

MR. LOGAN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I shall now proceed with my arguments, in the defence of the proposition under discussion, without particular reference to what my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, has said in his speech, to which you have been listening, until I get through with them; when I will notice such things in it as I shall deem worthy of attention.

I shall now take up the subject of the household baptisms, as they are termed; and first I will notice the case of *Lydia*, at Philippi: as our opponents affirm, that it cannot be proven there were any *infants* in her family; or, that if she had any, she had them with her there. There is a great deal depending on this case, as to this branch of our argument for infant baptism—perhaps as much as on any other case of household baptism, recorded in the New Testament; as, if it can be shown that there were *infants* in her family, then it can be proven that they were *baptized*; as we are told that "*she was baptized and her household*," which would include *all her family*. Before my friend can sustain his theory, he will have to prove that there were *unbelievers* in her family; and I think that it will be difficult for him to do this, unless I am greatly mistaken. This will be essential to his cause, and he cannot get along without it. It is not said, in the account we have of the baptism of her and her family, that any one of them believed but *Lydia*; yet we learn that *others were baptized*; and they must therefore either have been *infants* or *unbelievers*. Now if it can only be proven, that *Lydia* was a *believer*, my friend's position here must fail; as it can easily be shown, that her *household*, as well as she herself, were *baptized*. There are some *one* or *two* important *facts*, in reference to her case, which will claim our attention here; but let us, in the first place, give the history of the case, as recorded in the Acts of Apostles:

"And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named *Lydia*, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped 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."—Acts xvi. 13-15.

Such is the account we have recorded, of this instance of household baptism. Now we learn the following facts in reference to this case:

1. In the first place, we learn, that she was "a worshipper of God," and of course a *believer* in Him; that is, according to the Jewish religion. But as she was not a believer on Christ, as we are led to infer, she had, like Apollos, to be taught "the way of the Lord more perfectly," which she was, by Paul, when "the Lord opened her heart" to attend to the things spoken by him.

2. In the second place, among "the things spoken by Paul," to which she was induced to attend, was that of *baptism*, the *seal* of the Christian covenant, the nature, design, subjects, etc., of which were no doubt fully explained to her by the apostle, before she attended to it.

The result of all was, as we have seen from the account of her case, which I have quoted, that she and her household, of course including all her family, *children* as well as adults, received the *application* of the water of baptism, the *seal* of the covenant, and were all thus *dedicated* to God. As she had *all* her household or family with her at Philippi, and of course *children*, as generally to be found in all households, *these* must have been *baptized* too. We find nothing said about the *faith* of any of them but Lydia herself, which (faith) we infer from her being "a worshipper of God," and her heart being opened to attend to "the things spoken of Paul;" as we generally find in all these cases of household baptism, recorded in the New Testament, that the *faith* of the *head* of the family is all that is spoken of, or referred to; (and on that the family was baptized; while generally nothing is said of that of the family)—another strong presumptive proof of *infant baptism*, as we find that all the "household," or family, *were baptized*. But if we have no direct or positive proof of there being *infants* in the family of Lydia, my friend cannot show from the Bible, that there were *none* there. So the *presumption* will be as much in my favor as in his. Besides, if she had no children of her own, there might have been *members* of her family along, who had *children*; as we learn that there were other "women," to whom Paul spake, besides Lydia, who might have been of her family, and have had *children*.

In this same chapter and connection, in which we have the case of Lydia recorded, we have another case of household baptism, that of the jailor's family. In the account of that case, which has already been so much quoted, and so largely commented on, in the discussion of the preceding proposition, that it is unnecessary here to go over it again, we are told:

"And he took them [Paul and Silas] the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and *was baptized*, he and *all his* [family,] straightway: and when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with *all his house*.'—Acts xvi. 33, 31.

Now we reason from this case, just as we have from that of Lydia, in reference to *infant baptism*: that there must have been *children* here, as generally in all families, or households; and as *all his family were baptized*; consequently *they* were too. And if we have no *positive* proof of there being any—if they are not particularly mentioned—we have no positive proof either, that there were none; and my friend cannot show, from the account, that there were *none*; or that, if any, they were *not baptized*. So that the presumption, in this case, is as much in my favor as in his: and if against my position, is equally as much against his!

The next case of household baptism I shall notice, is that of Stephanas, mentioned by Paul. In speaking of those he had baptized at Corinth, he says:

"And I baptized also the *household* of Stephanas."—1 Cor. i. 16.

We reason in reference to this case of household, or *family* baptism, as we have in reference to the others; that there must have been *children* here too, and consequently *they* must have been *baptized*; or, it would not be true, that he baptized the "household." The omission of their baptism, would leave the baptism of the household incomplete; and rentier untrue the assertion of the apostle, that he had baptized "the household." So in reference to the other cases we have noticed. The *presumptive argument* here too, is as much in my favor, as in that of my worthy friend; or as much against his position as against mine!

And I will here say, that the mention by the writer of the New Testament, of household baptisms—of the baptism of *whole families*, again and again — of the baptism of Lydia, "and her household of the Jailor, and "all his," "all his house of Stephanas, and "the household of Stephanas"—contain presumptive arguments of the strongest and most conclusive character, in favor of *infant baptism*. If there was no such thing, no such practice, among the apostles, as my worthy friend has been laboring hard to show, why should such baptisms be so often referred to, and in the manner too in which they are mentioned? If I am told, that there is no mention of *infants*, in the notices we have of them, then I reply, neither is there of *adults*, only the *heads* of the families. If there were *infants* in these families, and we have every reason to believe there were, then they too must have been *baptized*; as we learn that *all the family*, in each case, were *baptized*. To exclude them, would destroy the baptism entirely!

As my worthy friend has, among other things which I may notice hereafter, charged me with affirming that a person is made a *disciple* of Christ, by water baptism *alone*—by *mere* baptism, without any thing else—I will here say, that I have affirmed no such thing, in any of the remarks I have made on the subject. I deny the charge flatly and positively! My position was, that it took *both baptism and teaching* to make the disciple, and not baptism *alone*. I suppose, he makes the charge, because I quoted the authority of Mr. A. Campbell, of his Church, for rendering the commission in Matthew, "Go, *convert the nations*," etc. And here he has misrepresented me, by charging me with affirming that Mr. Campbell said, "that disciples are made by *baptism alone*." Now, I did not say any such thing. As Mr. Campbell had rendered the commission as I have just quoted, I said, as my friend has quoted, "*According to this* [rendering,] it is the act of baptism that makes the disciple but not that it was baptism *alone*. It seems to me, that the cause of my friend must be in a bad and sinking condition, when it requires such things as these to sustain it—such twisting, and turning, and misrepresentation, and perversion of scripture, as you have been listening to!

My worthy friend has had a good deal to say, as you have heard, in reference to *infant baptism* destroying the *free agency* of persons, setting aside *heart religion*, etc. Now I have shown to the contrary of all this—that *infant baptism*, by placing the *obligation* on parents, to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," under which they place themselves, by the *promises* required of them, *when* their children are

baptized, which they have then to make, favors and promotes the religious training of children. But my friend's argument against it, must destroy this parental training. It places parents under no promise—no obligation whatever—to train up their children in the way of the Lord! Such is the natural tendency—the legitimate result—of his theory and argument against infant baptism!

My friend has enquired of me, what good infant baptism does?—of what *advantage* is it?—and all that. The remarks I have just been making, are, perhaps, a sufficient reply to these questions, without adding any thing else to them. I might ask, in turn, of what advantage is it, to attend to any thing required by the Christian religion? Or, I might reply to him, as Paul did to the Jew who asked, "What profit is there of circumcision?"

—and say, "Much every way." But it will be time enough to answer his question, when put in a serious and sincere manner, in order to elicit information, as that is not what he wants.

My worthy friend lays great stress on *water* baptism, as he believes it to be essential to the *saving* of the *soul*; and consequently, according to his theory, all who are *not baptized* must be damned and lost forever! This is very plain from his remarks on the commission in Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" and the expression in Peter, "the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth now save us" — where he (my friend) makes baptism a *condition* of the saving of the soul; and as *none* but the *baptized* can be saved, according to his theory, all not baptized—in fact, *all infants*, as he does not recognize infant baptism at all—as well as all the unbaptized, whether unbelievers or not, must be damned and lost forever! His doctrine is too horrible, too inconsistent with the Bible, too shocking to the senses, to be entertained by the honest mind! Our Savior said, "he that believeth not shall be damned" — not, "he that is baptized not" — which refutes this soul destroying doctrine!

My friend has insinuated, as you have heard, that I teach that *baptism alone* saves the infant. Now I have taught no such thing. I have not taught, that baptism, either alone, or with any thing else, saves the infant — or has any *saving efficacy* in it, in reference to infants, or adults.

My friend finds his theory of *salvation* by water baptism, beset with difficulties. According to it, there is no salvation without water baptism; and yet he has to admit that all the ancient worthies, as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., were saved without water baptism! How contradictory and inconsistent! At one time his theory cuts off all infants; and then at another, it cuts off all the good and pious of all past ages, before the introduction of water baptism!

As my friend will not have the church to begin with Abraham, nor with Moses, nor with John the Baptist, nor while our Savior was on earth, will he please point out to us *when* the church was *founded*? — *when* it *did begin*? — for I would like to know of him, whether we have ever had any church, or not, what it is, and *where* it can be found?

The next scriptural authority I shall present, in favor of *infant baptism* and *infant membership* in the church, is what Paul says, on the subject of *grafting*, in reference to the Gentiles, in his epistle to the Romans:

"For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of

the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, 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 high minded but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest be also spared not thee."—Rom. xi. 16-21.

We have here the *identity* of the Jewish and Christian Churches plainly taught. The Jewish is the "tame," or domestic olive tree, "*some* [not all] of the branches" of which "were broken off;" and the Gentiles, the "wild olive tree," were grafted in. Now we learn, that the Jewish "stump," or "*trunk*," was not broken off, or rooted up, but remained as before. Only some of the *branches* were broken off. Here is the *same trunk*, representing the same church, all the time, under both Jewish and Christian dispensations. Never was there a clearer case of church *identity*—a stronger argument illustrating it. And hence, if there was *infant membership* under one, it must have been *continued* under the *other*. If my friend is able to get in a *new* church here, he must first have the old Jewish trunk broken off, and the stump entirely rooted up! The Church is called the "Church of God," and in Acts vii, "the church in the wilderness;" and I would ask, where is the *difference* between these churches, that prevents them from being "one and the same" church all the time, and under all dispensations of religion?

The Church is called "the Church of the living God" — the Church of God—and what or where is the *difference* between the Church of God and the Church of Christ? It must be admitted, that God had a Church in the world before the coming of Christ, and before the day of Pentecost, as well as since; and I affirm, that it has always been one and the same." Christ had a Church before he came into the world, as we learn from the following:

"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 [Christ, this prophet,] is he, in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers," etc.—Acts vii. 37, 38

Here we learn, that CHRIST was in the Jewish church in the wilderness, consequently it must be the *same*, the *identical* Church *now*, as it was then. We hear our Savior speaking of this same Church, as existing while he was on earth, and before Pentecost:

"And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the *church*: but if he neglect to hear the *church*, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."—Matthew xviii. 17.

Another thing which shows the existence of the Church *before* Pentecost, is the expressions: "And there were *added* unto *them* the same day three thousand souls;" and: "The Lord daily *added* to the *church* such as should be saved"—showing that there was a Church in existence *before* the day of Pentecost—the words "them" and "church" implying the same.

Now, if the Church, as we have shown, was in existence "in the wilderness," in the *time* of Christ, and *before* Pentecost, *where* and *when*, I would ask, did Christ set up a *new* Church? Let it be shown. If there have been more churches than one, as my friend contends, an old Church and a new one, why is the Church always mentioned in the *singular* number? — as never but *one*? — as "the *church* in the wilderness; "tell it to the *church*;" "I will build my *church*," etc.—implying but *one* and the *same*

Church all the time? Again, if more than *one* Church, why is it spoken of so *definitely*; as, "Gave him [Christ] to be head over all things to *the* church," (Eph. i. 22); "And he is the head of the body, *the* church," (Col. i. 18.)

If there is no such thing as *infant baptism* in the Church, I would ask, when did Christ *repeal* the law of infant membership? — as it existed under the Abrahamic covenant and Jewish dispensation? Let it be shown when it was done.

In 1 Cor. x. 1, which has been so much quoted and commented on, containing the baptism of the Israelites "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," we have an *example* of baptism, left us by the apostle, for our instruction, for us to follow, in which *infants*, as well as adults, were baptized. Notice, the apostle says: "Now these things were our *example*;" and of course they contain an *example* of *infant baptism* for us to follow.

In Acts iii. 22, we hear Peter saying to the Jews: "For Moses truly said to the fathers, A *prophet* shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, *like unto me*; him shall you hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Now, as this prophet, our Savior, was to be *like* Moses, and as Jews were baptized unto Moses, at the Red Sea, *infants* as well as adults, and thus took him as their mediator and leader; so *infants*, as well as adults, are baptized unto Christ.

My worthy friend's interpretation of the passage in 1 Cor. vii. 14, "Else were your children unclean," is indeed a novel and strange one! The apostle is speaking of *ecclesiastical* uncleanness, when he tells the Corinthians, that "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the [believing] wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the [believing] husband: else were your children *unclean*; but now are they *holy*;" that is, legally, or ecclesiastically holy: but my friend, after giving us a long, labored, strange and novel interpretation of these passages—one utterly at variance with that of the whole Christian world—comes out, and says, that, as their own children were *not believers* they would have to put them away too!" — would have to put them away for not being believers, *before* they could *believe*!!

My worthy friend affirms, in the most positive and unqualified manner, that there cannot be a *single case* of *infant baptism* found, for the first 200 years after Christ and the apostles. Now we have the testimony of Dr. Wall, in his learned "History of Infant Baptism," and he had investigated the subject as fully as it could be done, that such was not the case and that the assertion of my friend is wrong. Dr. Wall says:

"Ireneus, who wrote about the middle of it, [the first 100 years after the apostles,] speaks of *infants*, as being ordinarily *baptized*, or regenerated; or of Origen, who was cotemporary with Tertullian, and wrote but a little after him; and who having traveled in all the noted churches then in the world, speaks of *their baptism*, both as being *generally practiced*, and also *appointed by* the apostles." — Wall, vol. ii, p. 21.

Here we have testimony to the effect, that *infant baptism* was practiced within the first 200 years after Christ; and we have no account of its being opposed by any denomination, until the 12th century, when one sect of the Albigenses declared against it.

From what the apostle Paul says, in the x. chap. of his epistle to the Romans, we learn that God has always had a Church in the world, in every age from Abraham on down; and in the ix. chap. we have presented to us

all the *essentials* of a Church. If not—if no antecedent Church—why did the apostle say: "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh?" And hence he continues:

"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 concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."—Rom. ix. 3-5.

Now we learn from all this, that there has been no *new* Church instituted; but that the Christian Church is only an *enlargement* of the old Jewish church. Hence it is said, that the Gentiles are "no more strangers and foreigners; but *fellow-citizens* with the saints and *of the household* [Church] of God."

I have now fully proven, that the Abrahamic and Christian covenants are *identical* and the same. Had I the time, there are several other things in the speech of my friend I would like to notice. He has accused me of "quibbling;" but he has shown himself to be one of the greatest "quibblers" in the world! What has the most of his speech been but a series of "quibbling" all the time? — and misrepresentations, and perversions of scripture? He has been constantly making "men of straw," and setting them up as my arguments, and then pulling them down, and tearing them to pieces!—[*Time expires.*]

MR. SWEENEY'S THIRD REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My worthy friend, in the speech to which you have been so patiently listening, for the last half hour, proceeded, in the first place, to try to infer something favorable to his proposition, from what he styled "household baptism." He did not even claim, that it is expressly said, that there was a single infant in any of these "households." His argument, from "household baptism," then, is nothing but an inference, or presumption, to make the very best of it. But I shall follow him through the whole list of "household baptisms;" and see what there is in them favorable to his proposition. Before I do so, however, I wish to call attention to the fact, that Pedobaptists rely more upon the simple *sound* of the expression, "household baptism," than they do upon the facts in the record of any or all the cases in the New Testament. I wish, therefore, to show that there are necessarily no infants in the word "household" itself. We can infer nothing as to infants from the mere word household, or even from the phrase "all his house." We learn, Acts xviii. 8, that, "Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, *believed* in the Lord with *all his house.*" Now, can we infer infant *faith* from this case of "*household, faith?*" Certainly not. Then, neither can we infer infant baptism from the phrase "*household baptism.*"

1. But now I will come to his first case of "household baptism"—that of Lydia. The first remark of my friend's, that I shall notice, is, that "it cannot be proven, that any of this household *believed*, but Lydia alone;" and consequently he thinks I must admit, that the residue of the household were infants; or else I must take the ground, that "unbelievers were baptized." Well, what if I were to take the ground that "unbelievers were baptized?" My worthy friend would have to acknowledge the "ground" as genuinely orthodox! For you know his order is, "to disciple by bap-

tizing and teaching;" and he has the baptizing first, and the teaching afterward. If this is the order for discipling one, it is the order for *all*; for there is no *distinction* made in the commission! There is just as much authority in the commission, for discipling a full grown man, by baptizing first and teaching afterward, as there is for discipling an infant—if it were possible—in that way. But I have shown, that this is not the order of the commission, nor is this the way the apostles proceeded. The apostle Paul had no authority for baptizing any untaught, and consequently unbelieving person, in the house of Lydia, or any where else; and this is all the proof *I want*, that all that household baptized were believers. *Paul had no authority for baptizing any others than believers.*

But you recollect, my friend was kind enough—and unfortunate enough, to define his position, as follows: "Infants of *believing parents*, are born within the pales of the Church; and are therefore entitled to baptism, the seal." Well, now, if Lydia had any infant children at the time of her conversion, they were of course born while she was an *unbeliever*; and consequently were not "born within the pales of the Church;" and, consequently, were not "entitled to baptism, the seal." Hence we see, that if my friend is right, as to the *ground* of infant baptism, Lydia had no children, born of "believing parents, and consequently none entitled to "baptism, the seal of the covenant." Here my friend will find it necessary to change the *ground* of infant baptism; or, otherwise, every case of "household baptism" will be taken out of his hands, just as this one has been!

Finally; there is no proof that there was a single infant in the house of Lydia. In fact, it has never been ascertained, that she was a *married* woman—that must be *presumed*. I am inclined to think she was an "old maid;" being engaged in the "purple" business, from city to city, she had with her doubtless several hired servants, or clerks, who, with her, were occupying a hired house, near the river; all of whom were baptized. Her *home* was in "Thyatira," where she would probably have been, had she had a *husband* to provide for her. And again, we learn, that when Paul and Silas were released from prison, the next morning, they "entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the *brethren*, they *comforted* them, and departed." Now what brethren were there in Philippi, to be "in the house of Lydia," the next morning, but those of her house, who were baptized the day before? Were Lydia's *infants* the "*brethren*" whom Paul and Silas *comforted*? Now what is there, in this "household baptism," from which to *infer* infant baptism? *Nothing!*

2. The same may be said of the jailor's infants—if he had any—that was said of Lydia's: they were all born of *unbelieving* parents; and consequently *without* the pales of the church: and were therefore not "entitled to baptism, the seal."

But it is said, that Paul *spake the word of the Lord* to all that were in the jailor's house; and again, it is said, after the baptism, that the jailor "*rejoiced believing in God with all his house.*"

And, finally, let it not be forgotten, that Paul and Silas had no authority to baptize any *untaught* and *unbelieving* person. Therefore it was, that "they *spake* unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house"—that they might *believe*; for faith comes by hearing the word of the Lord.

3. Paul says, "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas." (1

Cor. i. 16.) Now, five years before Paul wrote this letter, he was at Corinth, and preached the gospel; and we learn, that "many of the Corinthians *hearing, believed, and were baptized.*" (Acts xviii. 8.) So it seems, he baptized such only as he had authority to baptize—*such as believed.* Just *five* years after this, he wrote the letter, in which he says, he baptized the "household of Stephanas;" and at the close of his letter he uses this language: "I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, and that they [the house of Stephanas] *have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,*) that ye submit yourselves unto such," etc. So it appears, that these *infants* of the house of Stephanas, were *ministers and rulers* within *five* years from their baptism!

Now, what is there in any one, or all these casts, from which to infer infant baptism? Can we infer it from the fact, that we have no evidence, that Lydia was, or ever had been married? Can we infer it from the fact, that Paul and Silas "entered into the house of Lydia, and saw the *brethren, and comforted* them? Can we infer it from the fact, (in the jailor's case,) that "they spake unto him the word of the Lord, *and to all that were in his house* Or, from the fact, that the whole house "*rejoiced, believing in God?*" In the case of Stephanas, can we infer infant baptism from the fact that when he was baptized, with other Corinthians, it is said: "And many of the Corinthians *hearing, believed, and were baptized?*" Or, shall we infer, that some of his "household" were infants, from the fact, that within five years from their baptism, they were *ministers and rulers*?

I must ask my worthy friend to "keep cool," and attend to the argument; and let the audience judge and decide between us, as to who is guilty of "such twisting, and turning, misrepresentation, and perversion of Scripture." I did certainly understand him, at first, to take the ground, that disciples are made by baptism merely; and I understood him to try to prove it by Mr. Campbell. But now he says, "disciples are made by baptizing *and teaching;*" and he has the baptizing first, and the teaching afterward. Well, this is little less objectionable. I say, *teaching* is the *first* thing to be done, in making disciples to Christ. Now, I wish to know, if my friend means to say, that Mr. Campbell has taught, that disciples to Christ can be made by *beginning with baptism?* If he does say so, I will make it appear that he—even *he*—is guilty of very gross, and almost unpardonable "misrepresentation!"

I said that infant baptism sets aside all "heart-work," *in being baptized, and in becoming members of the Church.* How does my friend meet this? By saying that the ceremony of infant baptism brings Pedobaptist parents under obligations to train up their children piously, etc. Well, suppose I grant him this; and suppose I grant, as he unkindly insinuates, that nobody but Pedobaptists can train up their children in the right way; does it *follow* that infants *are baptized, and become members of the Church "from the heart?"* Certainly not. But I say, that there are as good and well-bred children in the families of Baptists, as in those of Pedobaptists. There is too much wickedness and corruption among the children of all church members, Pedobaptists as well as Baptists. The difference is this: My friend says, all this corruption is *in the Church.* I deny.

I shall pass over my friend's little *horrific* speech, concerning our views of the *design* of baptism, most respectfully suggesting, that he will need all

his accumulated *horror*, when we come to the discussion of that question, to fill up his time.

My worthy friend calls on me to say, "when and where the Church of Christ was established?" Is that the question in debate? He says, he has shown, that it was established in the ninety-ninth year of Abraham's age. Is he satisfied with his effort? If so, why does he call on *me* to show when it was established? He wishes to get up another question, and to get on the *negative himself!*

The gentleman read a portion of the xi. chap., of Romans; and gave us quite a lengthy dissertation upon it. But did he find any infant baptism there? Did he find any *baptism* itself, of any kind? Did he find anything, in any shape or form, about *infants*? Did he find any thing there about "Church identity?" Did he find any thing about "identity" of any kind? Did he find any thing about any "Church" in that chapter? He found none of these things! In the sacred name of reason, then, I ask him, does that Scripture prove his proposition? Did he *infer* "infant membership" from the expression: "*Thou standest by FAITH?*" Surely not!

Next my friend quoted Acts vii, 38, to prove that "Christ was in the Church in the wilderness." And though I am not interested to show, that Christ was not there *in any sense*, yet I deny that the Scripture he quoted proves it. His passage refers to *Moses*, and not to *Christ*. Let us read:

"This is *he* [my friend says, *Christ*—I say *Moses*] that was in the Church in the wilderness, with the angel that spake to *him* [whom? *Christ?* or *Moses?*] in the mount Sina, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us. [who was it that received the lively oracles to give to the Israelites?] To whom [the same person] our fathers would not obey [was not this *Moses?*] but thrust him from them; and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt, saying unto Aaron, Make us gods to go before us; for as for this *MOSES*, [this shows who is referred to,] which brought us out of the land of *Egypt*, we wot not what is become of him," It was *Moses* —Acts vii. 3d, 40.

Next—to prove "identity," I suppose — my friend quoted Matt. xviii. IT:

"And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the *Chuck*, and if he neglect to hear the *Church*," etc.

The Savior here was giving his disciples instructions, which were to have a *future* bearing. By referring back to the 3rd verse of this chapter, you will learn, that the disciples to whom Jesus was talking, were *not yet members* of his Church. There he tells these same disciples: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye *shall not enter* into the kingdom of heaven." This shows that they were not in the Church yet, or kingdom of heaven, which my friend has already admitted is the *same*. By the way, it was only the day before, I believe, that our Savior had said, as I have already quoted: "Upon this rock I *will build* my church," etc.; and had promised to Peter the keys of his church, or kingdom. And it was doubtless this promise, that had inclined them to ask him, who was to be the *greatest* in the kingdom of heaven—or in his Church. Then followed the lesson of the xviii. chap.—all of which was to have, as I before said,*t future bearing.*

My friend thinks the expression: "And there were *added* unto them the same day three thousand souls"—proves his notion of "identity." This passage is found in Acts ii. 44. The three thousand were the first

converts to the Christian Religion, under the great commission. My friend could not have gone to a place less friendly to his notion of "identity." Were the three thousand *added* to the old Jewish Church? No, sir! The three thousand comprised some of the most faithful and zealous members of that old Church. They had come from "every nation under heaven;" to Jerusalem, to worship. They were "devout men." And when they heard the gospel, *believed* and *obeyed* it, they "were *added* unto them." Unto whom? The Jews? No, sir! They were already the *cream* of the Jewish Church. They were added to the *disciples of Christ*. To these disciples Jesus had said: "Fear not, little flock, for it is your father's good pleasure to *give you* the kingdom." This promise was fulfilled at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, after Jesus had been anointed in heaven. These disciples, who had "waited for the kingdom of God," and to whom the Savior had said, "I *will build* my Church," were the "charter members" of Christ's Church: and it was to these, that the three thousand were *added*. Here begins to rise the "new Church," my friend asks for.

"The Lord daily added to the Church such as should be saved," was spoken after the organization of Christ's Church; and of course refers to it, without proving anything about "identity." Can my friend Mr. Logan, find wherever any body was added to the Church *before* the day of Pentecost?

My friend goes back again to the baptism "in the cloud and in the sea," to find an "example of infant baptism." I am perfectly satisfied with my remarks already made upon that "example of infant baptism," as a refutation of all he has said, or can say, about it; and shall henceforth let it pass unnoticed.

I stated that Mr. Logan, could not find even a *mention* of infant baptism, within *two hundred* years of Christ. I still say he cannot do it. He read you, in his last speech, an extract from Ireneus, in Mr. Wall's "History [or rather *defence*] of Infant Baptism." Ireneus wrote about the middle of the second century; but he never, in any way, mentioned infant baptism, in all his writings. He said something about the *regeneration of children* (not infants), and Mr. Wall assumes that by regeneration Ireneus meant *baptism*, and he (Wall) puts *baptized* for *regenerated*; and thus he tries to find infant baptism named within 150 years of Christ. I do not accuse Mr. Wall of acting unfairly with the writing of "father" Ireneus; for he comes out, and frankly confesses, that Ireneus did not use the word *baptizo*, in connection with infants; but he (Wall) is of the opinion, that when Ireneus speaks of the *regeneration* of children, he *means infant baptism*.

I reassert, that Tertullian was the first to mention infant baptism, and he *opposed* it. Would he have done so, if it had been ordained of Christ, and practiced by the apostles, and by the Church down to his time? When my friend re-asserted, that "we have no account of its being opposed by any one till the 12th century," it struck me as rather a reckless assertion. Let us read Tertullian. Speaking of *baptizing* infants, he says:

"Our Lord says indeed. Do not forbid them [little children] to come to me. Therefore let them come *when they are grown up*; let them come *when they understand*; when they are *instructed* whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians *when they can know Christ*." Wall's Hist. Inf. Bap, vol. i. p. 94.

Thus wrote Tertullian about 200 years after Christ. What shall we

think of my friend's assertion, that infant baptism was not opposed till the 12th century?

My friend asks: "If there was no antecedent Church, then why did Paul say: "For I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh?" But there is no controversy about whether there was an "antecedent Church." I freely admit, and have done so all the time, that there was a *fleshly* institution, called a Church, of which Paul was a member, in virtue of his birth of the flesh. But Paul had been "born again," "translated into the kingdom of God's dear S o n ;" a n d now, being a member of the Church of Christ—a *Spiritual* Church—he calls the Jews his "brethren according to the flesh." That this old, fleshly church was "one and the same" with the Church of Christ, is what I deny. If they were the same, is it not unaccountably strange, that every one of the Jews, the members of the Church, *had to come into the Church of Christ*, (of which they were already members, according to my friend's notion of "identity!") upon the same terms with Gentiles? Strange indeed, that the people, *priests and high priests*, and *rulers of the people*, had to be *born again*, to get into the Church, of which they were *already members!* These things are very exceedingly difficult for some of us to understand; and as my friend seems to be perfectly at home in 'identity,' I hope he will be kind enough to explain a little. And by the way, lean inform him, that I am "serious" and "sincere," in my request, and am not merely "ridiculing his arguments."

My worthy friend has had a good deal to say, from time to time, about what he calls the "enlargement of the Church," that he agrees took place from the day of Pentecost, about the time the "seal was changed from circumcision to baptism." Now, I have to say, that this change, my friend talks of, was a very singular one truly! It was such a change as turned out every member of the Church, and placed them upon an equal footing with aliens, requiring them to come into the "enlarged" *edition* of the Church, upon the same terms! My friend has, I believe, illustrated this change, or "enlargement," by the change of a State Constitution. Well, I have heard of Constitutional Conventions, which, when they had made a *new* Constitution, or "enlarged" the *old* one, *unofficered* the State; but I have yet to hear of one, that placed old citizens upon an equal footing with foreigners, respecting citizenship, requiring them alike *to become citizens—by the same process!* At the time of the change, or "enlargement," of the old Jewish Church, it seems that the Lord, not only "unofficered" it, but turned out all the members, and placed them upon equal footing with the Gentiles, or *foreigners*, requiring them to be all alike *naturalized*, in a new way, in order to citizenship in the "Church enlarged"—that is, He just "concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all." Well, this is not such a bad doctrine, after all; but to call it "Church *identity*," is what sounds so strangely to me!

Mr. Logan, is evidently a man of good talent, extensive reading, and enlarged experience; and if there were any *authority* in the Bible for infant baptism, he is the very man to bring it forth. He labors under no embarrassments, in this discussion, save what grows out of the cause he advocates; as he is an experienced controversialist; and we may reasonably expect, therefore, that if there is any authority in the Bible, for infant baptism, he

will bring it forth. Or, if there is any thing in history, favorable to it, he will produce it.

There are one or two little matters, that I think my worthy friend ought to rectify a little, before we close the discussion on this question; and that I may not be blamed, for his leaving them a little "out of shape," if he does, I will again refresh his mind concerning them.

1. In the first place, he has said, either intentionally or unintentionally, that "water baptism is the *seal* of the Christian covenant;" thus making it, not only essential in itself to the salvation of every soul, but also essential to the salvation of *Christianity itself!* To such an undue, and unreasonable, and unparalleled, exultation of *water*, I object! We should have some good, Bible authority, for such a "monstrous doctrine;" or it should be somewhat modified. My friend talks as complacently and confidently, about "administering the seal of baptism" to persons, as if the Bible was full of such teaching! Paul says, in his letter to the Ephesian Christians: "In whom also, after that ye *believed*, [not *before*] ye were *sealed with that Holy Spirit* of promise" — *not with water!*

2. My worthy friend, to evade the force of my argument for *immersion*, drawn from the expression: "Buried with him in baptism," (Col. ii. 12.) took the position, that the baptism of that passage, was "Holy Ghost baptism," and that it was the same as the "circumcision of Christ," "made without hands;" and being made "*without hands*," it must be Holy Ghost, and not water, baptism. Thus he fully committed himself, that the "Christian circumcision" is "made without hands," and is "Holy Ghost baptism." But now, my friend, that he may establish infant baptism by "inference," says, unequivocally, that "*water baptism is the circumcision of Christ!!*" Now, which—if either—of his positions, is correct? If the Christian circumcision is "made without hands," and is "Holy Ghost baptism," then it is not "*water baptism*," and made *with hands*. All truth is consistent with itself, and never throws its advocates upon such desperate courses. Any man though, who, either wittingly or ignorantly, contends against the truth, will find himself occasionally involved in difficulties and contradictions—no matter if he is a reasoner, and feels himself able to prove by inference and deduction, a doctrine not once mentioned in the whole Bible, nor for 200 years in the History of the Church! The TRUTH: cannot be put down by *error*.

"TRUTH crushed to earth, will rise again—

The eternal years of God are here:

While error vanquished, writhes in pain,

And dies amid her worshippers." — [Time expires

MR. LOGAN'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — I would not have you to understand, by any thing I have said, either in my preceding speech, or in any of the speeches I have delivered, that I am disposed to underrate, or make little of, my worthy friend and opponent in this debate, Mr. Sweeney. I regard him, not only as a Christian and a gentleman, but as a man of talent, ability and learning—more so than usual for a man of his age, and perhaps as much so as any man in the Church to which he belongs—and as an opponent altogether worthy for me to meet in discussion. My only regret, in reference to him, is, that he is not with

me, in my views upon the questions we are engaged in discussing, and on which we are at issue. I hope, however, he will pardon me for saying, that I think he has too large a share of what is called *egotism*, and manifests a little too much of it, in his remarks. To listen to him, you would think that he has perfectly demolished every argument I have advanced, and completely overturned every position I have taken! Why, to listen to him, you would think that he was one of the greatest men in argument in the world! It is all the time, what *he* has done, what *he* is doing, and what *he* is going to do, with my positions and arguments! Well, we will have to let him take his own course, and go his own way.

Before I enter upon my arguments again, I must notice some one or two things in the reply of my friend. He says, that I made an unkind *insinuation*, that none but Pedobaptists could train up their children religiously, as it should be done. Now, I must say, in reply, that I did not intend to convey any such impression. I endeavored to show, that the *obligations* and *promises* under which parents placed themselves, in having their children *baptized*, gave their children *advantages*, in this respect, which those of others could not enjoy—not that Baptists could not train up their children “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,” as well as Pedobaptists. And I may add here, in addition to this, that the church, or covenant, *relations*, in which children are placed by being *baptized*, also gives them additional advantages, to those I have named.

Another thing I must also notice here, is, what my friend terms, the “undue exaltation,” I give *water*, in baptism. To this I will reply, that I thought it was he and his Church that gave such “undue exaltation” to water, by their views of *baptism*, and by making it a *saving* and *regenerating* ordinance! Now, it is well known, that we attach no such “undue” importance to Christian baptism as this! As my friend has labored to prove, that the Christian church is not a *continuation* of the Jewish, and has endeavored to do away all “identity” between the two. I will here adduce another scriptural argument, in favor of my position. We hear our Savior saying:

“That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”—Matthew viii. 11, 12.

Now here our Savior says, that the Gentiles shall come from the east and west, and take their place with Abraham, etc.. “in the kingdom of heaven;” and that the Jews, “the children of the kingdom,” should be cast out, or excluded. And as the Kingdom and Church of Christ are the *same* according to my friend, here we have it in Abraham’s time—the *same Church*—as well as in the days of Christ and the apostles; which shows that it is *one* and the *same Church*, that was *continued* on all the time, and in every age. A clearer case of the *identity* of the Church, for which we are contending, cannot be found any where. Hence, it was called “the church in the wilderness,” as existing in the time of Moses; and is not a *new kingdom*, but an *old* one continued.

My worthy friend also endeavored to show, that the Church *originated* on the day of Pentecost; but has failed to *prove* it; while I have shown, clearly and conclusively, that those *baptized* on that day, “were added” to a church already and previously in existence—from the time of Abraham

and Moses on down. He says, they were added to the *disciples* of Christ; but the account says, they were "added unto *them*," without defining particularly whom the word "them" meant.

But again, in the convention held by the apostles, at Jerusalem, to consider the subject of circumcision, in reference to the Gentiles, the apostle James, after saying that Peter had "declared bow God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them people for his name," uses the following language:

"And to this agree the words of the prophet; 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; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."—Acts xv. 15-17.

We have here the Church presented under the name of the "tabernacle of David," which accords with what Paul says, in the ix. chap. of Hebrews, where the *tabernacle* erected by Moses, is presented as a *type* of the Church; and here we have it called the "tabernacle." The Lord says here, that he would "*build again*" this "tabernacle," or Church, which shows, as clearly as any thing can show, that the Church was in existence in David's day, as it is called the "tabernacle [Church] of David;" and as David was a *type* of Christ, and our Savior was to be raised up to "sit upon his throne;" this same Church continued, became the Church of Christ—their "identity" being the same, being *enlarged* so as to include the Gentiles, as we see here, from the language of prophecy, "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and *all the Gentiles*, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord."

Again, our Savior, by saying to the Jews, "that the publicans and harlots *go into the kingdom* of God before you," shows that his kingdom or Church was *then in existence*, and that people were entering into it—consequently it did not have to be set up, or organized *afterwards*; as my friend has endeavored to show, in order to get clear of the "identity" between the Jewish and Christian Churches.

Again, we have another most forcible and striking illustration of this *identity*, in the *parable* of the householder and his vineyard, in Matt. xxi. 33-43. Here the *vineyard* represents the Jewish Church; the servants sent from time to time by the "lord of the vineyard," the *prophets*; and the *son* whom he sent last, of whom they said, "This is the heir; come, let us *kill him*, and let us seize on his inheritance;" our Savior, "the only begotten Son of God," whom the Jews seized and *crucified*. And now notice well what follows. When our Savior asked the Jews what the "lord of the vineyard" would do to those "husbandmen" who had killed his son, they replied: "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will *let out his vineyard* unto *other husbandmen*, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons." Here the vineyard, or Church, already long in existence, according to this parable, was—not to be destroyed, and a *new* one planted—but (the *same one*) was to be given to others, the Gentiles. And now notice well the *application* our Savior makes of the parable: "Therefore I say unto you, the *kingdom*' [Church] of God shall be *taken from you*, [Jews,] and *given to a nation* [people, the Gentiles] bringing forth the fruits thereof." This is such a plain case of the *Church identity* for which I am contending, that further comment on it is unnecessary.

Now as *circumcision* is represented as a *sign* and *seal*, belonging to this old Church, or dispensation, to be *applied* to *infants* under it; so, when the Church became enlarged, under the new, or Christian dispensation, so as to include *females* and embrace the *Gentiles*, water *baptism* became the *sign* and *seal*, to be applied to *infants*. My worthy friend has charged me somewhere, with making baptism come in the place of circumcision; but I have never made such an affirmation as that.

My friend can never show where Christ made any *alteration*, in the terms of the "new," or Christian covenant; so far, at least, as the subject of *infant membership* is concerned; and this he will have to do, and to show that the *law* of infant membership was *repealed*, before he can succeed in disproving infant baptism. The apostle Peter, as we have already shown, to whom our Savior gave the promise of the keys of his kingdom or Church—the *authority* to "set up" or open, that kingdom—after telling the penitent Jews, on the day of Pentecost, who had enquired what they "should do," to "*repent, and be baptized*, every one of them, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," added: "For the *promise* is unto you, and to your CHILDREN," etc., thus showing clearly and unequivocally, that their *children*, their *infants*, were to be embraced in the Christian covenant, and have the *seal of baptism*; as they had been in the Jewish covenant, and had the *seal of circumcision*.

In order to get rid of the *identity* of the Jewish and Christian Churches, my friend has endeavored to show, that the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost, were added to the *apostles*; but we learn that they were added to the *disciples* of Christ—to those who had already become disciples, *before* that time. We are informed that, "The number of names together were about an hundred and twenty;" and it was to these, that they were added—"and the same day there were *added unto them* about three thousand souls." As to the *apostles* themselves, we have no *positive proof*, in the New Testament, that they were ever *baptized at all!* The evidence that they were, is all merely presumptuous and inferential. Hence, it cannot be shown, by any positive evidence, that a single one of them—Paul excepted, who was not one of the twelve, and made an apostle afterwards—was ever baptized! Hence, according to my friend's position, the three thousand were added to an *unbaptized* Church!

But my worthy friend will, I expect, be ready to *controvert* all these points, as he is to controvert every position I can take, on the subject of religion. He is a great hand for religious *controversy*. He and his brethren are the greatest controversialists in all the world! Just as soon as they come out of the water, they are "booted and spurred" for controversy! It is controversy, controversy, all the time! Well, I have no great objection to controversy in religion, where the object is to elicit the *truth*, and bring it out. But when the object is to achieve a *victory* over an opponent, then controversy is *perverted* from its legitimate object, and ceases to be productive of good.

As my friend has adverted to the case of Stephanas, whose *household* was baptized by Paul, and endeavored to exclude infant baptism there, I must notice it again. Because it is said of them, that "they had addicted themselves to the *ministry* of the saints," he argues that they had become *preachers* and *riders!* Was ever such an *absurd* position heard before? My worthy friend certainly does not understand the meaning of the word

"ministry," if he supposes that it always means *preachers!* We find that it frequently means supplying the wants and necessities of the poor, needy, and others, without any reference to the ministry of preachers. Paul speaks of ministering to the saints; and we could give several examples, had we time, where the word is used in a similar sense.

I shall also have to pay some attention to the case of Lydia again, as my friend has also endeavored to exclude infant baptism from her family. He says he thinks it probable that Lydia was "an *old maid.*" Well, what of that? It is no disgrace to be an old maid. And, as I showed, if she had no children herself—and it cannot be proven that she had not—there might have been members of her family who had. If I understood my friend, the word *household* does not necessarily mean a *family*; but I have not been able to see any difference between the meaning of the two words. Because it is said, that Paul and Silas "entered into the house of Lydia, and *comforted the brethren,*" my friend argues that there could have been no infants, or children baptized there. But this contains no argument, as there might have been *adults* baptized, as well as *children*, and no doubt were; and it was these they comforted. But according to his position, as to these households or families, they must either be *all adults*, or *all infants*, one! They cannot, like families generally, be part of one class, and part of the other! As Lydia is said to be a "woman of Thyatira," that city was her *birth-place*, while her residence was at Philippi; and she was not engaged, as my friend has affirmed, in traveling from place to place, in selling purple. Her residence being at Philippi, all her *family* would be there, *infants* as well as adults; and *all*, as we learn, were *baptized*.

My friend has also been equally solicitous to exclude infants, or children, from baptism, in the case of the jailor's family; but to as little purpose; as we are told, that he "and *all his* were *baptized* straightway"—including all his children, if *any* he had. The expression, that "he rejoiced, believing in God with *all his house,*" of course has reference to the *adult* portion of his family, who alone were capable of thus rejoicing and believing; and who, as *all his family* were *baptized*, were of course baptized too.

I have already proven, in the most clear, conclusive and satisfactory manner, that God made a covenant with Abraham, of which the *seal* was *circumcision*; and that this covenant was enlarged and extended, so as to include the Christian covenant, or dispensation; and that the *seal* became *baptism*, and *infants*, as well as adults, the subjects of it, and members of the Church. The Christian Kingdom is therefore not a *new* one, but the same *old* one, thus modified and enlarged. Hence the Church, under the Old and New Dispensations, is the *same*. As the Old and New Testaments wake but one *Bible*, so the Old and New Dispensations make but *one Church*.

My worthy friend also endeavored to show that the *prophets* spoken of in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, in connection with the apostles, were not the prophets of the Old Testament, but a class of New Testament prophets, cotemporary with the apostles; but what *proof* has he given? He could adduce none, to show that these were not the Old Testament prophets.

Because of the ecclesiastical terms and expressions we Pedobaptists use, he and his brethren are in the habit of charging upon us the use of the language of Ashdod, as they term it. Well, they are welcome to all they

can make in that way. My appeal has all the time been to the BIBLE for proof of what I have advanced; and I am willing to abide by its decision, whatever that may be, confident that I can be sustained by it in every position I have taken.

As to religious *controversy*, it is not the element in which I delight; and I only engage in it, to defend what I conceive to be the vital truths and doctrines of the Bible, when assailed. But it seems to be the very element of life to my friend and his party, who cannot get along without it. Where I live, in Alton, we all, Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians, get along on the best terms and in the most friendly manner. We let each other go along peaceably and quietly, in the enjoyment of our own peculiar opinions and sentiments. But where my friend and his brethren go, the religious community is thrown into a state of excitement and ferment, by their disposition and love for *controversy*! They seem to delight in destroying the peace and harmony of religious communities, and in breaking up churches, wherever they can do it!

Baptism, or *immersion*, as they call it, seems to be their great *hobby*, that they are riding all the time and all over the land!—and it is a great wonder, that they have not ridden it to death before this time! As there were some in the days of the apostles, who taught, “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved,” so now they go about saying, “Except you be *immersed* for the remission of sins, *you cannot be saved*.” Thus they are constantly unsettling the faith of Christians, and making them become dissatisfied with their baptism, where it has been by affusion, or performed in infancy; so that they may have the pleasure of “immersing” them, and of having to say, that they have gotten so many from the Methodists, and the Presbyterians, etc.

They would have you believe that when they get people “immersed,” they are then perfectly satisfied and safe. But such is not the case every time, by any means. There is a lady in my Church at Alton, whom they persuaded to be “immersed,” but who became dissatisfied, and came to the conclusion that she had *no religion*! She was then induced to seek it at the *mourning-bench*, where she at length “found the pearl of great price,” and was made to rejoice in the pardon of her sins and acceptance with God.

It is a *water salvation*, which my friend and his brethren are engaged in advocating; and no wonder that people become dissatisfied with it! It will not do, and cannot stand the test. It is salvation by the cross of Christ—by the atoning merits of the blood of the Lamb of God—that can alone take away sin.—[Time *expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S FOURTH REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — I should certainly be very ungrateful not to acknowledge the handsome compliment my worthy friend paid me in the opening of his last speech. But I must not forget, that he was only giving his estimate of his opponent. His compliment, however, was rather equivocal, after all; for after all the flattering remarks be made, he added, that, in his opinion, his opponent “has too large a share of what is called *egotism*” That spoils all! But then I am little concerned about such matters. This people will decide all those matters for themselves. If I give indications of the *Ego-malady*, they will

detect it. And they *might* detect any thing of the kind, should my worthy friend himself manifest it.

My friend says, he did not mean to "insinuate," that Baptists could not "train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and complains that I misrepresented him. Very well—I stand corrected. I did not *intentionally* misrepresent him. I certainly represented him just as I understood him. But I am always willing, that a man shall *set himself* right before his hearers. So now, I understand that he believes, that Baptists *can* "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," as well as those who have their children *baptized*. Then I should be glad to know, why he quoted that passage of Scripture to prove that children should be baptized? Can he tell?

Again, my friend is talking about "the Church, or covenant relations, in which children are placed by being baptized," giving them "advantages," etc. Now, has he not said and repeated, that children (such as he will baptize) are "born into the covenant"—"born *within* the pales of the Church?" Then why is he now talking of their deriving certain advantages from being "placed in Church or covenant relation by being baptized." Can any body understand him? *I cannot!*

The Gentleman denies, that he "unduly exalts water." Well, he makes it the "*seal* of the Christian covenant;" and that is what I called an "undue exaltation" of it; and I am of the same opinion still. He says: "I thought it was he and his brethren that gave such undue exaltation to water," etc. But I am little concerned about what he "*thought*." I am more concerned about the *facts* in the case. And what are the facts? *He makes baptism the "seal of the Christian Covenant"*—that that makes the covenant itself *sure, binding, and efficacious!* While I say, that it is merely an ordinance of Jesus Christ, to be obeyed by all who would come into his Church. But more about this, in the proper place.

My friend next quotes, to bolster up his "identity" notion a little, Matt. viii. 11, 12:

"And I Bay unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Now, if this proves any "identity" at all, it proves the "identity" of the Church or Kingdom *here*, with the Kingdom of Glory above! The Gentiles did not come into the Church of Christ, and "sit down *with* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob neither were the Jews "cast out into *outer darkness*, where there was weeping and gnashing of teeth," at the time the Church was "enlarged," as my friend claims. It remains for this Scripture to be fulfilled at some future period. My friend preaches good, orthodox Universalism from this "text."

Next, the Gentleman quotes Acts xv. 15-17:

"And to this agree the words of the prophet; 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: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

This he quotes to prove "Church identity." But does this Scripture prove it? Certainly not. True, the Lord says: "I will return, and build *again* the Tabernacle of David, which is *fallen down*." Now, does

my friend believe, that the *real, literal* "Tabernacle of David" was built up again? He surely does not! "The Tabernacle of David" was evidently a *type* of Christ's Church; just as David himself was a *type* of Christ. And when the Lord speaks of building the Church, the *anti-type*, He calls it building again the Tabernacle of David, simply because the Tabernacle was the Church *in type*. But the Church is built up a "Spiritual house," a "new man." It would be just as easy to prove the "identity" of *Christ* and *David*, as that of the "Tabernacle of David" and the Church of Christ! "David speaketh concerning him, [*Christ*,] I foresaw the Lord always before *my* face, for he is on *my* right hand that I should not be moved: therefore did *my* heart rejoice and *my* tongue was glad: because thou wilt not leave *my* soul in hell, [*hades*,] neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption," etc. Now, though David here uses the pronouns of the first person, "I" and "*my*," yet "he spake," says Peter, "of the resurrection of Christ, that *his* soul was not left in hell," etc. Now, shall I contend for the "identity" of *David* and *Christ*, because David here speaks of himself as *Christ*! But, does my friend say, the language I have cited is *prophetic* language? So is the passage he quoted, prophetic language. And the Tabernacle of David is the Church of Christ, just like *David* himself is *Christ*.

By the way, if my friend, Mr. Logan, had been in the "Convention of the Apostles," as he called it, what an easy matter it would have been, for him to have put that circumcision question, that had come up from Antioch, to rest. He could have written down to Antioch, that since the "enlargement of the Church," circumcision is no longer the *seal*, but baptism is now the seal of the "enlarged Church!" This would have been an easy method of settling the question—would it not? But the apostles not being so well posted up, upon the subjects of "identity" and "covenant seals," as my friend seems to be, had to dispose of the question otherwise. The apostles did not understand this circumcision question as my friend does. They understood that circumcision was a part of the law of Moses, given before, 406 years; but when the law was given, circumcision was incorporated in, and became a part and parcel of it. For Paul says, (Gal. v. 3): "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the *whole* law." Now, if circumcision was not a part of the Law, how could Paul say, that every man that was circumcised, was a "debtor to do the *whole* Law?" Again, our Savior used this language: "If a man on the Sabbath day *receive* circumcision, that the Law of Moses should not be broken, etc., which shows that he recognised circumcision as *part* of the Law of Moses. Now, are the "*Law of Moses*," and the Gospel, "identical?" John says: "For the *law* was given by Moses, but [something else] *Grace* and *Truth* came by Jesus Christ." We are not "under the Law, but under Grace." My friend's own creed says: "*Baptism* is an ordinance of the New Testament."

The gentleman seems very confident, I cannot prove, that the Church of Kingdom of Christ was established at Jerusalem, on the noted Pentecostal occasion, to which reference has been made. But I think it would be very little trouble for me to do so, were I under any obligations, and disposed to try it. That, however, is not the question in debate. The question is not about the establishment of the Church. Nor is it about Church "identity," as my friend, Mr. Logan, assumes—that he may find something to say, to

fill up the time on the occasion. The question, Mr. President, is *about infant baptism*. My friend seems to have lost sight of the question entirely; and is talking all the time about "Church identity," "Infant Church membership," "Covenant seals," and "covenants" *generally!* He seems disposed to talk about almost any thing else, rather than "*Infant baptism!*—" The fact is, he knows right well, that he can find *nothing* to say about infant baptism—it not being once named in all the Bible; nor in the history of the Church, for over 200 years after our Lord. But then the time must be filled up. It will never do for the champion of infant baptism not to find something to say all the time! Some body might suspect a failure! Therefore, he will talk about "identity," "Covenant seals," etc. I said in the beginning, and I now repeat, that I might admit every thing my friend claims, as to Church identity, (though it is not true,) and it does not *begin* to establish his proposition, that, "Infants of parents; one or both of which are believers, are Scriptural subjects of Christian baptism." Although he preaches "identity," he does not believe in it. Identity is not what suits his ease. He thinks the Church has been enlarged, so as to admit the Gentiles to membership. It has also been so changed as to recognise "female membership." And the "*seal*" has been changed too, from a mark *in the flesh*, to water baptism! And, by the way, he denied; in his last speech, ever having said, that baptism has taken the place of circumcision! Well, now, I most respectfully submit, that, under all the circumstances, he had better give us a little authority for *infant baptism*, if he can find it! Otherwise, his cause might suffer a little in this intelligent community.

But my friend informs us that, "As the Old and New Testaments make but *ONE Bible*, so the Old and New Dispensations make but *ONE Church*." In other words, the Old and New Testaments are bound in the same piece of *sheepskin*; therefore, the Old Covenant and New are identically one and the same Covenant! This logic lays Aristotle in the shade! This kind of logic would prove the *identity* of the *teachings*, and *persons*, of Alexander Campbell and Nathan L. Rice!

He quoted an expression (Matt. xxi. 31.), from our Savior, to prove "Church identity," of course, as he is discussing that question exclusively, to which I must give attention. It is as follows:

"Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

Now, it strikes me, that this would be about the last passage of Scripture I should quote, were I trying to prove the "identity" for which my friend is contending. At the time our Savior used this language, he was in the temple, talking to "the chief priests and elders of the people." Not only were these people *members* of the Jewish Church already, having been regularly "sealed" by circumcision; but they were the "*chief priests*" and "*elders*" in that Church—yet our Savior said unto them: "The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God *before you*." Now, if the Jewish Church was *identical* with the "kingdom of God," how could the publicans enter it *before* those, who had been *born in* it, and circumcised the eighth day? Can Mr. Logan tell?

The gentleman appears anxious to get away from the proposition under discussion. He occasionally fires a short-fuse bomb, that, if I am not mistaken, he will need, when he becomes my respondent on the *design* of

baptism. It will be time enough then, for him to expose and demolish oar "monstrous doctrine" of the design of baptism. But I shall not complain, as by his premature shots I may learn something of the "range" and "caliber" of his guns. He accuses me and my brethren of making a "great hobby" of baptism, of preaching a "water salvation," etc.—all of which I pronounce untrue, and foreign to the question in debate. I know of no people, who come so near preaching a "water salvation," as those who "disciple" unconscious babies with a few drops of *water, alone!*

He also complains of myself and brethren, on account of our extraordinary "controversial" proclivities. He is a peace man — a "let alone" man. He gets along most admirably, even with his Baptist brethren, *when at home!* But he is not *at home* all the time, as some of us happen to know. He thinks we "come out of the water ready for controversy." Well, I do not know, but I am inclined to think, that had he "come out of the water" once, it would have improved him as a controversialist! I am for "peace" myself; but my motto is, "*First pure, then peaceable;*" and this I hold to be "*wisdom from above.*"

When the gentleman told us of the lady in Alton, who had *obeyed the Gospel*, and becoming dissatisfied with that, "went to the mourner's-bench, and *at length* found the pearl of great price," he certainly "perpetrated" an argument irrefragable! It would of course be no reply, for me to point to more than a dozen persons in this house, having been sprinkled in infancy, and to more than one here, having at the mourner's-bench obtained "*at length*" the pearl of great price, who have since *obeyed the Gospel*, and now feel happy that they did so! This would be no reply at all! But this is not my style of argument exactly. If a person should join the Church, and afterward go back to the *Devil*, would it prove him right? Hardly, I think.

But now, having noticed what of the gentleman's speech I have thought necessary, and having a little time, I purpose noticing, very briefly, the *establishment* of the Church. I will commence by reading from the prophecy of Isaiah, ii. chap. 2 and 3 verses:

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Here we have evidently a prophecy, concerning the Kingdom of heaven, or the Church of Christ. It is styled the "mountain of the Lord's house." Paul says, (1 Tim. iii. 15): "The house of God, *which is the Church* of the living God," etc. This House, the Holy Spirit says, "shall be established"—not *was* established in the ninety-ninth year of Abraham's age! The Spirit also says, that this establishment of the Church is to take place "*in the last days:*" and then, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from *Jerusalem.*" This prophecy concerning the Church, was uttered hundreds of years *after* the covenant of circumcision was made, and only 760 years before Christ. Still later, 603 years before Christ, the Holy Spirit says by Daniel, in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream;

And in the days of these kings, [the *Roman* emperors,] *shall* the God of heaven set up a Kingdom, which shall never be destroyed," etc.

Here the setting up of the Kingdom of heaven is spoken of as an event still *future*. And I might refer to many other corresponding passages in the prophecies, all pointing to the setting up of this Kingdom or Church, as a *future* event, to take place in the days of the Roman kings, "in the last days," when "the word of the Lord should go forth from Jerusalem," etc. But I hasten down to John the Baptist, after our Savior was born. John the Baptist came, saying, "Repent, for the Kingdom [so long promised] of heaven *is at hand*"—not on hand, but "*at hand*." And we learn, (*Matt.* iv. 17.): "From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent; for the Kingdom of heaven *is at hand*." Again, we read, *Matt.* x. 7,) that when Jesus sent forth the twelve disciples, He told them: "And as ye go preach, The Kingdom of heaven *is at hand*." And, (*in Matthew* xvi. 18,) the Savior promised, as I have already quoted: "Upon this rock I *will* build my Church;" and in the 19th verse, He calls his "Church" the "Kingdom of heaven"—promising to Peter the keys, etc. We learn also, that at the time our Lord was crucified, Joseph of Arimathea, "*waited* for the Kingdom of God." And indeed all the references to the Church, or Kingdom, show it to be *future*, till we come down to the "day of Pentecost." Jesus has now ascended to heaven, been glorified, and taken his seat at the right-hand of the Majesty on high. The foundation for the Church—"Christ the Lord"—has now been tried and proven "*precious*." The Apostles, by whom the Lord proposes to "*lay*" this foundation, are at Jerusalem, from which place "*the word of the Lord is to go forth*." The Holy Spirit descends, to "*guide* them into all the truth." And the "*last days*," in which the Church is to be "*established*," are now come; as we learn from Peter's discourse upon that august and interesting occasion. Here, for the first time it was ever done, Jesus was declared to be both "*Lord and Christ*," seated at the "*right hand of God*." Here the foundation was laid—"Christ the Lord"—by the Apostles, guided by the unerring Spirit of all wisdom. He had bidden adieu to the Temple, and to the Jewish nation as such; and become the great Agent in laying the foundation of, and building up, "*the Kingdom of God's dear Son*," who had just been "*annointed Lord and Christ*." Three thousand persons were, upon this awfully sublime and momentous occasion, convinced that Jesus was Lord, and crying out, "*What shall we do?*" were commanded to repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; which they did gladly, and were "*added [not to the old Jewish Church, for they were born in that, but] unto them*"—unto the disciples of Christ, who were as "*charter members*," then and there the recipients of the long-promised Kingdom. From this day forward, we read of no one preaching, "*The Kingdom of heaven is at hand* of no one "*waiting* for the Kingdom of God;" of no one saying, "*The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established*;" but we read of persons being "*daily added* to the Church;" of persons being "*translated into the Kingdom of God's dear Son*;" of persons being "*in the Kingdom and patience of our Lord Jesus Christ*;" of persons being taught how to behave themselves "*in the house of God*;" and of persons being "*in the Church*." We see then, that *before*, and down to, the day of Pentecost, the Church is *prophesied of, promised, looked for, and "waited for*;" but *after* this day it is spoken of as existing; and men are said to be actually *in* it. This shows to the reflecting mind, "*when and where the Church was established*." What does

the crippled notion of identity look like, along side God Almighty's *truth*?

I predict that Church identity will be abandoned by the advocates of infant baptism before many years. When infant baptism first found its way into the Church, its advocates contended it was necessary to wash away original sin. Then "original sin" was the ground of infant baptism; and when any one undertook to defend it, his stand-point was "original sin." The argument was short: infants are *sinner*s by nature; baptism is for the remission of sins; and, therefore, infants should be baptized. And, furthermore, they all believed, that if infants were not baptized, they would be eternally damned in hell! But when this proved a little too strong for the people, they changed the ground a little, and made "Jewish proselyte baptism" their starting-point. This becoming thread-bare, they now start out with "Church identity." What we shall have next, I cannot tell.—[*Time expires*,

MR. LOGAN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I think, that in the reply of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, to which you have been listening, you have a fair illustration of his talent at *ridicule*! It seems to me to have been a complete tissue of ridicule, from beginning to end; or rather of attempts to expose my arguments to ridicule, and thus to cast all the odium upon them that he can! It seems to me, that my friend ought to have learned before this time, the difference between *ridicule* and *argument*, and that ridicule is not argument. Why, any thing in the world can be ridiculed, it matters not what it is, and of how true and serious character it may be. Even the Savior of the world, when on the cross, was *ridiculed* by the Jews, who "wagged the head at him," and told him, "if he was the Son of God to come down from the cross!"

If you would listen to my friend, in his speech, you would think that he had completely *demolished* all my arguments, and left nothing of them behind! He complains, that he cannot get me to argue the question at issue—that I am all the time talking about "Church identity," and "Covenant Seals," and all that—that I am constantly after something to say, to fill up my time—and finally he proclaims a victory over me, in advance! Now we will let the audience settle this matter, when we are done arguing the question.

He has been very particular to follow me up, in every little thing; but I shall not imitate his example, in this respect, and notice every thing he advances; but shall attend to my own arguments, and pass over the most that he has said.

He closed his speech with inch a warm exhortation, that he ought certainly to have called for *mourners*, as he no doubt could have had some. [Here Mr. Sweeney replied, "Rather for persons to *obey the Gospel* Well, let him have it as he pleases. But to pass on to my arguments, which I must now resume again.

And here I will have to revert to the subject of the *identity* of the Church again—notwithstanding all that my friend has had to say on the subject, as you have just heard, in his reply to my speech—as it is upon this *identity* of the Jewish and Christian Churches, that the proof of my proposition rests: for if they are *essentially* the *same*, as to the different *characteristics* I have already enumerated, in my preceding speech, then the Christian

Church is the modification and enlargement of the Jewish, *both* being based upon the *same* covenant and promises, God made with and to Abraham, and hence the same kind of *subjects* pertaining to the one must belong to the other: and the *seal* of the covenant being *changed*, with the change and enlargement of it to embrace the Christian dispensation, from circumcision to *baptism*, of course *infants* would come in as *legitimate subjects* of the ordinance, or "ceremony," as my friend is pleased to call it. The change or amendment of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, would not necessarily involve the abrogation of the law of citizenship of the State; but would merely furnish rules or articles, by which future laws are to be enacted, on this, as on all other subjects. Hence, the Apostles fixed the law of citizenship, in the kingdom or Church of Christ, in accordance with the Abrahamic, or Jewish covenant already in existence; and consequently had to embrace *infants* in it, as *subjects* of the *law* of *baptism*. There was no internal, or radical change, in the constitution; but the change was outward and external, and pertained entirely to the *ceremonial*.

My friend, as you will recollect, quoted the prophecy of Jeremiah, where the Lord said, he would "make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and Judah," in order to show the *abrogation* of the Abrahamic covenant, or "the covenant of circumcision; and the establishment of an entirely new one in its place. Now, if you will notice well, it is not the Abrahamic covenant that was to be done away. The expression, "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," etc., shows that it was the Mosaic or Jewish covenant that was to be done away, and superseded by this new covenant, and not the Abrahamic, which was to remain, and which was not abrogated. And hence; as circumcision was the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant, and was applied to *infants*; so *baptism* has become the sign and seal of the Christian, and is to be applied to *infants* also. Hence the *baptized infant* is as much a *member* of the Christian Church, as the circumcised infant was a member of the Jewish; as the Christian Church was only an enlargement of the Jewish. The new dispensation was to be a *revival* of David's Tabernacle, which had fallen down, and was to be built up again. Now as circumcision was a sign and seal of the faith of all under the old covenant, so is baptism a sign and seal, in reference to the Christian Church.

My worthy friend argues, that *males* only were *circumcised*, under the Abrahamic Covenant and Jewish Law; and that as the seal of circumcision was applied only to *them*, if the Christian covenant is the *same* as the Abrahamic and Jewish, and *identical* with it, *males* only can be *baptized*, and *females* would consequently be *excluded!* While I am willing to admit, that *females* were not included in the Jewish Church, but only *males*, as it was a fleshly and political institution; I contend that it became so modified and *enlarged*, under the Christian Dispensation as to include *females*.

But my friend contends, that, according to my theory, when those were baptized, who had been circumcised, they *received the seal twice*. Now, I hope he will remember, that it was not the *same seal* they received the second time, but a *different one* entirely—one belonging to another dispensation of religion. So this objection is without any point or force whatever. We might as well argue against a foreigner taking the oath of allegiance

to the Government of the United States, because he had before taken it to the Government of Great Britain, or that of France!

Again, my friend says, that the circumcised Jews, who were baptized with the baptism of John when they received Christian baptism, revived the seal the *third time!* Now there is not a particle more argument against infant baptism, in this objection of his, than there was in the preceding one, and there was none in that, as we have seen. Does he not know, that John's baptism was not the *Christian* baptism; and consequently it contained *no seal*. He came, as we are informed, to prepare the way for the Lord—to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord," etc.—and not to introduce the Christian dispensation. Hence his had *no seal* belonging to it, and ceased with his ministry.

And right here, since my friend and his brethren are so much in the habit of inveighing against Pedobaptist Churches, and charging them with being filled with so many gross and glaring religious *errors*, I would ask: if they are not *branches* of the Church of Christ, and neither "part nor parcel" of it, as they attempt to make out; if they came from Rome, as they charge, and are based upon assumption and error, and without any Divine authority, and all this; how comes it, that God has *blessed them* as He has, and still continues to *bless them* as he is doing? How is it, I would ask, that they have been *so long* in existence, and *grown*, and *flourished*, and *prospered*, as they have done? How does it come that so many great, and pious, and learned men have *lived* and *died in them*, *satisfied* all their lives, that they were *right*? How is it that such men as Luther, and Wesley, and Dr. Geo. Campbell, and Macknight, and Doddridge, and Stuart, and Jonathan Edwards, and a host of others, of the most learned, pious and best men on earth, were content to live and die in these Pedobaptist Churches, and who believed in, and practised *infant baptism* all their lives! And how is it, that so many *thousands* of the best and most pious people on earth, have *lived* and *died* in these Churches, satisfied all their lives, and rejoicing in death, in the triumphs of *faith* and *hope* of a glorious immortality beyond the grave? How comes it, I would ask, that God should so *bless* these Churches, if, as my worthy friend and his brethren assume, they are *not of God*, and are so full of *religious error!*

You will recollect, that, in proof of the *identity* of the Abrahamic and Christian covenants, and of the Jewish and Christian Churches, I quoted from Matt. viii. 11, 12—that "many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness," etc. My friend endeavors to get around my argument here, by saying, that the Gentiles never came into the Church, and "sat down with Abraham," etc., and that the Jews were never "cast out into outer darkness," etc., and, finally, that "this Scripture is to be fulfilled at some *future* period!" Now, if this, like the most of the parables of our Savior, in reference to the Jews and Gentiles, was not *fulfilled* at the introduction of the Christian dispensation, I would like to know when it will be? That it refers to the *reception* of the Gentiles into the Kingdom of our Savior, and the *rejection* of the Jews—like the parable of, the vineyard and the olive tree—is, I think, as plain as can be. If it did not *then* meet with its fulfillment, I would like for my worthy friend to show *when* and *how* it will be fulfilled—if *he can*. From the manner, in which this setting down is

spoken of, it was evidently to take place in this world, and not in the "Kingdom of Glory above."

My worthy friend has also endeavored, in order to get clear of my argument for the *identity* of the Jewish and Christian Churches—or rather for *infant baptism*, as drawn from that—to show, that as infants had to be *circumcised* at *eight days old*, if baptism has superseded circumcision, in becoming the *seal* of the Christian covenant, infants should be *baptized* at *eight days of age*! Now the Jewish law regulating circumcision was consistent with other matters under the Mosaic dispensation, as *purification*, etc. But in the change, modification and enlargement, of the covenant, under the Christian dispensation, made by the Apostles, there was no law, or regulation, made, in reference to the particular *age*, at which infants shall be *baptized*. That was left by them to the discretion and convenience of parents. I trust that this will be a sufficient reply to what he has said on that point.

Well, we will have to advert to Dr. Wall again. My friend says, in reply to what I quoted from him, that the reason why we find no *objectors* to infant baptism for 200 years after Christ, or the apostles, is, that there was *no infant baptism* to object to, during that time! This is a very easy and summary way of disposing of such things—one by which we may dispose of almost any thing, where there is no positive testimony. Now, for 400 years after Christ and the apostles, history shows but *one* objector to *infant baptism*, and that was Tertullian—if he can be termed an *objector*—and he only advised *delay* in their baptism. And we have no account of its being opposed, by any sect or denomination, until the 11th century, when it was opposed by a sect of the Albigenses. So much, then, as to this objection to infant baptism, which, like his other objections, is easily met and refuted.

My friend, as you may recollect, adduced the commission in Mark, as opposed to infant baptism. By placing baptism *after* faith there, and making faith and baptism the indispensable *conditions* of salvation, if it is applied to *infants* they cannot be saved; as they are incapable of exercising faith before baptism. Such an application of it would cut them off entirely! But we find that the *want* of *baptism* is not put in, by the Savior, as one of the terms of condemnation, but merely the *want* of *faith*—"He that believeth not"—not he that *is baptized not*—"shall be damned." That this commission is intended to include *infants*, is evident from the terms of it: "Go ye into *all* the world, and *preach* the Gospel to *every* creature." Here we learn, that the gospel is to be preached to all the world—to *every* creature—and consequently as *infants* are included by the expression "*every* creature," it applies to them too.

The Church is represented as a sheep-fold, by our Savior, in the parable where he says that he is the "Good Shepherd," and his disciples the "sheep." As it must be admitted that *baptism* became the *door* into the fold, under the Christian dispensation, my worthy friend, by *excluding infants* from baptism, would shut all the *lambs* out of the fold! He will only take in the *sheep*, and leave the poor, little lambs out, to be exposed to the wintry winds and the pelting of the storm! But we take the *lambs*, as well as the sheep, into the fold of Christ, where they can be secure from these, and from the *wolves* that would devour them; and where they can be nursed, and trained for heaven! In order to "train up the child in the

way be should go, that when he becomes old he will not depart from it"—to "train him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—it must be done *in the Church*. As the Jewish children were trained up in the Jewish Church; so must the children of Christians be trained up in the Christian Church; and before this can be done, they must become *members* by *baptism*. The Church is the *school* of Christ, where they must be taught and trained. The very term "disciple" means a *learner*, and implies this teaching and training.

I most now, in conclusion, recapitulate some of my arguments, in as brief a manner as my time will permit.

I have shown, that the Church was in existence at the time of Abraham, and included by the covenant that God made with him, of which circumcision was the sign and seal. And I have also shown that the Christian Church is the same, *identical* Church with that, modified and enlarged so as to include females and the Gentiles; that Christian baptism is the sign and *seal* belonging to it; and that as *infants* were the subjects of circumcision, and members of the Abrahamic, or Jewish Church; so now are they legitimate *subjects of baptism*, and members of the Christian Church.

Paul represents the Jewish Church under the figure of a domestic olive tree, and its members as the branches of that tree; and represents the Jewish branches (or members) as *broken off*, on account of unbelief, and the Gentiles as *grafted in*, in their place; and I have shown from this, that as the same old *trunk* was not broken off, or removed, but continued—representing the Church—so the *same Church* has been continued all the time, from Abraham on down to the present—only modified and enlarged, as we have shown. The Gentile world was grafted on the old Jewish stock. We find that all Abraham's family were included in that covenant and church, and that his *children*, as well as the adults of his family, were embraced by them.

I also quoted the language of our Savior: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and showed from it, that children were proper subjects of his Kingdom or Church. That he was speaking of that cannot be disputed, or controverted, as he says, in another place, in reference to *adults*: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise *enter into* the kingdom of heaven." Notice, our Savior uses the expression, "*little children*;" and he does not say that *like* such is his Kingdom, or Church, but "*of such*"—showing as plainly as any thing can be, that his Church was to be composed, in part at least, of "*little children*," or *infants*; and as persons are made *members* of his Church by *baptism*, consequently, infants are proper subjects of that ordinance, and to be made members of his Kingdom of Church.

I have never contended, that baptism *of itself*—without any connection with religious teaching and training, repentance, faith, etc., will save any one. When children are *baptized*, it is in reference to their future religious instruction and training, without which it will do them no good. The very *promises* made by their parents, and the obligations under which they place themselves, imply this.

My worthy friend, as you no doubt recollect, urged, as an *objection* to infant baptism, that it destroyed the free agency of children. But where is there any point or force in such an objection as this? How, I would ask.

can an act, performed for children by their parents, have any effect, in destroying their agency in after time, when they come to years of maturity? Are not such children just as much free agents then, and have they not just as much volition to act, or not act, as any others? Most assuredly. So this objection to infant baptism of my worthy friend, like-most of his other objections to it, which he has been urging, when properly analyzed and examined into, amounts to just nothing at all! And so far from setting aside, or destroying, the *religious training* of children, *infant baptism*, as I have shown, presents one of the strongest arguments in its favor.

My worthy friend has also endeavored to show, as you have heard, that *faith* is a positive and absolute condition of Christian baptism. Now I deny this. It is true, that *faith* is placed *before* baptism, in the commission in Mark, but that is no evidence of the truth of his position; as we frequently see, that the order, or arrangement, of words, is merely arbitrary, and does not necessarily imply, that such was the order of the *things* themselves. Such a "rule" as this would deprive my friend entirely of his favorite hobby, water baptism, in many places in the New Testament; as we frequently have repentance and faith mentioned, as the condition of pardon and salvation, without a single word being said about *baptism!* Again, we find whole families, or households, baptized, without a single word being said in reference to their faith! And I could give other instances of the mention of *baptism*, without a word in reference to *faith*. The *meaning* of the commission in Mark is: "He that believeth and is [already] baptized, shall be saved." But if this commission applies to *infants*, according to the interpretation of it by my friend they must be *dammèd*, as they cannot believe! But it is "he that believeth not"—not that "is baptized not"—who "shall be dammèd."—[*Time expires*].

MR. SWEENEY'S CLOSING REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — Mr. Logan has again and again taken it upon himself, to inform me and this audience, that "ridicule is not argument." This, however, we knew before. And one or two other things we knew as well. An argument that can be reduced to an absurdity is unsound. No sound argument can be made absurd. If I am not very much mistaken, some of my friend's arguments, so called, have been made to appear very absurd; and it therefore becomes necessary for his cause, that he raise a warning voice against "ridicule." Again, all truth is consistent with itself. No one truth will conflict with another. But some of my friend's positions have been made to appear antagonistic, the one to the other. If a man take a position, and then in the same speech, take another which antagonizes the former, it follows most obviously, that one, or both, of his positions, is incorrect. This my friend did in his opening speech on this question; and has done repeatedly since. As, for instance, when, in his opening speech, -he said, "Infants of believing parents are *born in* the Church;" and, before he closed, said, they are "*brought in* by baptism." And I then called on him to explain—or to define his position—which he did as follows: "Infants of believing parents are *born within the pales of the Church*; and are, *therefore*, entitled to baptism, the seal." But, in his last speech, after lecturing us pretty severely for taking into the "fold," *only the old sheep*, and leaving out the "lambs," he says: "But we *take in* the lambs, as well as the sheep."

Here, all can see that his fundamental positions are *contradictory*; and, therefore, one, or *both*, false. And I must silently pass by these glaring contradictions, or else be called "*egotistic*;" and compared to the Jews, who ridiculed our Lord!

What does my friend mean by the "wintry winds," "pelting storms," "wolves," etc., to which these little "lambs are exposed," when left out of the "fold?" Does he mean, that infants, if not baptized into the Church, are exposed to damnation? It would seem so! Then, will he, in all the charity of his soul, leave all the little *orphans* out exposed to damnation? Will he suffer *four-fifths* of the little lambs to bleat around the fold, "exposed to wintry winds, pelting storms, wolves," etc.?—and refuse to take them in, because, unfortunately, (and by no fault of theirs,) they happen to be the lambs of *black*, or *dead* sheep? Whenever I am convinced, that by baptism children are delivered from the wrath of God, then I shall be very much inclined to the view taken by those "other advocates of infant baptism," that *all* infants should be baptized.

My worthy friend thinks that the "prosperity," etc., of Pedobaptist Churches, proves that they are right. He argues that "God has blessed and prospered" the advocates of infant baptism; and therefore they must be right in practicing it. The objection I have to this argument is, that it proves entirely too much. The Romanists, Mormons, Spiritualists, and Materialists all use it. And, by the way, if it is an argument at all, it is just to my band also. But it is no argument at all. The logic runs thus; A thing *is*; therefore it is *right*!

My friend says: Tertullian rather "*advised delay*," in case of infants but did not oppose their baptism. Well, he "*advised delay*" "till they are grown up"—till "*they know* the Lord"—and such precisely is the advice of Baptists now.

The gentleman gave us a new argument from the commission, in his last. He says the gospel was to be preached to "*every creature*;" and as infants are "*creatures*," it must be that they are included. Well, a *horse* is a "*creature*" and therefore, I suppose, horses must be baptized! But then, I must not "ridicule" my friend's *arguments*! Was it "every creature" that was to be *baptized*? No. Our Savior said, "preach the Gospel to *every creature*; [and how many shall be *baptized*, Lord?] he that BELIEVETH and is baptized, shall be saved." The *Gospel was to be preached* to "every creature," and the *believer* only was to be baptized. But my friend seems to understand the commission, "Go, preach the Gospel to every creature, and *baptize every creature*, whether he believes it or not!"

But now I must briefly recapitulate the argument. I should be pleased, if it were within the range of human possibility for me to do so, to lay before you a synopsis of my friend's arguments, with my replies. But the thing is absolutely impossible; for his arguments were "without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep"—confusion! You have all heard what he has had to say. He has quoted many Scriptures. But if any of you can see any relevancy of these Scriptures to his proposition, I must envy you your powers of discrimination! He has not found "infant baptism" once mentioned, in any shape or form, in the whole Bible! Nor has he found any thing there, that *implies* it! He failed to show that it was named in *any* book, within 200 years of our Lord!

[Here Mr. Logan said: "If my friend will give me the opportunity, as I have no reply, I *will* show that infant baptism *was named* within 200 years of Christ. I only ask two minutes." Mr. Sweeney replied: Read on, Sir." Mr. Logan then read from Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," as follows:

"Therefore as he was a Master, he had also the age of a Master. Not disdaining nor going in a way above human nature: nor breaking in his own person the law which he had set for mankind: but sanctifying every several age by the likeness that it has to him. For he came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are regenerated [or baptized] unto God: infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons."—Wall, vol. i, p. 72.

Thus wrote Ireneus, in the year 176. This is a mention of infant baptism *within* 200 years of our Lord."] Well, my friend has read us, in Wall's History, an extract from Ireneus; but the word "baptized," in that extract, was not the word used by Ireneus, as my friend should have known. It is in brackets, and is Mr. Wall's word, who assumed, that Ireneus *meant* baptized, when he *said regenerated*. Wall did not claim that Ireneus *said* "baptized," but that he *meant* that, when he said "regenerated;" but it has been shown by Dr. Gale, who reviewed Wall, that such was *not* his meaning. So my friend cannot claim, that he has found a mention of infant baptism, within two hundred years of our Lord; unless he will say that the fathers, or at least one of them, used the words *baptized* and *regenerated* synonymously. Will he do this? [Here Mr. Logan said: "I will not."] Then my friend gives up this point.

My worthy friend started out, to prove infant baptism from "Church identity," falsely so called. This argument I refuted, by showing, that the Christian covenant and the "covenant of circumcision" were not identical. This I showed, first, from the prophecy of Jeremiah, (xxxi. chap. 31-34 verses,) where the Lord said, the days would come, when he would "make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah"—a covenant "not according to" the one he made with their fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt; but this should be the covenant he would make with them: that "after those days he would put his law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and would be their God, and they should be his people and that "they should no more teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord;" but that "they should all know him from the least to the greatest of them;" and that "he would forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more."

Here I showed, that 1351 years *after* the "covenant of circumcision" was made with Abraham, the Lord said that the days would come, when he *would make* a *new covenant*. And I showed from this, that whatever covenant was there referred to, it was *not made* at that time, which was 1351 years later than the "covenant of circumcision." I then remarked, that if we could show, that this "new covenant," which was promised 1351 years *after* the "covenant of circumcision" was made, is the *Christian* covenant, it would forever destroy the "identity" argument of my friend!

I then proceeded to prove this from Paul's letter to the Hebrews, (viii, chap. 6-13 verses,) where he says, that Christ "is the mediator of a *better* [than the old Jewish covenant, or "covenant of circumcision,"] established upon better promises;" and that, "if that first covenant had been faultless," there should have been "no place sought for a *second*" one. But finding

fault with the Jewish people, the Lord said, (by the prophet Jeremiah as we have seen,) that the days *would, come*, when he *would* make a *new* covenant with the house of Israel and Judah—"not according," or not *like*, the covenant he made with their fathers, after they left Egypt, at mount Sinai—because they "continued not in" it, and the Lord "regarded them not." But "this is the covenant," said the Lord, that he would make with them *after* those days—that he "would put his laws into their minds and write them in their hearts," and "would be to them a God, and they should be to him a people;" and that they "should not teach every man his neighbor and his brother, saying, Know the Lord;" but that "all should know him from the least to the greatest;" and that he "would be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities he would remember no more." And, continues the apostle, "in that he saith, a *new* covenant, he had made the *first old*;" and "that which decays and waxes *old* is ready to *vanish away*."

I showed from this, that Paul quoted the promise made in Jeremiah, and made the Christian covenant the one promised; and which, as I have shown, was *not made* 1351 years *after* my friend's "covenant of circumcision." I showed, that Paul calls the Christian covenant a "*new*," and a "*better*" one, than the old Jewish covenant. And I showed, it was as clear as a sunbeam, that 1351 years *after* the covenant of circumcision was made, the Christian covenant was still *future*; and consequently could not be the same with the covenant of circumcision.

I also showed, that this "new covenant" was to have distinguishing characteristics—that those entering it were to be "all *taught* of God;" so that all in it should "*know* the Lord, from the least of them to the greatest;" and that that beautifully harmonizes with the *commission* our Lord gave his apostles, when the blood of the *new* and everlasting covenant had been shed, when he said to them: "Go, *teach* all nations," etc.—and I showed here, that my friend, in contrast with this, *disciples* simply by *baptizing*, without the teaching; and that, therefore, the *least* in his Church do not "know the Lord," while the apostle says, that, in the Christian Church, and under the Christian covenant, "*all* should know the Lord, from the *least* to the greatest."

In further proof of my position here, I quoted the words of our Lord himself, (in *Matt. xvi. 18, 19*.) where he told Peter, that upon that rock, (the great truth which Peter had enunciated, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,") "*I will build* my church; and the gates of hell [*hades*] shall not prevail against it;" and, "*I will give* unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

This forever settles the question about church identity, with all who are willing to take the word of the Lord as meaning what he says; as he had said, when in the world: I *WILL build* MY Church;" and that, had this Church been built hundreds of years before—in Abraham's day—our Savior would never have used such language as this, implying what was then to take place *in the future*.

In the next place I quoted from Paul's letter to the Ephesians, (*it. chap. 14, 15*.) where, speaking of the union of Jews and Gentiles in one body or Church, he says that Christ "is our peace, who had made *both one*,"

and had *broken down* the middle wall of partition between them; having *abolished in his flesh* [when crucified] the *enmity*, the law of commandments contained in [Jewish] ordinances; in order to make in himself of *twain* [of the *two*] one *new man*, thus making peace"—which I showed to be simply *one new Church*; and I showed, that Dr. Adam Clarke, one of those "other advocates of infant baptism," of my friend, upon this passage says: "To make *one Church* of both people, which should be considered the *body* of which Jesus Christ is the *head*. Thus he makes one new man, *one new Church*." And I further showed, that before this new Church could be formed of both Jews and Gentiles, it was necessary that the "enmity between" them should be "abolished," which our Savior did "*in his flesh*," when he was crucified. And how could this have been done *before he "was made flesh*," and dwelt among men?—and then asked, if this *new Church* was made in the days of Abraham? — which was impossible, when our Savior had said that he *would build it*—in the future—and when, during his whole earthly ministry, it was represented as still *to come*—"the Kingdom of heaven is *at hand*."

I will now proceed with a recapitulation of my *objections* to the practice of infant baptism.

1. My first objection was, that it was prohibited by the *very terms* of the commission, which requires, that those baptized shall first be *taught*; but infants *cannot be taught*; and, therefore, cannot properly be subjects of Christian baptism. I showed here, that the Commission requires, that all who come into this new Church—this new Covenant—"shall be taught of God"—so that all in this Church "shall *know* the Lord, from the *least* of them to the greatest of them;" and that this beautifully fulfills what the Lord said, as we have seen, when he *promised* this "New Covenant;" but that the Church of my friend would not answer the description!

2. The second objection to the doctrine, or practice, as you please, of infant baptism, which I urged, was, *that it is not once mentioned in any shape, in the whole revelation of God to man!* — and that the Bible, on the subject of *infant* baptism, falsely so called, is as silent as "the night of the grave!" I affirmed, that if I had said and were to say, not another word on this question, while this is true, my friend can never succeed in establishing his proposition! I showed that, while my friend talked so largely about "going to the Bible only" for his proof, he will have to go somewhere else for proof to establish his proposition; as "*infant baptism*" is language unknown to the Holy Bible! I showed, that he relied for proof on *inference* and *deduction*; and where he was peculiarly unfortunate was, that there was nothing in the Bible for him to *infer* or *deduce* any authority from, for his practice! — and that he occupied a most unenviable position, in the discussion of this proposition!

8. My third objection to the practice, for which my worthy friend has been contending, was, that it *sets aside all human agency* and *accountability*, in both being baptized, and becoming "members of the Church, which is both anti-Scriptural and anti-American.—that "*whoever will*" is the language of Christ, in reference to this matter; and not, whoever has a "believing parent," and *cannot help itself!*—that the expression, "To whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are," contains a principle running throughout the entire Will and Testament of Jesus Christ; and consequently the *imposing* of religious ceremonies upon helpless per-

sons, such as *infants*, has no countenance there! I showed that you must go to the book of "human tradition" for *authority* for "infant baptism," "infant communion," "counting of beads," etc.—such things as cannot be found any where in the Bible.

4. I showed, in the fourth place, that this practice, by human tradition, completely sets aside the command of God to "*be baptized*"—that there is nothing plainer in the New Testament, than that every *believer* is commanded to be baptized; but that where the practice for which my friend contends, prevails, believer baptism is completely set aside, and only *infant* baptism, so called, is practiced—and that when the infants so baptized grow up, and are *taught* of God and *believe*, if there were no preachers but Pedobaptists. they could never be baptized, should they desire to do so—and that *shocking* it would be to hinder voluntary obedience to God!

5. In the fifth place, I showed that baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God; but that *infants* can have no conscience in the matter; and cannot therefore be properly baptized: and I asked the question, how can baptism be the answer of a good conscience, in any sense, to an *infant*, that is *not*, and *never can be conscious of the fact* ?

My friend, in anticipation of this "stumbling stone" in his way, spent some time, in preparing to "fall easy;" and informed us, that when persons sprinkled in infancy, grow up, and are told that they were baptized, they *believe* it on the testimony of their friends; and it then becomes the answer of a good conscience to them; but I showed that the things which we receive only upon the *testimony of others*, are things of the existence of which we are not *conscious*, and never can be; and that matters of *consciousness* are not matters of *faith*.

6. I then went on to show that, in the sixth place, the practice of "infant baptism," so far as it goes, sets aside all *heart-work*, in obedience to God—that we should obey God "from the heart"—that therefore he requires *faith*, as it is with the *heart* we believe—and that therefore, when the Ethiopian Eunuch asked, "What binders me to be baptized?" Philip replied, "If thou *believest* with all thine *heart* thou mayest—but that *infants* have no *heart* in the matter, no *conscience*, no *faith*, no any thing but *water*, and not much of that—and that therefore they cannot properly be baptized.

7. In the seventh place, I showed, that baptism is worthless, without the work of the Holy Spirit—that it is useless to have a birth of *water* without the *Spirit*—and asked, if my friend would say, when an infant is baptized, that it is "born of water and of the Spirit?"—and showed that as infants are not born of water *and of the Spirit*, it is wholly useless, and therefore folly to baptize them.—[Time expires.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

"Baptism is a condition of the Gospel, precedent to the Remission of Sins, equally important with Repentance and Faith.—[MB. Sweeney

AFFIRMS.

[ME. SWEENEY'S FIRST SPEECH.]

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE AUDIENCE:

— Our first proposition related directly to the *action* of Christian baptism. Its substance was: What is the *action* called baptism? Our second proposition, dismissed this forenoon, related to the *subject* of the ordinance. Its substance was, Who may be properly baptized? Our present proposition, just read in your bearing, relates to the *design* of this ordinance. Its substance is, What is baptism *for*? I affirm, it is *for*, and consequently a condition precedent to, the remission of sins. The proposition has not come before you exactly in the shape that I desired to have it. Yet I believe all it affirms; though I think the point of difference between us, is not as fairly and plainly set forth, as it might be in other words. In our correspondence I presented Mr. Logan what I was willing to affirm, and what I still conceive to be a much plainer proposition than the one we are to discuss. I desired to affirm as follows: "Baptism properly administered to a proper subject, is for (that is, in order to) the remission of sins." This, Mr. Logan, refused to deny. I was a little surprised. Then I offered to affirm as follows: "Baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins." This he also declined to deny" Then, when I began to look upon his case as rather hopeful, he offered to deny the proposition just read, and which we are now to discuss. I might infer from his course in our correspondence, that we will have no discussion about whether or not baptism is a condition of pardon; but about its comparative importance, as such. But I am rather inclined to think, that he added: "Equally important with repentance and faith," merely to have something to talk about—or to fall back on. Without this clause, the proposition was entirely too plain.

I take it, that every condition of remission of sins, which is positive, derives its importance from the authority of God, solely; and consequently not from anything in itself. I do not suppose, that God Almighty was absolutely necessitated to make faith, repentance, or baptism, a condition of the sinner's pardon; but if He has done it, I bold that as a condition, one is just as important as either of the other two; as they all derive their importance *as conditions*, from the *authority* that made them such. Such is the character of all positive conditions. I am aware, that some deny that faith is a positive condition of our pardon; asserting that it is *necessarily* a condition—a condition by a natural necessity. I say, it is a *condition, made so by Divine appointment*; and therefore necessary. So is repentance; and so is baptism. And we have no right to dispense with any condition, made such by Divine authority. Nor have we any right to compare their

importance. They are all as important as it is, that God should be honored and obeyed by his creatures. Another thing, which shows the positive character of both faith and repentance is, that they are commands of God; and in this respect, placed on the same footing with baptism. Whatever God *commands* people to do is positive in its character. Let us see what is said in the New Testament on this subject. And,

1. Faith as a command: — “And this is his *commandment*, That we should *believe* on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another as he gave us *commandment*”—1 *John* iii. 23. “*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.”—*Acts* xvi. 31.

2. Repentance as a command:—“And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now *commandeth* all men every where to *repent*.”—*Acts* xvii. 30. “*Repent*, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.”—*Acts* ii. 38.

3. Baptism as a command:—“And he *commanded* them to *be baptized* in the name of the Lord.”—*Acts* x. 48. “*Be baptized*, every one of you,” etc.—*Acts* ii. 38. “*Arise*, and *be baptized*, and wash away thy sins,” etc.—*Acts* xxii. 16.

Now here we have faith, repentance and baptism, all as *positive* commands of God, and all made equally important.

I shall proceed then to show, that baptism is, among others, a condition of the remission of sins. I affirm nothing about baptism *alone*. The debate about baptism alone has just closed. And I am aware that the people, with whom I esteem it an honor to stand identified, are the only people in this country, who openly teach the doctrine of my proposition. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that it is true; and therefore enter upon its advocacy, nothing terrified by any odds against me. I court no sympathy from any one, who cannot sympathize with the teaching of my proposition. What I ask, is a candid hearing; and this I have every reason to believe I shall have, from this large and intelligent audience.

God is a God of order. Order is to be seen in all his works of creation, preservation and providence. A time and a place for every thing, and every thing in its time and place, is order. The Christian system is from God. Every thing, therefore, which pertains to this divine system, has its place. To find the place for Christian baptism, will be our object in the present discussion. In order, it either comes before remission of sins, or it comes after I have affirmed that it is “precedent to remission;” Mr. L. may, for aught I know, contend that it is on the contrary a subsequent. Again, baptism must fill its own place. It cannot fill the place of “grace,” the “blood of Christ,” the “spirit,” “repentance,” or “faith.” Nor can any of these fill its place. Faith will do for faith, but not for baptism. Baptism will do for baptism, but not for faith. Going to make up what is generally included in the word “door,” for illustration, we have several items. There is the opening in the wall for ingress and egress. There is the “shutter,” to close up this opening when necessary. There is the “bolt,” for fastening; the “hinges” in their “place; and the little “screws,” to stay the hinges, etc., etc. All these parts are necessary, each in its own place. Fifty shutters would not answer the purpose, for which those little screws were made. And if this is true of the simple affair of a door, made by a common mechanic, is it not true of the system of Christianity, devised and framed by the Great Architect of this wonderful universe? Or

shall we say, that Christianity is so bunglingly arranged, that we preachers have a deal of trouble, separating between the "essentials" and the "non-essentials?" I deny that there is one single "non-essential," pertaining to the entire system.

I. I shall now proceed to my first argument. Baptism is a condition upon which we "enter into the kingdom of God." To "enter into the kingdom of God," is the same with entering into "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God." The same is meant also, by entering "into Christ," or into the "kingdom of heaven." One state is thus variously styled. This is a state of "justification," of "pardon," of "salvation," of "remission," etc. Hence it is said, "If any man be *in Christ* he is a new creature; *old* things are passed away, behold, all things are become new." For, "God is *in Christ* reconciling the world unto himself, *not imputing their trespasses* unto them." See 2 Cor. v. chap. 17-19 verses. Again, we are told that God "hath delivered us [Christians] from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: *in whom* [same as in his kingdom] we have redemption through his blood, *even the forgiveness of sins.*" But to enter into this kingdom, or "*into Christ,*" which is precisely the same, a man must be baptized; and therefore baptism is a condition precedent to remission, as I affirm in my proposition. There is no promise of remission of sins to any man out of Christ: "For *all* the promises of God *in him* are yea, and *in him* Amen." 2 Cor. i. 20. Now upon what conditions a man may "enter into the kingdom of God," "into the kingdom of his dear Son," or "into Christ," the Lord himself only has the right to say. "Hear ye him:" "*Jesus answered, truly, truly—I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*" John iii. 5. This settles the question, that no man can "enter into the kingdom of God," where we have "forgiveness of sins," without being "born of water and of the spirit." Now, it remains for us to ascertain what is meant by "born of water and of the spirit." This we must know—else we cannot know whether *we* are "born of water and of the spirit," or not; and consequently cannot know whether we are in "the kingdom of God," or not. We are agreed, I presume, as to the office of the *spirit* in this birth. There is a great preparation of the mind and of the heart of man, necessary in order to his coming into this new state. This work must be done by the spirit. But there is no "water" in this work of the spirit. And *in addition* to this work of the spirit, there must be something which has "water" in it, to constitute the *birth*. This something, I affirm, is baptism. What else is there, pertaining to the kingdom of God, that has water in it? In baptism "water" is always present. Then the work of the spirit upon the mind and heart, and baptism, constitute the birth. Here we have present both water and the spirit. That I am right in making the "water" of this passage *baptism*, there can, I think, be no question. I have with me here, all the "Fathers." all the "Commentaries." and all the "Creeds."

My argument is briefly thus: It is in Christ, or which is the same, in the kingdom of God, that we have remission of sins. But baptism is a condition upon which we enter this new state. It is therefore a "condition precedent to the remission of sins." My friend and all our opposers will agree with us, in contending for the work of the spirit in this change, called here a birth; but they are indisposed to take water, when they are

grown up especially. They do not like to take water. [Here Mr. Logan said: "We wont take water."] No, I suppose you prefer to be "*bora of water,*" on *dry land!* It is a great wonder you wear the name of the *Cumberland river!* [A laugh.] No wonder that we have to preach more on baptism than our dry land neighbors, when the preachers among them have almost repudiated it, in its place. They only use it now to "*seal babies* in covenant relation." I am frank to admit that we urge the importance of *believers* being baptized, "five times as much" as our religious neighbors; and I think I can show a good reason why we should do so. For illustration: In Kentucky, where I was brought up, the people very generally lived in log houses, especially in the country, about the Green and "Cumberland" rivers. "House-raising" were very common. A man would hew out, prepare, and draw together, his logs; and then invite his neighbors to assist him in raising his house. We will suppose we are at a "house-raising"—a very heavy raising—the logs are very large; the building is to be two stories high; and forty hands are present to raise the house. They all lay to like men, and up goes one log after another, till all are up but the top-log, called the "wall-plate." Just here thirty, of the forty hands, declare that it is not at all "essential" that the "wall-plate" should go up! They propose some sort of unheard-of substitute; and say: "If you ten will join us we will work with you at this substitute, but will not put up the "plate"—"it is a non-essential." The ten true men remonstrate and reason with the thirty: "That the master of the building has prepared all the logs, plates and all; and he has a place for every log, and a log for every place; and we should therefore put up the building as he wishes." But the thirty grow worse; and not only declare, that they will not help raise the log, but turn round, and sit down upon it! So now, the "loyal" ten have not only to raise the log without the aid of the thirty, but they have to lift their laziness! And who would wonder if they should make a little more noise about it, than about the other logs, when they had the help of the thirty? Such, precisely, is our condition, my friends, in contending for Christian baptism, in its place.

In urging the necessity of faith, repentance, prayer, etc., we have the co-operation and assistance of our religious neighbors; but when we come to the proper place for baptism, we are left alone to urge its necessity. Our neighbors tell us it is a "non-essential," and that a man can be a Christian just about as well without as with it. They have substituted the "mourner's-bench," unknown to the whole Bible, and are now complaining, that we are making entirely too much noise about baptism, and will not join them in preaching their substitute. They have accused us of preaching "a water salvation," as you have heard from my very worthy opponent during this discussion; have called us "Campbellites," "water regenerationists;" and have decided pretty generally that we are exceedingly "heterodox!" And in their zealous opposition to "Campbellism," they are found preaching down Christian baptism! And we are not only left alone to urge the necessity of baptism, upon penitent believers, but we have to do so under the weight of our self-styled orthodox neighbors. We must, alone, raise the "log" *and them on it!* And, by the help of God, we can, and will do it. But if we make a little noise about it, we beg of our friends, that they will not be surprised. I predict, that, notwithstanding Mr. L. has told us, that it is the "seal of the Christian covenant," he will

be found preaching down baptism during the entire discussion upon this proposition.

II. My second argument is drawn from the commission our Lord gave his apostles when he authorized them to preach "remission of sins" among all nations in his name. We will examine that commission as recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, only premising, that it is necessary for us to take all that is said by all four of these witnesses, to get *all* the truth, in the case. What each one of them says is true, but may not be *all* of the truth; and what all of them say is true, and is the *whole* truth.

Matthew says, our Lord said: "Go teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Then it is true, that our Lord required that the nations should be *taught* and *baptized*. The commission cannot be shown to contain *less* than *teaching* and *baptism*, while Matthew is unimpeached.

Mark says our Savior said: "Go preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here we have *teaching*, or *preaching*, which (sensible preaching) is the same thing, expressed in another word, and the *baptism*, as given by Matthew; and *in addition* we have other items. Mark puts *faith* between the teaching, or preaching, and the baptism; and adds "shall be saved," *after* the baptism. Now, taking all both these inspired witnesses have said, we have in this great commission the following items: *Teaching, faith, baptism*, (into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) *Salvation*. It cannot contain *less* than these items, though it may contain more. Let us hear Luke. He says the Lord said: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke gives us the additional item of *repentance*; and what Mark calls *salvation*, he styles "*remission of sins*." John's record of the commission harmonizes with those noticed without giving any thing additional. Now, in this commission we have the following items: 1, *Teaching*; 2, *Faith*; 3, *Repentance*; 4, *Baptism*, and 5, *Salvation, or Remission of Sins*. Mr. Logan cannot deny that these items are all in the commission. Nor can he deny, that they are in the *order* I have given them, except he claims that repentance should precede faith; and were I to grant him this—which I will not do—it would cut no figure in the present discussion. In either case, baptism comes *after* faith and repentance; and this salvation, which comes still *after* baptism, Luke calls "*Remission of sins*." Hence, remission of sins comes, in order, after baptism; and hence my affirmation is true, that "baptism is a condition of the gospel *precedent* to the remission of sins." I very much desire that Mr. L. shall fairly and rigidly examine, and if he can, refute this argument. I court a rigid examination of all my arguments.

Mr. Logan claims to be laboring to disciple the nations under this very commission. But he discipled infants by the *baptism* alone, and "adults" by *faith* alone! I want the gentleman to give us a little authority, if he can, for promising to any one the "remission of sins," before baptism. We shall see if he does it.

III. I now propose to base a third argument upon what I conceive to be the best *commentary* upon the commission that is to be found any where. My commentary is not that of Dr. Clarke, or that of Barnes, but it is one given by *Simon Peter*, who, in commenting upon the commission, was

guided into all the truth by the unerring Spirit of all Truth. It will be remembered by the audience, that when our Savior gave the commission to his holy apostles, he bade them "tarry at Jerusalem" till they were "endowed with power from on high," to carry it into effect; or, in other words, till they should receive the Holy Spirit, to guide them infallibly into the true and right way, while at work under this great commission. And accordingly, we learn, they went to Jerusalem—the place at which they were to "tarry"—where remission of sins was to *begin* to be preached—and there they abode "with one accord in one place," until the "day of Pentecost was fully come." There and then they received the promised power. They were all "filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance." Now, we have the men commissioned, all in the right place, at the right time. They have "power from on high" to guide them into a correct understanding of their commission, and to aid them in carrying it out. Now, I submit, that their conduct upon this occasion, being guided as they were by the Holy Spirit, *will show vs just how they understood their commission.* Will it not? They have here to begin with, hundreds and thousands of "Jews out of every nation under heaven." The proceedings of the occasion are in a very short time to be known every where. Their preaching, and the *terms* of salvation, as propounded by them, will be scattered world-wide in a very few days. Upon this occasion, if never afterward, it will be necessary for all the conditions of remission to be set forth clearly, so that all may understand them. Peter, ever ready to speak first, and to whom the Savior had promised the keys of his kingdom, arose, full of the Holy Spirit—guided by it—and begins the work assigned him and his fellow-apostles under their commission. What does he do first? He begins by "*teaching*"—this being, as we have already seen, the first item in his commission. Guided by the Holy Spirit, he *taught* the people; or, in other words, he "preached the gospel" to them. And we are informed, that, "when they heard this, they were pierced in the heart, and cried out, unto Peter and the rest of the apostles: 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?'" These persons have heard the gospel and *believed* it, else they never would have asked Peter, what they must do. They are fully convinced that Jesus is the Christ, and is at God's right hand exalted; that they are sinners, condemned before God; guilty of the blood of the only begotten and well beloved Son of God. Therefore, pierced in the heart, they cry out—"What shall we do?" Here we have, 1, *teaching*; 2, *faith*. Then Peter said unto them, "*Repent* [3, *repentance*. And, by the way, this settles the *order* of faith and repentance] *and be baptized* [4, *baptism*'] *every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, [5, remission of sins] and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" Acts ii 38. How did Peter understand the *commission*? He understood it to contain, 1, *teaching*; 2, *faith*; 3, *repentance*; 4, *baptism*, and 5, *remission of sins*. Here we find baptism a condition, *going before* remission of sins; and hence my proposition affirms truly, that, "baptism is a condition of the Gospel, *precedent* to the remission of sins" But my friend, will give us an order something like as follows: 1, *Baptism*, (in infancy) 2, *teaching*; 3, *repentance*; 4, *faith*, and 5, *remission of sins*! He, of course, does not object to my making "baptism *precedent* to remission," for he does it himself. He has baptism to precede *every thing*! I suppose he will deny that baptism *it a*

condition at all—it is merely the “covenant seal.” Well, it is no where said just in so many words, that baptism is a *condition* of pardon; neither is it said that faith, or repentance, is; but I have already shown, and shall do so more conclusively if possible, that, that *is said* which *implies* that it (baptism) is a condition. The very language which makes faith and repentance conditions, also makes baptism one. Peter, as we have seen, commanded these persons at Jerusalem, to “repent and be baptized *for* the remission of sins and this language makes both repentance and baptism conditions of remission. And my friend believes repentance is a condition, and so admits in our proposition. This being admitted by him in our proposition I have only to remind him, that the relation of baptism and that of repentance, to remission, are *one and the same*, being expressed by one and the same word, “*for*.”

I desire to make clean work as I go; and I will, therefore, walk out in the open field, and face the worthy gentleman squarely, here. I say, that in this passage, “*for*” means *in order to*. If I am correct in this affirmation, then my proposition is established. If I am wrong, Mr. L. is the man, and now is the time, to make it appear. I do not say, that “*for*” always means necessarily “*in order to*,” but that it does in *some instances* Mr. Logan will hardly deny; and that this is one of the instances in which it does, I affirm. If the gentleman denies this—and deny it he must—I wish him to be so kind as to inform us what “*for*” *does* mean in this passage. It will not suffice for him simply to say, as others have said, “it has more meanings than one.” For this is admitted. But it does not have more meanings than one, *in this place*. It must have but one meaning at a time, and in one place. In this place, there is a circumstance that fixes its meaning; and that is this: In whatever sense *repentance* is “*for*” the remission of sins baptism is. If repentance is *for* (that is, *in order to*) remission, then baptism is, also. But if baptism is “*for*” (that is, “*because of*,” as is some times claimed) remission, then, so is repentance! It is very convenient for the worthy gentleman, and his brethren, to dispose of this passage, by saying, “*for* means *because of*,” when they have the stand all to themselves. But this is not so convenient when there is an opponent to follow. How often has this plain passage of scripture been disposed of in the hearing of this people, and from this pulpit, by the preacher who would merely say—“*for*, here, means, as in other instances, merely *because of*?” I now venture to predict that Mr. L. will not take this ground. Mark the prediction! In fact, I shall be surprised if he takes *any* clear and unequivocal position here, at all. There is none tenable but the one I hold, and if he comes upon that, then I shall hold him as my prisoner. There is plain, straight forward work here for the gentleman. Let him tell us, if *for* in this passage does not mean *in order to* as I have affirmed, then *what does it mean*? Did those persons who had been *taught* and who *believed* the Gospel, and were consequently “*pierced in the heart*,” want to know what to do *because of* the remission of their sins, or *in order to* remission? I say, they desired to know, and Peter told them, *what they should do* IN ORDER TO remission of sins. Will the gentleman say, they desired to know, and Peter told them, *what to do* BECAUSE OF the remission of their sins? Or what *will* he say? We shall see.

Again, I wish the gentleman to answer, right fairly and unequivocally, another question. When those persons asked, “*What shall we do?*” *did*

Peter answer their question right? He may be a little surprised that I should ask him such a question. But, I beg him to remember, it is because he and his brethren some times *surprise me* that I ask it. When persons are *taught*, as were those at Jerusalem, and *believe*, as they did, and, as they did, ask, "What shall we do?" will *he*, as Peter did, answer, "*Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins?*" Do he and his brethren do this? I am pretty well acquainted with the gentleman's people, his Creed and his practice. I know how far they and my brethren go together, and I know just where we part. In preaching to such as their practice makes it necessary for them to call "*adults*," we alike, preach to them Jesus—tell them that he is at God's right hand exalted—is "*both Lord and Christ*"—as did Peter who was directed by the unerring spirit of God. But when the people *hear, believe*, and, being "*pierced in the heart*," ask, "What shall we do?" here we come to the "*forks of the road*." Those who are "*led by the spirit of God*," going straight forward, say, "*Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" while those who are not "*led by the Spirit*," take a little *left hand* road, that leads off *down* through the *brush* to the "*mourner's-bench*." There they, as they claim, are "*born of water and the spirit*" on *dry land*! And in Mr. Logan's own language, "*There, at length*, they obtain the '*pearl of great price*.'" And this "*at length*," means, some times, but a few hours; some times, a few *weeks*; and some times a few *years*; and some times, as some know by sad experience, it means *several* years—even a long life-time! And, my friends, Mr. L. stands here where the road forks, crying at the top of his voice to you, to go not straight forward, as the Holy Spirit directs, but to take this road that turns off to the *left*; and this he doubtless does in all honesty and sincerity. But surely he is in error. The Holy Spirit says, to such as have *heard* and *believed* the Gospel, "*Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" *Who is right?*

You have seen, my friends, that I am not contending for baptism *alone*, as *the* condition of pardon, but for it as *a* condition, along with others of equal importance. I have argued for a "*birth of water and of the spirit*," which includes, teaching, faith, repentance and baptism, as necessary to remission of sins. I have also shown that the great commission our Lord gave to his holy apostles contains these items: *Teaching, faith, repentance and baptism*, and where these all obtain he promises remission of sins. ' I have also shown, in the third place, that the apostles so understood their commission. They first *taught* the people, and when any *believed*, they commanded them to "*repent and be baptized*, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins.*" I now propose to show, that, in any case Mr. L. may select where any one in the time of the apostles reached remission of sins, or salvation, these items—teaching, faith, repentance and baptism—all obtained. This is the *order* of the commission, and that observed by the apostles of the Lord Jesus. Let him find where any individual under the preaching of the apostles ever obtained the remission of sins, or the salvation of the Gospel, *without any one of these conditions*, if he can. When he selects his case I will certainly pay my respects to it.

I am as well satisfied, as to the course the worthy gentleman will pursue, as if I had heard him through. He will select a class of Scripture quotations which predicate pardon of *faith* without naming baptism, and will claim that they prove that faith is the *only* condition of pardon. While I am free to admit, that our justification, or pardon, is predicated of faith in several places in the New Testament, where baptism is not *there* named I shall deny that these passages prove that faith is the *only* condition of pardon, or that baptism is *not* a condition also. If the gentlemen reads us a passage of Scripture, predicating our pardon of faith, let him tell us it he understands that *repentance*—because not named—is *excluded*. When Paul says we are “justified by faith,” *does* he understand Paul to exclude *repentance* as a condition of justification? Certainly not. And why? Because it is else where taught in the Bible that repentance is also one of the conditions of justification, and this being so it must be understood as implied where it is not expressed. And just so precisely of *every thing* that is any where in the Bible said to be a condition of pardon. It must be understood as *implied*, if not expressed, where ever pardon is mentioned; else, to save the Bible from condemnation, we must say God has diverse ways of pardoning sinners under the one dispensation! Our Salvation is predicated of *baptism* in one place in the New Testament, without any other condition being named in the connection. And shall we conclude from this that baptism is the *only* condition of Salvation? I suppose Mr. Logan would hardly consent that “*adults*” are saved by baptism *only*!

I am aware that illustrations *prove* nothing, but they aid us in getting matters fully before our hearers. I once beard of a good old Methodist Class Leader, in the State of Indiana, whose house was bard by the meeting house, and was a homo for the preachers, of his own kind especially. But his wife was, without being worse for it, a member of the Christian Church. She was, nevertheless, very liberal, as most of her brethren are, in her feelings, and was kind to her husband’s brethren, and always attended their meetings. With her husband’s influence, she gained permission of the M. E. Church for a couple of *her* preachers to occupy the meeting house fur a few days. The appointment was made, the preachers came, preached once or twice, and were invited to go home with the Class Leader. They, of course, went, and were treated very kindly. But they found the old gentleman uncompromisingly opposed to their doctrine. “Gentlemen,” said he, “I believe in the doctrine of justification by faith only.” The Preachers very mildly informed him, that they supposed he was in an error. But he contended that the Bible was “full of the doctrine.” They asked him to turn to one place in the Bible, that taught “justification by faith only.” He flew to his Bible, and began to turn over the leaves, hunting for “faith only.” Of course my audience is aware that “faith only” occurs in the whole Bible, only where it is said, we are “*not* justified by *faith, only*,” and that consequently the old man’s search had to be a fruitless one But the old gentleman finally turned up this passage—“Therefore being justified *by faith*, we have peace with God” etc. But the preachers reminded him, that this passage was *minus* the “*only*.” Whereupon the old gentleman laid down a *rule* of interpretation, as follows: “Where any result is predicated of a given cause without any other cause being named, the passage is to be understood just as it *only* followed the cause given.” “And here,” continued he, “in the passage I have adduced, justification

is predicted of *faith*, and no other cause being named, it follows, that justification is by *faith only*." Here the conversation was interrupted by the dinner bell. After dining, the old gentleman invited the preachers to walk out and look at his farm, stock etc. Among other things, he pointed out to them a fine, level field, containing forty acres of fine "corn land," saying, "gentlemen, last year, that *forty* yielded me 3000 bushels of corn." This passed, and in a fine pasture, the old man pointed out a pair of beautiful bay horses, saying: "Those bays made roe that 3000 bushels of oorn." By and by, they came into the old gentleman's bam yard, and while looking at the machinery, their attention was directed to a couple of fine plows, the old man saying: "Those plows, gentlemen, without being once repaired, made me that 3000 bushels of corn." Finally, upon re-entering the house, the old gentleman called the attention of the preachers to a couple of fine looking lads, his sons, saying: "These boys raised me that 3000 bushels of corn." Just here, one of the preachers, wishing to resume the subject of *justification*, did so by calling attention to what the old gentleman had been telling them about the land, the horses, the plows, and the boys. Said he to the old gentleman, "are you aware that you have been telling us some marvellous stories about that 3000 bushels of corn r" "What?" enquired the old gentleman. "Why. you have tolAs," continued the preacher, that 40 acres of land *alone*—without any horses, boys, plows, seed corn, or any thing else—yielded you 3000 bushels of corn! And you have further told us, that two horses *alone*—without any land, plows, or anything elsi—made you 3000 bushels of corn! Still further, you have told us, that two plows *alone*—without boys, land or horses—made you 3000 bushels of cum! And, finally, you have told us, here, in the hearing of your family, that these two lads *alone*—of course without land, horses or plows,— made you 3000 bushels of corn!" The old gentleman squarely denied the whole bill, saying: "I neither said nor meant that the land, horses, plows or boys, *alone*, had made the corn! I supposed, that you knew enough about corn-raising, to know that when the land *was the subject of conversation*, I predicated the whole result of it, without stopping to name every other particular thing necessary to such a result, supposing you *knew* that other things had of course to perform their parts." "Very well said the preacher, "we understood you very well, and would have had no trouble with your language, but for your "Rule of interpretation" which you gave us before dinner Did you not lay down as a *rule*, that, ' where any result is predicated of a given cause, without any other cause being named, the passage is to be understood just as if *only* followed the cause given" "Yes," said the farmer, "but I-I-I meant that rule for *Theology*. I did not intend it should apply to common matters, each as *firming*."

I now submit, my friends, that Mr. L. must defend that old Class Leader's *Rule*, else his failure on this proposition will be seen of all men, and felt by himself. He must go to passages of Scripture where remission, or salvation, is promised to, or predicated of, *faith* or *repentance*, or some other cause «here baptism is not named in that connection; and then he must contend that it is *excluded*, because it is not *there* named—no matter if it is named, as a condition, *else where!* But will this intelligent audience look with approbation upon such a course? I think not. Why, my friends, if allowed to proceed in this way, an adroit man can disprove almost any

doctrine of the Bible. For very frequently when the inspired writers or speakers are treating of *faith*, they predicate our justification of it, without naming in the same connection, *Grace*, the *blood of atonement*, *preaching*, *repentance*, *baptism*, or any other condition. And again, when speaking of *repentance* particularly, they promise to it, or predicate of it, remission of salvation; without naming in that connection, *faith*, or any other condition. Thus we are said to be saved by grace," in one place; in another, "justified by his *blood*;" in another, saved "by the foolishness of *preaching*;" in another, "justified by works;" and in another, "even *baptism* doth also now save us." But we are never said to be saved, pardoned or justified by any of these things *alone*—mark that. Our justification is predicated of any of these conditions that happens to be the *subject treated of at the time*. When, for instance, an inspired apostle is treating of the Grace of God, he says, "We are *saved* by Grace." But he does not say by Grace *alone*. Where he is speaking of the blood of Christ, he says, "We are justified freely by his blood." But not by that *alone*. When he is speaking of *faith*, he says, "being justified by faith." But he does not add the *alone*, or *only*, to exclude every thing else. When he is speaking of the importance of *preaching*, he says—"it pleased God by the [so called] foolishness of *preaching*, to save them that believe." But it is not by *preaching alone*. Where he is speaking of Christian baptism, he says, "baptism now saves us"—not *alone* though.

The "Grace of God" brought Jesus to our sinful world; he shed his precious blood as the great propitiatory, for the sins of the whole world; rose from the dead, for our justification, bringing life and immortality to light; gave a commission to his holy apostles, for the Christianization and salvation of the world. This commission as we have seen contained, 1 *teaching*, 2 *faith*, 3 *repentance*, 4 *baptism*, and 5 the promise of *salvation*, or *remission of sins*. And so, we have seen, the apostles themselves, understood it. For they first *preached*, when persons *believed*, they commanded them to "*repent* and be *baptized*, for the remission of sins." Thus you see, friends, I am contending for baptism, simply as *one* of the conditions of remission of sins—in its own place. I give it no prominence or importance, which it does not derive from the authority of the Great Head of the Church. He commanded believers to "*repent* and be *baptized* for the remission of sins." He has said—"he that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved." Is it not *superlatively* "important," that he should be obeyed? Can any thing be *more* important, than that He should be obeyed? If so, then, *what is it*, I demand?

I may have been too diffuse, in this, my opening address. I beg to be excused. I have purposely been so, knowing that the position of myself and brethren is not generally understood, especially where it has been set forth only by our opponents. It has been my purpose to set forth our position in such a manner as to leave no occasion for even the worthy gentleman himself to misunderstand us. I care not with what force he attacks my *real* position. We do believe that baptism is a condition of pardon—simply one among others—and in itself, being a simple action, of no more importance than any other simple action. But as it has been enacted by the *Lord himself*, it is *therefore* as important that it should be attended to as anything can be. I never will consent, that it is in any degree unimportant that the Lord should be obeyed in *any* of His commandments. We do not, then,

as you will see, put the salvation in the *water*, or in the *act* itself, of being baptized—or any other act. *Salvation is of the Lord*, "UNTO ALL THEM THAT obey HIM."—(*Time Expires*.)

MR. LOGAN'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — As we have now commenced the discussion of another proposition, in which my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, has to affirm, the "laboring oar" has again fallen into his bands. And I wish you to notice well the terms of the proposition he has undertaken to defend; as this will be very important in order to see properly what his doctrine is on the subject. He has undertaken to affirm, not only that "baptism is a condition of the gospel, precedent to remission of sins," but that, as such, it is "equally important with *repentance* and *faith*." This, then, makes it a condition of the remission of sins, of as great importance as, and equally necessary with either and both of these! It is claiming for it—for a mere, outward, bodily ordinance—a design and character I am bound to *deny*; as it makes mere *water baptism* as indispensably necessary, and as absolutely essential, to pardon of sins and salvation, as either of the great principles of *repentance* and *faith*! — a conclusion to which, I think, no one can come, who will notice the comparative importance of the three, according to the teaching of the Bible, and the greater stress that is every where laid on *repentance* and *faith*. But if my friend thinks that he can sustain his position, let him try it. As my worthy friend has all the *affirming* to do, on this proposition, the burden of *proof* will devolve on him; while I have nothing to prove. All I have to do is to *deny*, and *disprove* what he advances in support of his proposition. Hence we have now shifted places; and my business will be to reply to his arguments on this question. And here my friend and his party have to stand by themselves. They are alone here, in advocating this doctrine of "baptism for the remission of sins," as it is termed; while we have the whole Christian world with us, in advocating the great doctrine of justification by *faith*, in opposition to it! My friend had the Baptists, and immersionists generally, to sympathise with him on the two propositions, which have recently been discussed in your hearing; but here he has to part company with thorn, and file off with his own party; while they go along with us, to swell the ranks of the opposition to his "peculiar doctrine," as it is termed. And here I must remark, that, not satisfied with the rendering in the common version of the Bible, of the noted passage, in Acts ii. 38, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," on which their doctrine of baptismal remission is principally based, as not strong enough for them, they have *changed* it to, "be baptized *in order to* the remission of sins!" But this was not strong enough for them; and they had to change the passage still more, and render it, "*Reform*, and be *immersed*, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins!" Now, when people have to so change and alter the reading of a passage of Scripture, in order to sustain a favorite doctrine, does it not, I ask, throw an air of suspicion over it, that it is wrong, and not taught in the word of God? Most assuredly, it does. But to proceed with my reply.

I must notice, in the first place, a few of the positions of my worthy friend, which he has taken in the speech to which you have just been listen-

ing. Ha baa had a good deal to say about the form of the proposition under discussion, and how difficult it wag for him to get one that would suit myself; or, as the truth of the matter is, that would suit his own self! He says, that he first presented the proposition, in one form, which you have heard, and I refused to deny, at which he was a little surprised. He then says, that he offered to affirm it, in another form, which you have also heard, and that I declined to deny; and that then he began to look upon my "case as rather hopeful," when I offered to deny the proposition, now under discussion; but as "hopeful" in what manner, he has not informed us, and all that we can do, in reference to it, is to conjecture. If he means "hopeful," as to embracing his own peculiar views of baptismal remission, I can assure him that he is most egregiously mistaken. As to the 'form of the proposition, my worthy friend did not state it to embrace the teaching of him and his brethren on the subject, in the first two forms he presented, according to my understanding of their teaching on it; and hence the form of the present one, which he has agreed to defend. I wanted one, that would present their teaching on the subject; and as I understood that teaching to make baptism a condition of remission of sins, *equally* with repentance and faith, I accepted the proposition under discussion, in preference to either of the other two. Christian baptism can only be performed by the authority of Christ; on the terms prescribed by him and his Apostles; and for the purpose or design laid down by them, in the inspired word of God; and nothing else can be called *Christian* baptism.

And as my worthy friend is in the habit of occasionally presenting some strange and unheard-of things, in his speeches, I must here notice a most strange and novel position he took, on the subject of faith, as a condition of remission of sins. In order to get baptism in as a condition of equal importance with repentance and faith, as *baptism* is a *positive* institution, he affirms *faith* to be *positive* too—a "positive institution," I suppose! Well, I had always supposed faith to be *necessarily* a condition of pardon—a condition by a *natural necessity*, as it were—and not a positive one; and I doubt whether my friend will find many of his own brethren with him here! If I am not mistaken, I shall have the great body of them, including some of the *editors* and "*doctors*" of his church, with me, in my views on this subject—if I have not been wrongly informed. I know not what *Mr. Campbell's* views on the subject are; as I expect that he has probably never thought any thing about it; and that my worthy friend has got ahead of him here, as he has probably, in some of the other strange and unheard-of positions advanced by him! I admit with my friend, that faith is a *command* of God, as he has shown; a command emanating from divine authority—but does that prove that it is *positive* in its nature and character? Baptism is *positive*; and obedience to God in it is voluntary, and not the result of a *natural necessity*. A person may be baptized, or not, as he chooses. But not so with faith. When good, credible *testimony* is presented to the intelligent and discriminating mind of a person, he *cannot help believing*—he is *compelled* by a *natural necessity* of the mind to *believe*, however disagreeable to him, the object or subject of the faith may be! He may shut his ears, and close his eyes, to the testimony, and thus refuse to receive it, and believe; but let him have it fairly presented to him, and he cannot help believing! And this accords precisely with what our Savior says, in speaking of the unbelief of the Jews: "For this people's heart is waxed gross

and their ears are dull of bearing, and their eyes *they have closed*; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

My friend had a good deal to say about a "log argument," which he has presented by way of illustration. He has forty hands engaged in "raising," or putting up a log-house, away somewhere in the State of Kentucky, where he was "raised." They all get along very well together, until they come to put up that topmost log, or wall-plate;" when thirty out of the forty bands at work in raising the house, declare that this "wall-plate" is a "non-essential," and that they will not help to raise it; and all of them sit down upon it, when the ten—poor fellows! — had to lift it, with the thirty and "their laziness" on it, by themselves! This "wall-plate" my friend makes *baptism* "for remission of sins"— the thirty, who refused to help lift it, and sat down on it, the Pedobaptists, or those denying¹ baptism for remission"—and the ten heroic fellows, the real "Simon-pures," who had the log to raise, with the thirty on it and their "laziness," his own brethren! Such is the *application* of the illustration, by my worthy friend; but I wish the audience to remember, that illustration is not argument. Now I deny that my brethren are sitting upon this log, and that he and his brethren have them and their "laziness" to lift with it! We occupy the Scriptural ground, or "log" if you please, of "justification [or pardon] by faith," and are not on his "log" of "baptism for remission of sins" at all! So he and his brethren may lift, and lift on, and continue to lift on, without our weight and "laziness" on it! But I judge that they have found it very heavy lifting so far; and that my friend will find it task him to his utmost strength to get this "wall-plate" up, with all the help he can get to assist him! I expect that he will find this "log argument" more a "*logomachy*" than any thing else!

My worthy friend had also a "door argument," or illustration, which I think a much better one than his "log argument." He did not tell us *where* "baptism for remission" was, in it—only it had its *place* somewhere—the "*hinge*" I suppose, on which the door turns. Unless, indeed, like our Baptist friends, he makes baptism the "*door* into the Church," by which it has to be entered.

I must now notice here my worthy friend's first argument for baptism in order to the remission of sins. After asking, on what conditions a man may "enter the Kingdom of God," he quotes John iii. 5, containing the reply of our Savior to Nicodemus: "Yerily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God;" and then says: "This settles the question, that no man can 'enter into the Kingdom of God,'" where we have 'forgiveness of sins,' without being 'born of water and of the Spirit,'" or, in other words, *without bring baptized*; as that is what he makes this birth of water to consist in. Now I think I shall be able to show, that this passage has no reference whatever to water baptism; but that the *water*, mentioned in it, is figurative, has reference to entering the Kingdom of Christ. Christian baptism is not in the passage at all! As it was not instituted by our Savior and the Apostles until afterwards, and as this took place *before*, I ask, how could it refer to that? Notice, that the birth here mentioned, in this passage, was something that was to take place *then*, as the very language of the Savior indi-

cates, I am ready to acknowledge, that some of my own brethren, and some Pedobaptists, have admitted that water baptism is referred to in this passage; but it does not necessarily follow from their admission, that it is. That the "water" here has a figurative reference to entering the Kingdom of Christ, and not to water *baptism*, and that it is an *emblem* of purification, as here spoken of, I shall be abundantly able to show. It must be admitted, that the blood and water, shed out of the side of our Savior represent purification from sin, and was emblematical of that; as Christ is said to have "*washed us from our sins by his own blood;*" "*we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,*" etc. and, "*having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, [by his blood,] and your bodies washed with pure water, [the water of purification,]*" etc.

Before I enter on a critical examination of this passage, (John iii. 5,) in its connection, I will show that the "water" in it has reference to the work of the Spirit, on the heart, in its purifying and sanctifying influences. We find the term "water" used by our Savior to designate this work of the Spirit. We hear him, as recorded in this same book of John, saying to the woman of Samaria: "But whosoever drinketh of the *water* that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the *water* that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water *springing up into everlasting life.*" (John iv. 14.) That this was not *material* water must be admitted by every one, as our Savior had just been contrasting it with that. The following passages fully explain it, and show what was meant by him: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of *living water*. But this spake he *of the SPIRIT*, which they that believe on him *should RECEIVE,*" etc. (John ii. 17-39.) Here we find the term "water," used by our Savior again as representing the Spirit, in this same book of John. Now we can infer from this, that the term "water" means "Spirit," in John iii. 5, just as much as that it means Spirit, in the passages above quoted. But my friend may say, it reads, "born of water *and* of the Spirit." Granted, but what of that? May not the word (*kai*) in the original mean "even" as well as "and?" Then it would read: "Except a man be born of water, *even* the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." So this passage does not necessarily refer to water baptism.

Let us notice what our Savior first said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be *born again*, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." And now notice what he said to him next: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Mark the difference in the two passages. The man is not born *twice*, but only *once*; as both refer to the *same* birth. The one passage signifies the *agency* in this new birth, the Spirit; and the other, the *manner* of it, implying the same thing. Nicodemus did not understand our Savior; as he had a birth of flesh and blood—a natural birth—before his mind. But we see that our Savior, in opposition to this, presents to him, and keeps up, separate and distinct from it, the birth of the Spirit. And we see, moreover, as I have shown, that this passage can have reference to Christian baptism, because Christ's Kingdom was still in the future. If our Savior meant *two* births—one a separate birth of water, and the other of the Spirit; then he ought to have said, "That which is born of the water *is water*, and that which is born of the

Spirit is spirit!" [Here Mr. Sweeney said: "I never meant that there were two births."] Well, it amounts to the same thing at last.

We hear our Savior saying still further to Nicodemus: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is *born of the Spirit*"—not "of water and of the Spirit"—but only "born of the Spirit." How was it possible for it to be Christian baptism, when that, as I have shown, was still in the future? Here this birth of the Spirit is represented to be as inexplicable as the coming and going of the wind, and as difficult to explain; but my friend professes to tell you all about it—for he says that, "the work of the Spirit upon the mind and heart, and baptism, constitute the birth." Ho must have baptism in it some way, or it is no birth with him! I suppose then, that on his theory, without baptism all the work of the Spirit—all the change of mind and heart—would be nothing! — no more than "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal!" There can be no remission, no regeneration, without his hobby, baptism!

Another objection to the position of my friend, on this passage, (in John iii. 5,) is, that the *commission* never mentions any such thing as this birth of water for which he contends. Let us read and examine the record of it, and we will see that there is not a single mention of it any where in it:

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi, 15, 16.

"Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, And ye are witness of these things."—Luke xxiv. 45—18.

"Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."—Johm xx. 21-23.

Now, I would ask, where is there a single mention, in all these records we have of the commission which our Savior gave his Apostles, of this birth of water for which my friend contends? We have faith, and repentance, and baptism, and remission of sins, and the Holy Ghost; but not a word about being "born of water and of the Holy Spirit," as in this passage, (in John iii. 5;) which shows that it refers to the work of the Spirit, in regeneration, and not to water baptism. How my worthy friend can make a *birth* out of baptism, is something I am utterly unable to see!—and I cannot see how any one else can perceive it, either! What analogy, I would ask, is there, or can there be, between being dipped in the water, (his baptism,) and being born? The idea is absurd and preposterous! We hear our Savior telling his Apostles, that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," which shows the great importance of repentance. He does not say, "faith and repentance," because a genuine repentance ends in a living faith. Hence, "a godly sorrow [for sin] works a repentance not to be repented of." And we find that repentance was the great burden of

the preaching of John the Baptist, Christ himself, and the Apostles: "*Repent*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand and: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commands all men, every where, to repent." Hence, as such stress is every where in the Bible laid on repentance, and as it ends in a living faith, as we have said, a *precedence* is given to it over faith itself, in the order of Heaven. We have the example in the language of the Savior himself, who said: "*Repent, and believe* the gospel and Paul to the elders of the Church at Ephesus: "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, [Gentiles,] repentance toward God, *and faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Hence we place repentance *before faith*, as the order of the Gospel. And when we see the great stress every where laid on *repentance*, while not a word is said about baptism in connection with it, and see the great importance of *faith*, in the office of pardon, justification, and sanctification, while the Scriptures are silent in the connection of baptism with it; how, I would ask, can this mere external ordinance be of *equal importance* with repentance and faith as a condition of remission of sins, according to the proposition and theory of my worthy friend? The thing is impossible according to the Scriptures.

All the point that he can make, from the records of the commission, is in Mark, where the Savior said, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved and this arrangement, as to the position of terms and their precedence in reference to each other, as I have already shown, is arbitrary, and does not necessarily imply such a precedence and relative importance. But not only does the position of my friend here *damn infants*, as I have before shown, as they cannot believe, but it is condemned by the balance of the passage: "but he that *believeth not* shall be damned"—not, "he that is *baptized not*"—which makes *unbelief* the ground of condemnation, and not the omission or *want*, of *baptism*!

If I can be allowed the liberty of making a discrimination in the records of the commission, I would say, that that of Luke is the *most important*, He specifies *two* commands, while the others do not: 1. Repentance; and, 2. Remission of sins—"that *repentance* AND *remission of sins* should *he preached* in his [Christ's] name," etc. He says nothing about *faith*; but we know that that was necessarily included, and is understood. The very moment that a man gives up all; makes a surrender of himself; and rests upon Christ as his only Savior; *that moment* he receives the pardon of his sins, and is converted to God. Hence his faith is the *end* of a true and genuine repentance. But how is it, on the theory of my worthy friend? Why, another person, a second party, has to be called in, before he can get the remission of his sins, and be converted! All his repentance, all his faith, all his praying to God, will avail him nothing, not a single cent, unless he is *baptized* by a second party! Now, I would ask, how can such a theory as this, which makes the pardon and salvation of a person *depend on another* person, have any place in the word of God? If a man happens to be away in a desert where there is no water, or in the extreme north where it is all *frozen* up in ice; and truly and sincerely repents of his sins, and believes on Christ, and experiences a change of heart, *he must be lost*, for the want of water to baptize him! God does not thus make the salvation of one man to depend on another; and require a second party to be called in to effect it! But what say the Scriptures? "*Repent, and be con-*

verted, that your sins may be blotted out," etc: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God etc., etc.—but not a word about baptism! Does not all this mean something? Does it not show the great conditions of pardon and salvation to be *repentance* and *faith*? Most certainly; anti that water *baptism* occupies a position entirely *subordinate*, and of a different character altogether, having nothing to do as a *condition* of remission of sins!

Though we find repentance as precedent to faith, where named together, and though we often find one of them mentioned, without the naming of the other, yet they necessarily include, or involve each other. Where repentance is mentioned, without faith, faith is *understood*; and where faith is mentioned, and repentance not, repentance is understood. Hence they are as inseparably connected as are *cause* and *effect*.

But before I proceed further with my remarks, I must notice another thing in the speech of my worthy friend, in connection with what I have already been noticing. You will recollect, that he made the expressions, "in Christ," "the house of God," etc., as *equivalent* to the Church or Kingdom of Christ—to the being in this, as a *state* of "justification," "pardon," "salvation," "remission of sins," etc.—and finally affirmed, that there was "no promise of remission of sins to any man out of Christ;" or, in other words, *outside of the Church!*—consequently, all without are in a *state of condemnation*, and exposed to the wrath of God and eternal damnation in hell! Now, as my friend teaches, that water *baptism* is the way by which persons enter into Christ, into his Church, etc., consequently *all the unbaptized* are in this state of condemnation and exposure to eternal punishment in hell! And as he makes *faith* and repentance conditions of remission, *equally with baptism*, and in order *precedent* to it, his doctrine damns *infants*, as well as unbelievers, as they can neither believe nor repent; and these, with him, are indispensable conditions, of salvation, as applicable to *all mankind!* [Here Mr. Sweeney said: "It is only sinners of whom I spoke, and not of infants."] Well, where is the difference? Is opt what I have slated, the logical deduction—the legitimate conclusion—from such teaching? If *all the unbaptized—all outside the Church*—are in a state of condemnation before God, must not *infants* be *included* among them?

I come now to the passage, in Acts ii. 38, containing the reply of the apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, to the penitent Jews, who enquired. what they must do, on which (passage) my worthy friend and his brethren seem to rely so much, in proving their favorite doctrine of baptism "in order to the remission of sins." It reads: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now if you will notice, *repentance* is the first and main thing the apostle enjoins upon these penitents. He does not tell them to *believe*, as they had given evidence of their *faith*, in the question they asked. As *repentance* is the principle, thing enjoined on them, and enjoined "for the remission of sins," as my friend must admit—for he will not say that it means "because of"—from the character and office we find elsewhere ascribed to repentance, and the place it occupies as a condition of pardon, *precedent* to remission, as my friend must admit, the true *meaning* of the passage would be as follows: "*Repent for the remission of sins*, and be baptized, every one of you, in

the name of Jesus Christ; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This would certainly be more *consistent* with the office and character of repentance, in its connection with remission of sins, than would be the baptismal remission of my worthy friend!

In Acts iii. 19, we have the true interpretation of this passage, (in Acts it. 38;) and I must say that I like Peter's discourse here better than the one on the day of Pentecost. I think it a better one, as he had probably improved since that first discourse. Now I wish you to notice well what he said, and you will hear nothing of the baptismal remission of my friend: "*Repent ye therefore, and be converted,* [not baptized] that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," etc. Here we see that *repentance* is the first thing again, in the order of Heaven; and that instead of telling them to "be baptized," as on the day of Pentecost, he tells them to "*be converted,*" that their "sins may be blotted out," etc. He told them to "be baptized," on the day of Pentecost, because that was his first discourse, and *baptism* was the "*seal*" of the Christian covenant; but we now hear no more about *baptism*. It is now, "*Repent, and be converted*" for the remission of sins. As my friend and his brethren affirm that the expression here, "be converted," is the same in meaning with "*be baptized*" and equivalent to it, I will give some passages, by way of illustration, where it is impossible for such a meaning to be attached to it: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye *be converted,* and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xviii. 3.) Now no one can pretend for a moment, that "*be baptized,*" is meant here! Again: "lest at any time they should *be converted,* and their *sins* should be *forgiven them.*" (Mark iv. 12.) Here again there can be no baptism. And let it be borne in mind, that these passages were spoken by our Savior, *before* Christian baptism was instituted. We find that *repentance* and *faith* are always included, the one by the other; but we find nothing of *baptism* here, (in Acts iii. 19.)

As the apostle Peter had the promise given him, by our Savior, of the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," and opened it on the day of Pentecost, as we have seen, to the Jews, we will now go to the house of Cornelius, see how he opened it to the Gentiles, and see if we can find any baptism "for remission of sins" there. We hear the apostle saying: "To him [Christ] give all the prophets witness, that through his name, *whosoever believeth* on him shall *receive remission of sins.*" Here we have not a word about *baptism*! *Faith* is all the condition of pardon here presented. The language is, "*whosoever believeth* on him shall *receive remission*"—not, "*who believes and is baptized.*" It is true, that repentance is not mentioned, because faith is the great justifying principle under the Christian dispensation; and because, as I have before shown, repentance and faith involve each other, and the one always includes the other Notice too what we are told of the *acceptance* of the Gentiles by the Lord, on this occasion: "While Peter *yet spake* these words"—just quoted above, "the Holy Ghost *fell* on all them which heard the word." Right here, at this point in his discourse, while he was saying, "*whosoever believeth* on him shall *receive remission of sins,*" the Holy Ghost was poured out on these Gentiles, showing that they were then pardoned and accepted by the Lord.? And now, notice again what follows just here: "And they of the

circumcision [the Jewish brethren] 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," etc. Now it was not until after all this, that we find *baptism*: "Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid *water* that these should not be *baptized*, which *have received the Holy Ghost* as well as we?" Hence the reception of the Holy Ghost is made the ground, the reason, of their baptism: and, I ask, does God give his Holy Spirit to the unconverted?—to the unpardoned sinner? Hence these Gentiles must have been pardoned, when they received the Holy Ghost, and *before* they were baptized—consequently baptism cannot be a "condition of remission of sins, equally with repentance and faith."

When I speak of Christian *baptism*, its nature and design, etc., and make remission of sins *precedent* to it, and not make it a condition of remission, as my worthy friend does, I do not admit that any man can be a Christian who *wilfully neglects* it. Such a man cannot have any *evidence* that he is a child of God. Persons cannot neglect any command of God wilfully and with impunity, and stand *acquitted* of guilt before God!

Let us now examine the case of the jailor at Philippi. When he enquired of Paul and Silas; "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"—they replied: "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Here again, we have not a word about baptism. *Faith* is the only *condition* they prescribe and we hear nothing of baptism until the last thing, when we are told that he and his family were baptized, without being told a word as to what it was for, or the *design* of it.

I have transposed the language of Peter, in Acts ii. 38, and shown that the true interpretation of the passage places remission of sins *after* repentance and *before baptism*. I have given some texts of Scripture, which sufficiently illustrate this new position; as "whosoever believeth on him shall receive the remission of sins," etc., where there is no mention of baptism. Again: "Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is *born* of God," but nothing of baptism, I could adduce numerous other passages, to the same import, where there is no allusion whatever to baptism, nor is it implied; but these are sufficient.

The allusion to baptism in the case of Noah, is the next place to which I come, that is relied on by my friend and his brethren, to prove their doctrine of baptismal remission; The apostle Peter, (1 Pet. iii. 20-22,) speaking of the salvation of Noah and his family from the waters of the deluge. in the ark says:

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The correct rendering of "saved by water," would be, "saved *through* water," as they were really saved by, or in, the ark, and through the water's floating it. Now the apostle does not say we are saved by the water of baptism; but that it is the "*like figure*," or antitype, of Noah's salvation, by which we are saved, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." And he is particular in saying, that it is "not the putting away of the filth of

the flesh, but the *answer* of a *good Conscience* toward God;" when we receive the remission of sins by faith in Christ, through the atoning merits of his *blood*, by which alone we can be cleansed from sin, and *not* by the *water* of baptism. As it is "by the *resurrection*" of Christ, notice what the apostle Paul says on this subject, in Rom. x. 8-10:

"The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we [apostles] preach; that if thou shalt conies with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt *believe in thine heart* that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

Here the apostle says, that it is by faith in the resurrection of Christ, that we are *saved*; which accords with what Peter says about our being "saved by the resurrection of Christ. The *water destroyed* the people, the antediluvians; but the *ark saved* Noah and his family. Now Christ is the Spiritual Ark, by which the sinner is saved. Such is the correspondence of the figure. "By one *Spirit* we are all *baptized* into one body"—into Christ, the Ark, by this Spiritual baptism. Noah was saved through the water; we are saved through this Spiritual baptism. God did not say, *we* were saved *by* water—only that *Noah* was thus saved; and we, by something else.

My worthy friend has exerted himself some, in ridiculing the *mourning-bench*, and exposing it to derision. But what, I would ask, has the mourning-bench to do with the discussion of the question before us? I can let him know, however, that I can sustain the *mourning bench*, from one end of the Bible to the other! He endeavors to make out, that it is "all moonshine;" but I can assure him, that there is no "moonshine" about it. It is a *reality*—a Bible reality—based upon *experimental religion*—a religion that will hold and last, while his *water* religion will *evaporate*; and,

"Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
Leave not a rack behind!"—[*rime Expires*].

MR. SWEENEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—The speech to which you have listened this afternoon, from Mr. Logan, was, beyond all controversy, demonstratory. It did most obviously demonstrate all I said in my opening speech, touching the relation of his influence to the importance of Christian baptism, in its proper place. I may not be a competent judge in the case, but it did look to me very much like the sole object of his speech was to make it appear, that the importance of believer baptism was *nothing*! What did he mean by such expressions as, "*mere* water baptism"—"*mere outward* ordinance"—"*his hobby* baptism"—"*a mere dipping*." What did he mean by "*mere*?" and what by "*outward*" Such language is employed, by men who understand the force of language, only when it is their object to depreciate the importance of something. Did I say any thing about a "*mere* baptism?" or a "*mere outward* ordinance?" If you were to immerse a *log*, an *infant*, or any *unbelieving, unconscious thing*, that would be "*mere* baptism"—"*mere outward* baptism," to all intents and purposes. But *Christian* baptism is "the answer of a good conscience;" and therefore has to do with the *consciences* of its subjects. Have I not been laboring to show, that only *believing penitents* can be properly baptized; that it must be done "*from the HEART*?" The gentleman would, positively, do himself great credit to make a public apology,

for the manner in which he has spoken of this Rite—the only one man is authorized to perform in the awful and sublime name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The gentleman says, we have to “file off” to ourselves, in advocating the doctrine of “baptism for the remission of sins.” Did he not see that he “filed us off” with the apostle Peter, by stating our “doctrine” in his identical language, in his Sermon on the day of Pentecost? If we do have to “file off,” comparatively few in number, we have one consolation, my brethren: It is not the first time that the advocates of truth have had to

file off” to themselves, for the truth’s sake. Many have been “filed off,” and hundreds *fired off*, for the truth. I had rather have the truth, than all humanity with me, without it. Truth is omnipotent. This topless, bottomless, boundless universe floats upon the bosom of truth —

“The eternal years of God are her’s.”

In vain, therefore, may you tempt a true man with numbers, what the world calls popularity, “or any other creature;” for none of these are able to separate him from the love of the truth, as it is revealed in the Bible.

It seems that I can hardly get the gentleman to understand that we believe, that the Gospel is addressed *only to responsible persons*. Let him challenge this position if he will. When our Lord said, “Except a *man* be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God,” I do not suppose he had *infants*, as such, in his mind at all. I do not apply that language to infants, or any irresponsible persons. And when I say, a man must enter into the Kingdom of God, to be saved or pardoned, I am not talking of infants. They need neither the salvation nor the pardon of which I speak. Jesus came to save sinners, not infants, from their sins. Innocent, unoffending infants need no Church relation, nor the pardon of the Gospel, being neither sinners, nor *lost*, as sinners are. How, then, I ask, in reason’s sacred name, does our position, in any way, involve, as Mr. L. claims, the idea of “infant damnation?” The horrid idea of *infant damnation*, seems to haunt and perplex the gentleman continually. This, though strange indeed, is not unaccountably so. I think I could account for it, had I the time and disposition to do so.

I must next notice, that the gentleman told us, he was “advocating the great doctrine of justification by faith, in opposition to my position.” Not quite so fast, Mr. Logan: “Justification by faith” is no more *against* “baptism for the remission of sins,” than it is against *repentance* or *prayer* for the remission of sins. The doctrine of “justification by faith *only*” is against, and excludes, baptism as a condition of remission, I grant, and so it does repentance, prayer, grace, the blood of atonement, and every thing but *faith*. But this is a doctrine the gentleman will, I predict, prove a little too shrewd to avow in this discussion. It strikes me, that it requires but ordinary capacity in any one, to see, that a man may have grace, faith, repentance, prayer, baptism, and every thing that the Law of the Lord requires; and yet he may be said to be saved by any *one* of them—but not one *only*—as I showed clearly in my opening speech.

The worthy gentleman denies, that faith, as a condition of pardon, is *positive*. He says, “it is a condition by *natural necessity*.” That is equivalent to saying, God *cannot* save any sinner without faith, unless He should save such an one *in his sins*. Now, when he tells me how his little *infant sinners* can be saved—since they are sinners, cannot believe, and faith is

a condition of remission "by *natural necessity*"—then I will notice this matter further—till then I shall pass it.

I must notice briefly the gentleman's reply to my first argument. And if I should pass a large portion of his *quibbling*—I cannot afford to call it any thing else—it will be simply because I do not deem it deserving even a notice. He says, "born of water" can not refer to baptism; and gives us two reasons: 1. Baptism—*Christian* baptism—"was not then instituted." 2. "Christ's Kingdom was still in the future." It is true, that the *Christian* baptism, as we now have it, was not then practiced; and it is true, also, that "Christ's Kingdom was still *future*" at the time he used the language from which my argument was drawn. But it is *not* true, "that the *birth* was something that was to take place *then* and only then, as he would have us believe. "Except a man be born" etc., implies *future* time, necessarily. The language is in what English Grammarians call, "the subjunctive form of the present tense," subjunctive mood; and *condition*, and *future* time are always implied in such language. We have similar language used by the Savior—Matt. xviii; 3. "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven." This teaching was designed to have, and did have, a *future* bearing. This *conversion* did not, and the Savior knew it would not, take place till after his resurrection from the dead. So in the language from which my argument was drawn—the Savior simply propounded a doctrine to Nicodemus, as to what should obtain when his Kingdom should become a present existence. But, by the way, the gentleman's optics are improving vastly, I discover. Yesterday, all day, and up to noon to-day, he was entirely unable to *see*, that "Christ's Kingdom was *still future*," in the time of Nicodemus! But now he sees it most vividly, and builds an objection to my argument upon the fact! This improvement of *vision* is certainly a hopeful symptom in his case. His is a disease of the *eyes*; and I am happy to report him convalescent; A thorough course of treatment, under the *Hydropathic* system may yet effect a permanent cure.

But again; he tells us that in the expression, "born of water and of the Spirit," water is *figurative*, and means spirit, Then he anticipated a difficulty, that he might be involved in, if I should call attention to the fact, that the Savior said, "born of water *and* Spirit." And consequently, if *water* simply means *Spirit*; then the language would be, "born of Spirit *and* Spirit." Which he knew would be making our Lord's language nonsensical and absurd! And how did he fix up the matter? Why, he told us, that "*kai*," rendered "*and*," in the passage, might be translated *even*, which would give the exact sense. "Born of water, *even* the Spirit," is our Savior's language, then, according to this *old version*—man's *new* version! Let us try this way of translating *kai*: "Repent, *even* be baptized every one of you" etc. Here *repent* means be *baptized*; and as Mr. L. admits that repentance goes before the remission of sins, I prove my proposition without any trouble! Again; "He that believeth, *even* is baptized shall be saved" etc. Here *believeth* means simply to be *baptized*, according to Mr. Logan's translation of *kai*. And as faith and baptism are *one*, and Mr. L. admits faith to be a condition precedent to remission of sins, so is baptism; and my proposition affirms truly. When we wish to prove our doctrine by *translating*, I think we would do well to employ the Rev. James B. Logan to work for us!

But, finally, on this passage, the gentleman has again deserted his *creed!* His creed quotes this passage to prove its doctrine on water baptism, and he is *sworn* to defend his creed; yet he will—to save his cause—in discussion, deny that the passage “has any reference to Christian baptism.” V»» an eternal quibble his reply was! What an obvious failure! No Creed, or Critic, or Commentary, worthy the name, has ever denied, that John iii. 5, refers to baptism.

The gentleman scarcely touched¹ my argument drawn from the commission. The fact is, he attempted no reply to it at all. He only made an effort to kick up a little dust, to cover his failure. He quoted, incorrectly, the commission, as recorded by Mark, and said, “the Savior makes *unbelief* the ground of condemnation.” This is granted: but did not the Savior put both *faith* and *baptism*, precedent to *salvation*? It was not to find the “ground of condemnation,” but to find the *conditions* of *salvation*, or pardon, that I went to the commission. The Savior says: He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved.*” If a man is *already* saved before he is baptized, how can the language of the Savior, here, be true? There is nothing affirmed of any other than *two* characters, in the commission, as given by Mark. *Salvation* is affirmed of the character that “*believes and is baptized;*” and *damnation* of the character “that *believes not.*” There is not a word said about that man, who believes and is *not baptized.* Not a word! No man is authorized to promise pardon to any sinner who believes, and stops there. His “*faith is dead,* being alone.”

But the gentleman seems to prefer Luke’s record of the commission! And why do you suppose he does it? Simply because there is no *baptism* mentioned in it! Then, he had better repudiate, as spurious, the records of Matt. and Mark, and then we will have a commission without baptism in it! But hold! there is no *faith* in the commission by Luke. What now? Oh! he tells us “*faith is always involved in repentance.*” Happy conception! With me, repentance presupposes faith; but not so with him. He gives repentance the “precedence.” If, then, repentance goes *before* faith, there can be repentance *without* faith. And how does “one always *involve* the other?”

But it strikes me, that the gentleman has only *quite recently* given Luke’s record of the commission the preference, over those of Matt. and Mark. When he was trying to find authority for infant baptism, he appeared to be decidedly partial to Matthew’s record. He, then, was of the opinion that, “the nations were to be *discipled,* by *baptizing* and *teaching*”—especially baptizing. But now, he prefers a record with no baptism in it at all! “Circumstances alter cases”—very materially, too, sometimes!

But, now, a few words about the *order* of faith and repentance. I wish to state my position clearly and unequivocally: *No man can repent without faith.* That is easy understood. Now, will the gentleman be so kind as to answer this plain question: Can a man repent without faith? Let him My yes, if he will, and we will have quite a “side debate” here. When Paul “testified repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ,” it was to such as *believed in God already*—Jews, and *such Greeks* as Cornelius who believed in God. When the Savior said, “Repent and believe the Gospel,” it was to such as already had faith in God. So John the Baptist, preached the “baptism of repentance,” [toward God] telling the people to believe on him that was to come. But these persons who repen-

ted "toward God," all had faith in God. "*For without faith it is impossible to please him.*" "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Repentance, therefore, without faith is sin.

The gentleman, very correctly, told us—"the very moment a man gives up all; surrenders himself entirely, and rested upon Christ, *that moment* he is pardoned." But how is this done? is the question I discover, the gentleman and his brethren do not know how to answer! They keep anxious persons at the "mourner's-bench," for days, weeks, months, years, and life-long sometimes, seeking pardon! Some obtain it "*at length*;" others never! If any one would know how they "came to Christ, gave up all, and rested on him," in ancient times, let him read the history of conversions in the acts of the apostles. Go to Jerusalem, to Samaria, along the road from Jerusalem to Gaza; then from Jerusalem to Damascus; over to the house of Cornelius; thence to Philippi, Corinth, etc., etc. But friends, you will read of no "seeking religion for weeks;" no "getting religion;" no "mourner's-bench," or "anxious seat;" but you will read of persons who, having heard and believed the gospel, being, commanded to "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins;" of others, who, having heard, "when they believed the things which Phillip spake, concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women;" of another, who heard only one sermon concerning Jesus and his gospel, who, on coming to water, said: "See here IBS water, what hinders me to be baptized?" and when he was answered, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest," said, "I believe Jesus Christ is the son of God," and forthwith he was baptized, and pursued his journey rejoicing; and so on this history goes. But alas! my friends, how this simple apostolic order is changed. Now, we have "seekers of religion;" persons coming to the "mourner's-bench, and there, *at length*, they obtain the pearl of great price!" Now, we have preachers, "called, qualified and sent," who talk sneeringly, of "mere *outward* baptism;" who class this heaven-appointed rite along with "dead *laith*," such as *devils* have! alas!

The gentleman cannot see how obedience to God in this "mere external act" of baptism can be of equal importance with repentance and faith. Well, I can not see how any thing can be of more importance than obedience to God. God loves "*obedience better than sacrifice*," whether he can see it or not.

I come now to the weakest thing in the gentleman's speech—his reply to my argument drawn from Acts ii, 38. After reading the passage, he says: "Now, you will notice, *repentance* is the first and main thing the apostle enjoins." It is true, repentance was the *first* thing the apostle enjoined, the persons being *already believers* as the gentleman admitted; but who authorized Mr. L. to say, repentance was the "*main thing*" enjoined? He said it without one particle of authority! And it was *trifling* with the passage, too! Then the gentleman admitted as much as I could ask him to admit—that *for*, there, means *in order* to. The audience saw, that in his remarks, he clearly admitted it. What then? Is baptism *in order* to remission of sins? No sir! He just *picks up* baptism, and *holds it*, while *for* expresses a relation between *repentance* and remission, and then puts down baptism *after* remission! f A laugh.] Did he not do it? That caps the climax! I have heard several expositions of this passage of Scripture,

and expositions generally, but that beats any "*exposition*" I have ever beard, of any kind!

But let it be borne in mind, that the gentleman has admitted, that *for*, in this passage, means "*in order to.*" That is undoubtedly correct, and it is all I want. It remains now for him to defend his new translation, or rather, *transposition* of this passage. And, this, no man under the broad range of the whole heavens can do. The thing cannot be done. It is an utter impossibility. What could not be disproved, if such procedure were admissible?

In the next place, and just as I anticipated, the worthy gentleman arrayed several passages of Scripture where baptism is not *expressed* as a condition of pardon, to prove, I suppose, that those that do mention it as such *art not true!* "Repent you therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Here we have remission of sins—or the same, in other words—in connection with *repentance*, and baptism not named. Does it follow, that baptism is not a condition, because here not named? Then *faith* is not a condition either, because it is not here named. But will the gentleman say, *faith* is understood as implied, because it is *elsewhere* made a condition? So is baptism, for it is elsewhere made a condition, too, as I have already shown. But will the gentleman say, *faith* is *included* in repentance and conversion? I grant it—and so is baptism included. Conversion to God includes *faith* and baptism both. Mr. L. will scarcely deny, that *conversion* to God, means *turning* to God. Then, as "no man can come to God except he *believe*," *faith* is indispensable to conversion.

Where can a man find God? He is "*in Christ*, reconciling (or *turning back*) the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." How can a man, who would be *turned to God*, get into Christ, where God is, and where we have "forgiveness of sins?" "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." So we see conversion to God includes baptism. I do not say baptism *is* conversion, but that it is *included* in it.

But the gentleman likes Peter's second discourse "better than the first!" Well, if Peter kept on "*improving*," I suppose he was *about right* when he said, "baptism doth also now *save* us." But I want it distinctly known, that the idea of Peter's "*improving*," when he was directed all the time by the spirit of God, is the gentleman's own conception—not mine!

"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy bouse." This passage, the gentleman thinks, clearly proves salvation, or pardon, without baptism; because baptism is not mentioned in immediate connection with *faith*. Then it proves pardon without *repentance*, or *prayer*, for neither of them is mentioned. But, then, I affirm that *teaching*, *faith*, *repentance*, and *baptism*, all obtained in this case, as in all others; and they all obtained, too, before the man "*rejoiced*," in the salvation of the Gospel. The reason why Paul only told him to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," in the first place, was, that it was wholly useless to tell him to repent, be baptized, or to do any thing else, *in the name of Jesus Christ*, till he *believed*. When Paul told him to believe, he immediately "spake unto him the word of the Lord," that he might believe; and in one hour the man was baptized, and was "*rejoicing*." Why? He had *heard* and *believed* in, and been baptized in the name of our blessed Lord, whose words are: "He

that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Thus all may rejoice, who believe in, love and *obey* the Savior.

But, Mr. Logan says, this jailor when he came trembling and fell down before Paul and Silas, acted very much as their "mourners" do. True enough. But did Paul and Silas act as their *preachers* do? Did Paul and Silas tell the jailor, "to pray for faith"—"to pray the Lord to speak peace to his sin sick soul"—"to pray on, and 'at length' he should find the pearl of great price?" No, verily! "They spake unto him the word of the Lord"—knowing, that "Faith comes by hearing the word of the Lord."¹ And when the man believed "the word spoken," they then told him what to do next, and he did it—"was baptized straightway"—"the same hour of the night." If Mr. L. and his brethren would act thus, there never would have been any occasion for this debate. He and I, and his brethren and mine, could all go hand in hand, and with one mind and heart, into the great work, under God, of christianizing this country. But he is engaged in *preaching down baptism*. He is sitting on the "log," and this people can, and do see it; and his brethren in the ministry, around us here, begin to *feel* it. I can see it in their countenances.

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God," etc. This declaration of the apostle, I believe as fully and sincerely as Mr. Logan, or any other man. Does this passage exclude baptism? Paul had "Grace and apostleship, *for obedience to the faith*;" and when a man rendered "obedience to the faith," then he was justified by faith, and cot till then. For Paul says in this same Roman Letter: "God be thanked, that though ye were servants of sin, ye have *obeyed from the heart that form, of doctrine* delivered unto you, *being then made free from sin*, ye became the servants of righteousness." Thus men are "justified by faith, without the deeds of the [Mosaic] law;"^o but not by faith *only*. This passage disproves nothing relevant to our proposition. If it excludes baptism, it excludes repentance also—the blood of Christ, itself, and *every thing*, but *faith*, which being *alone* is *dead*, "as the body without the spirit." So says the apostle James, at least.

But I must now follow the gentleman to the "house of Cornelius." The gentleman quoted Peter's language, as fellows: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," and exclaimed in an affected air of triumph, "No baptism here! The language is, 'Whoever *believes* shall receive remission of sins.'" And at the same time, the gentleman *knew* if he had read the next words of the apostle, he would have found this institution which he styles "*mere baptism*." Let us notice the teaching of this passage closely: "To *him* give all the prophets witness, that, through his name, whoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins." The passage teaches, not that whoever believes in him *has* remission of sins, but that the believer *shall receive* remission of sins, *through the name of the Lord*.

How? "And he commanded them to be baptized *in the name* of the Lord."

What did he command them to be baptized in the name of the Lord for? At Jerusalem he said, "be baptized *in the name* of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*." Thus believers receive remission *through his name*; for he said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And, hence, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest be baptized, in

the came of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." There is no faith *only* in this passage.

But the gentleman says: "The Holy Ghost was poured upon those in the house of Cornelius, before they were baptized, allowing that they were then pardoned and accepted with God." "The Holy Spirit fell on all them which heard the word," it is true; but who authorized Mr. Logan to say, it did so, "*showing that they were then pardoned?*" He made it. Peter was sent for, purposely, to tell these persons what to do—to tell them words whereby they might be saved. The Holy Spirit did always bear him witness; and upon this occasion, doubtless, it fell on the Gentiles, to remove the prejudices of the Jews, which so very intensely existed, against the Gentiles. Paul explains this, Heb. ii. 3, 4. Speaking of our salvation, he says: Which began to be SPOKEN [not poured out] by the Lord himself, and was confirmed unto us, by them that heard him, God also bearing witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his own will." Salvation is spoken unto men; and in the beginning, when it was necessary, God bear his servants witness "with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost." Peter spoke salvation to Cornelius, as we have seen, and the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost upon that occasion was no evidence, that he was then pardoned at all. It was satisfactory evidence to Peter, that he ought to be baptized, and thus permitted to enter into Christ, as well as the believing Jews, in whom all "have redemption, through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."

The gentleman entered an "*objection* to the doctrine of baptism for remission," which I must notice. He said, substantially, ". If this doctrine is true, then our salvation, depends upon a second person—to baptize us." He thinks we can "believe and repent, of ourselves, but must have a second person to baptize us;" and therefore he "objects to the doctrine of baptism for remission." This objection lies against *faith*, as a condition of pardon, with as much force, as against baptism: For "how can they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher If *faith* is a condition of pardon—and this the gentleman, himself, admits—then we discover much depends upon the preacher, whose duty it is to preach, as well as to baptize. And a preacher, loyal to his God, will preach the Gospel, that men may believe; and when they do believe instead of preaching down baptism he will baptize them willingly, A preacher that will not thus do will be dealt with as he deserves. So we discover the gentleman's "objection" is against the Lord's plan of saving sinners. The Lord has made more to depend upon *human-instrumentality*, than he is willing should. He ought to be reconciled.

The gentleman has got some distance ahead! I am not ready to notice 1 Peter iii. 21—yet. I will examine that passage in due time. And I will suggest, with the kindest regards for the gentleman, that he will better maintain his wide-spread reputation as a debater, by noticing my arguments as I introduce them. And again; he will do his head an honor, and his heart great credit, by leaving off the expressions, "*baptismal remission*," "water salvation" etc. Some fifteen years ago, men of about a third-rate, met our arguments in that way pretty successfully, in the estimation of such as were very much prejudiced against us; but that style of *argument* will

not be received at this late day, in this community. If I preach a "water salvation," in this discussion, this people will detect it.

If there is an individual in this large and attentive audience, who understood what the worthy gentleman was aiming to establish, while he was talking of "Noah's salvation," I must envy him his power's of perception. I could see no point he made, nor any he was aiming to make. If there is any point there, which the gentleman sees, and supposes to be against my proposition, I hope he -will *magnify* it a little!— [*Time expires.*

MR. LOGAN'S SECOND REPLY.

Gentlemen MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I arise before you, to respond in brief to the speech of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, to which you have just been listening. And as I remarked, in my first reply to him, on this proposition, that he had now got "the *laboring oar*" in his hands, I think that it has been very evident, from what you have heard—from the manner in which he has had to *labor* to sustain his cause. Like a man on board of an old, leaky, sinking ship, who has to be pumping the water out all the time, to keep it from going down; so my worthy friend has had to keep hard at work all the time, to keep up his system of baptismal remission, and to keep it from going down!

A word here on the charge he has brought against me, of *forsaking* my Creed. He says, that I tried to make "water" *figurative*, in John iii. 5, where our Savior says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God while my own Creed makes it water baptism; and that thus I have forsaken my Creed! Now, I deny the charge, that I have *forsaken* it, in that or any thing else. How does he endeavor to prove, our Confession of Faith teaches that that passage of Scripture refers to water baptism? Why, not directly, but by the *references* attached to it! Now my friend knows very well, that when he brought up these references, in the discussion of our first proposition, in order to prove, our Confession taught that water baptism was referred to, in Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12, and thus to prove *immersion* from it; I *repudiated* them; and told him, that while I accepted the *body* of the work, I did not bold myself bound to accept them; as they were of an arbitrary character, and not put in by the framers of the Confession. And so I say again. Now I ask my friend, if he adopts the *references* of the reference Bible, which he has there? [Here Mr. Sweeney replied: "If they had been put there by the *writers* of the Bible I should adopt them as of equal authority with the Bible itself."] Very well. So I refuse to adopt these references, because they were not put there, as I have said, by the writers, or framers, of the Confession. I am willing to adopt both the Creed and the Bible, as I believe them to be consistent with each other, and that the Creed contains the teaching of the Bible; but not the references, only as I choose.

As I showed, in my former speech, that the doctrine of my friend on baptism for the remission of sins, by making baptism a condition of pardon and salvation equally with repentance and faith, and by making these two precedent to it, would *damn infants*, as they cannot repent and believe; he endeavors to get out of the difficulty, by saying that infants are not saved by baptism. Now, I never affirmed that they were saved by baptism, never taught such a doctrine as that, but that they were saved by the blood

of Christ. I showed all about them, in my speeches on the second proposition—the one before this, which we have already discussed—hence it is unnecessary to go into the argument of the question again here.

My friend says, that our Savior came to save sinners, and not infants; and that infants are in a saved state", and do not need the salvation of Christ, which he came into the world to bring to mankind. Now if infants are pure and holy by nature—if they are in that pure and saved state, in which he represents them to be—why, I ask, has all Adam's race gone astray?—as we not only learn from the Bible, but have daily evidence, every where around us? Why do all come into the world *depraved*? The apostle says, that "the carnal mind is enmity against God"—that "it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be"—that "they who are in the flesh cannot please God"—that we all "go astray, speaking lies," etc. And why are mankind represented as not being good?—"not one" of them?

My friend says, that the expressions, "born again" and, "born of water and of the Spirit," in John iii. 3, 5, refer to the *future*, and had nothing to do with the time at which they were spoken. Well, it must have been a good while in the future, if from the time mentioned. He gives us a grammatical criticism on the passage; and says that the verb "be born" is in the subjunctive mood, or in the subjunctive form of the Indicative; which implies *future time*—how far in the future, he does not tell us. Now he has neglected to notice some passages, in the same connection, and on the same subject, which evidently refer to the *then* present time; as "so *is* every one that *is* born of the Spirit," and, "that which *is* born of the Spirit *is* spirit." Is there no *present time* here? I think there is; and as "Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture," we will interpret the foregoing passages by these, as to the *time*; and have it *then*, when the Savior spoke it. My friend is in a sinking ship, and will have to pump harder, and get some other mood, (as he seems to be in a "*bad mood!*") to help him out of the difficulty here!

My worthy friend asks, how the expression, in John iii. 5, can be *literal* and *figurative* at the same time?—or, I suppose he means, how can it be *part literal* and *part figurative*?—as I did not represent it as *all* literal and *all* figurative, at the same time; as that would have been absurd! Very easily. Nothing is more common than to illustrate the literal and real by the *figurative*, as in that passage. In illustration, our Savior said that "*rivers* of living *water*" should flow out of him who believed on him; and that expression, we are told, he spake of the Spirit, which those who believed on him should receive. Here we have the *literal*; the *Spirit*, and the *figurative*, the "*rivers* of living *water*." Again: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so shall the Son of Man be lifted up," etc.—the lifting up of the serpent, *figurative* of our Savior "lifted up" on the cross, *literal*; and both in the same passages. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Here we have the blowing of the wind, *figurative*; and the birth of the Spirit, as *literal* and real; and that too on the very subject of the birth in this passage, (in John iii. 5.)

According to the theory of my worthy friend, *all must be baptized!*
Neither repentance, faith or prayer, however earnest, heart-changing, fer-

vent, etc., will avail any thing, unless the person is baptized!—though we are told by the apostle Peter, that, “whosoever *believeth* on him [Christ] *shall receive* remission of sins though the jailor was told: “*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou *shalt be saved*, and thy house;” and though Paul says: “Being justified *by faith*, we *have peace* with God through our Lord Jesus Christ!”

In the commission in Mark, on which my worthy friend relies so much to prove that *faith* must *precede* baptism, and that the two must be equally conditions of pardon and salvation, why did our Savior say; “he that believeth not shall be damned,” if his theory is true? According to him if people are *not baptized* they cannot be saved; but our Savior makes *unbelief* all that condemns any one; and not the *want of being baptized*. How does it read? “He that *believeth not* shall be damned”—not, “he that is *baptized not*.” “A good rule must work both ways.”

As my worthy friend attaches such importance to water *baptism*, as a divine, positive institution, without obeying which no person can be saved, and says that *faith* is positive too, I would ask, why cannot *faith* be the indispensable condition, to the *exclusion* of water baptism; as we so often find it spoken of in the New Testament as the condition of remission, justification, etc., without a word being said in reference to baptism! We are told by the apostle, that “*faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*.” Is there no divine instrumentality then in *faith*? But what is *water baptism*? It is all *human*—a mere external ordinance, pertaining entirely to the *body*—a *ceremonial washing*, and cannot reach the heart, the conscience, and the soul, like *faith* and repentance. God can and does use various instrumentalities to reach the mind and heart of man, and convict and convert him; without being *restricted* to water baptism. We are told by the Psalmist: “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day *uttereth speech*, and night unto night *sheweth knowledge*. There is no speech nor language where *their voice* is not *heard*. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and *their words* to the end of the world.” But my friend will say, no, we must have *water baptism*; or there can be no pardon, no salvation! He must have a *water* pardon and a *water* salvation—or *none*! Again, Paul shows, that men can exercise a degree of *faith* from the works of nature. He says: “The invisible things of him [God] from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being *understood by the things that are made*, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they [the Gentiles] are without excuse.” (Rom. i. 20.) Here the apostle represents the Gentiles as being able to learn the character and will of God, from the works of nature; and were thus left without excuse. But, no, says my friend, they *must be baptized*, or they cannot be saved! Again, he says: “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, *do by nature* the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are *a law unto themselves*: which shew the work of the law *written in their hearts*, their *conscience* also *bearing witness*, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.” (Rom. ii. 14, 15) But no baptism mentioned!

As my worthy friend makes water *baptism* an indispensable condition of remission of sins, of equal importance with *repentance* and *faith*, and pieces *faith* as *first* of all the conditions of pardon and salvation, and then *repentance*, and then *baptism*, I will admit that there is a sort of *historical*

faith which men may exercise, in believing the facts and truths recorded in the Bible; but this is entirely different from an evangelical, saving faith, that faith on which the soul is pardoned and justified. Nearly all men will tell you, that they *believe* the Bible as strongly as you do—even the most wicked men will tell you so—but what good does this faith do them? Not a particle; because it is a *mete historical* faith. Is this the *faith* for which my worthy friend contends, as the first thing in his arrangement, and with which baptism is of equal importance?—and I do not see that it can be any other—then he is welcome to it; as it is of no more account in obtaining remission of sins, than his baptism, and will do to be classed along with that!

This *historical* faith comes before repentance; but a real, evangelical faith—the faith that “saves the soul”—comes *after* repentance, and is, as I have said, the *end* of a true and genuine repentance. Here I place repentance *before* faith, as did our Savior: “Repent *and believe* the gospel and as did Paul: “Testifying both to the Jews and to the Greeks, repentance toward God, *and faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”

My friend has had a good deal to say about my *transposing* Acts ii. 38: “Repent for the remission of sins, and be baptized,” etc., as he contends for baptism as a *condition* of remission here, *equally* with repentance. But, as I showed, the order of the apostle here is arbitrary; and this transposition tallies with the comission in Luke: “Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead, on the third day: and that *repentance* and *remission of sins* should be preached in his name among all nations,” etc. Here we have repentance placed next to remission of sins, as the order of the gospel; and my transposition *corresponds* with it, and must be correct.

My friend and his brethren harp a great deal on what Peter said to the penitent Jews on Pentecost, when he told them to “repent and be baptized, every one of them, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins,” etc. But we find that the apostle never afterwards associated baptism with remission of sins. In his very next discourse we have recorded, we hear him saying: “Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,” etc., but not a word about baptism! If any difference, I had rather take Peter’s second sermon, in Acts iii, than his discourse, in Acts ii; as I think he must have *improved* by that time. All my friend’s theory hangs on one crazy peg—baptism for remission of sins. Take that out, and it all falls to the ground! We have seen, that *repentance* and *faith* involve each other, and the one always includes the other; but water baptism cannot be involved with both or either. It is a mere outward, bodily act, performed by a second party, dependant on the *agency* of *man*; and cannot be made a *condition* of pardon and salvation at all, much less one of equal importance with repentance and faith! If it is so important as my friend attempts to make it, and so indispensable to remission of sins, why did not Peter tell Cornelius and his family to “repent *and be baptized* every one of them, in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins,” as he did the Jews on Pentecost? It was a strange audience, who had never heard him before; and there was the same necessity for telling them what he did the Jews, on the theory of my worthy friend. Peter did not tell Cornelius to be baptized in the name of Christ. We are merely told, that “he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” He said there, that

"whosoever *believeth* on him [Christ] *shall receive* remission of sins;" but not a single word of baptism! My friend says, that Cornelius was baptized for remission of sins; but he cannot prove it—there is not a word of it—it is mere assumption on his part, without a shadow of proof! He says that the Holy Spirit's coming on his friends, him and his family, was no evidence of their acceptance with God, as I have shown it was; but here he gives no proof either—nothing but his own assertion! But, as I have shown, there is *no evidence* that they were baptized for remission of sine—not a particle!

In the case of the jailor, (Acts xvi. 30,) my friend attempts to get in his favorite doctrine of baptism for remission of sins; but in vain, as he cannot prove it there, by any thing he can bring forward. The jailor acted like our mourners. He "came *trembling, and fell down*"—just like our mourners—"before Paul and Silas," and enquired of them: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"—and they told him, just like we tell our mourners: "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," etc. But my worthy friend happens to know a little more, and to be a little wiser, than Paul and Silas; and he would have told them to "be baptized for the remission of sins," and they would then be saved! I wish you to notice particularly what Paul and Silas told the jailor—to "*believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and he should be saved, with his house;" and that he never said a word about baptism! The divine order here, as announced by these inspired men, was, 1. *Faith*, a living, genuine, evangelical faith; and not the *historical* faith of my friend, the *mere assent* of the mind, to the facts and truths of the Bible; and, 2. *Salvation*, or pardon of sin, and acceptance with God. How much better is the faith, for which he contends, than that of which the apostle James speaks, when he says: "The *devils believe*, and tremble?"

Our Savior proclaimed the great condition of pardon and salvation, when he said: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up [on the cross]: that *whosoever believeth on him* should not perish, but *have eternal life*." Here faith in Christ is laid down by himself as the great condition of eternal life; but he says not a word about baptism! Notice how this accords with the expression, "*whosoever believeth on him* shall receive remission of sins." My worthy friend seems to be *afraid* of these passages; and yet the Bible is full of them!

God has never had but *one Church* in the world, as I have shown in the discussion of the preceding proposition; and the Lord Jesus Christ was and is the "Alpha and Omega" of that Church; and FAITH, and *not water baptism*, has always been the great principle and condition of pardon, salvation, justification, and acceptance with God, in that Church, in every age of the world. Paul shows this, in the 11th chapter of his epistle to the Hebrews. Notice the long list of the ancient worthies, which he there gives: Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Joseph, and Moses, and Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthae, David, Samuel, and a host of others, who all *believed on Christ*, and stood justified and accepted before God!

God has ever had the *same conditions* of pardon and salvation; and not *two plans*—*one* for the Jew, and *another* for the Gentile. According to the proposition, which my worthy friend undertakes to prove, none but the *baptized* can be saved. His theory cuts off all the unbaptized from pardon and salvation; and consequently consigns them to eternal condemnation

and punishment! And as he makes *immersion* in water the only baptism, all the pious and godly Pedobaptists, as Wesley, and Clarke, and others are *cut off* and lost, if his doctrine is true!

We are told that, "without faith it is impossible to please God;" but we are nowhere told, that *without baptism* it is impossible to please him. Such an exclusive theory as this, which cuts off all the unbaptized from salvation, cannot be of God, and cannot be reconciled with his word!

Baptism is a Christian *duty*, enjoined upon those who are truly converted to God, pardoned, and accepted by him, where they have not been baptized in infancy; and should not be neglected, and cannot be neglected with impunity, but is not a *saving* ordinance, as my friend endeavors to make it. We find that Saul was first converted, and then commanded by Annanias to "be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." My friend's theory here would have his sins washed away by the *water* of baptism; but we learn in the New Testament that it is the *blood* of Christ alone, and not water, that can wash away sins.

As to *faith*, we find that there are *degrees* in it; as historical faith, the faith of assent, faith of assurance, faith of reliance, evangelical faith, saving faith, etc.; but it is none but a *faith*, resulting from a true and genuine repentance, that *relies* on Christ as the only Savior and Redeemer, that can save the soul. And to believe on Christ, and *in* him, are two different things. We must have the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God, as the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, before we can be qualified for baptism.—[*Time expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The gentleman's last speech contained an argument, often used by our opposers, which, for the want of a better name, I call the *horrific* argument. Oh! So many will be lost, if, forsooth, baptism *is* for remission!! Horrible to think of it! Therefore baptism is not for remission! That is about the logic. Well, I submit, that nobody need be alarmed, only such as have not, and are determined they *will* not obey the Lord, in this institution; and such *ought* to be alarmed—the quicker, the better! And it is no bad indication, that our teaching alarms the *disobedient*. I shall contend for what God's word teaches, if its truth cuts off nine tenths, even of those who profess to be *Christians*. I am more interested to know just what the word of God teaches, and how I and my fellow-citizens can be *saved*, than about how many will be lost, in consequence of disobedience; and am not, therefore, to be daunted by all these horrific exclamations you have been hearing.

It may be owing to mental obtuseness, but for the life of me, I cannot see how any one can call the teaching of my brethren, on baptism, a "dangerous doctrine." It seems, to me at least, to be perfectly safe. We tell no one to be baptized, only such as with *all the heart* believe the Gospel. And if Mr. L. is right, in teaching justification by faith only, as we have the faith, surely we are safe—unless, forsooth, God should damn us for obeying another one of his commandments—that to be baptized. We claim to have as strong faith as our neighbors. We allow no people to believe more firmly the Gospel of the blessed Savior than we. Then, is it unsafe to urge *obedience* to the gospel? Will Mr. Logan answer affirmatively? It is the position of Mr. L., and those with him, that, to me, appears to be a

"dangerous one." They hold that one of the conditions of pardon, as found in the commission, and urged by the apostles of the Lord, and also by myself and brethren, is a "non-essential." They call it a "mere outward" affair, and preach it down, as "all human!" and as, in no way, essential to salvation. In this, they are wrong, and may suffer loss. We, as much as they, urge the importance of *faith unfeigned*, and of *repentance sincere*, and also of obedience from the heart, to the *form of doctrine* delivered us in the Gospel; which last they refuse to do, denying that it has any importance. Did you, my friends, hear Mr. L. say, "It is all human?" What in the sacred name of reason did he mean? Is Christian baptism, instituted by our Lord, who had all authority in heaven and in earth, "all human?" Surely the gentleman did not intend to say this; and I shall be happy to give him an opportunity to qualify or explain his language.

The gentleman seems to be debating any thing and every thing but our proposition. The question is not, whether God will save any one under any circumstances, who does not comply with all the conditions of the Gospel; but the question is, *Is baptism a condition?* I have not affirmed that baptism has been, in all ages of the world, a condition of pardon; but, that it "is a condition of the gospel." The gentleman quotes passages, which show very conclusively, that *faith, repentance, the blood of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, and other things, are conditions and means of pardon.* All this I believe as firmly as he. But does all this show that baptism is not a condition, also? Surely not.

Mr. L. informed us in his last, that, "baptism is a *Christian duty.*" Did he ever perform this "*Christian duty?*" He was baptized *before he was a christian, or any thing else, but a baby!* He also says, Christians cannot neglect this duty wilfully, and be saved. Why, his own doctrine will damn himself, and all his Pedobaptist brethren! He is more uncharitable than my brethren are! When Mr. Logan says, "baptism is a *Christian duty,*" he contradicts all he has been contending for, on baptism, during this entire discussion. And when he says, "no Christian can wilfully neglect this duty and be saved," he proclaims the *damnation* of himself, and of all his brethren who have never been baptized, *since they became Christians!* He says baptism is a *duty,* which no Christian can wilfully neglect, and be saved, and yet he knows he has never performed this "*Christian duty,*" as he calls it! The gentleman has no clear, fair, tangible and unequivocal position at all, on this question. This is as clear as a sunbeam to the minds of our hearers.

The gentleman spent a little of his time, telling you, that I and my brethren have no faith, but a mere "*historical faith,*" "*assent of mind,*" such as *devils,* and all wicked men have. He told us of several kinds of faith; but as I know nothing about all those numerous and different kinds of faith, we will have to get the worthy and learned gentleman to expound the whole matter to us. There are some of us, however, who read our Bibles, and know what they say about faith, as well as he. There is "*one faith,*" that "*works by love, and purifies the heart;*" and there is another faith, that is "*dead, being alone.*" This is the kind the *devils,* and doubtless, many *wicked men* have. Mr. L. can tell you whether his is *working* faith, or (he faith *only,* which is *dead* faith.

IV. My fourth argument is based upon the plain language of Scripture as follows: (Acts xxii., 16.)

"And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Such is the language of Annanias, to Saul, upon the occasion of the latter's baptism. You will all readily recollect the circumstances attending the conversion of this distinguished parson. Saul was a most furious persecutor of the church up to the time the Lord appeared, personally, to him, by the way from Jerusalem to Damascus. That there was something extraordinary in these *circumstances*, I do not suppose any one, at all read in the Bible, doubts. The Savior appeared to Paul, it seems, for the purpose of making him an apostle. But when Saul saw and heard the Lord, he was convinced of the truth of the Gospel—that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Previously, he had not believed the story of the resurrection. Now, since he has seen and heard him, and knows Jesus to be alive, he is fully convinced of the truth of the Gospel; and his faith and penitence are both manifested in his language: "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" Is he not a *penitent believer*? Who will deny? Surely none. Now, is a good time for the Lord, himself, to settle the question between Mr. L. and myself. Did the Lord tell him, "In as much as thou art a penitent believer, thou art already saved?" No. Then what did he say? "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Can Mr. L. tell us, why the Lord did not "speak peace to the soul" of this trembling and prostrate man? The Lord told him that, in the city, it should be told him what he "*must do*." The Lord sent to him Annanias, who told him to "*do*," as we have heard—"Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This is what the Lord said Saul "*must do*;" and Annanias said, it was for the washing away, or remission of his sins. It is useless to comment further upon this passage of Scripture, till I hear from my opponent. If he says any thing deserving a notice, your attention will be called to it again, in my next speech. I will, however, before submitting the argument, call my friend's attention to the fact, that, notwithstanding Paul had been a *penitent believer* for three days, yet his sins were against him, till he was *baptized*. This shows, that my proposition affirms truly, that, "baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins."

V. My fifth argument is drawn from the following passage of Scripture: "*But ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you; being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.*" Rom. vi., 17, 18.

Paul defines the Gospel, (1 Cor. 15, 1, 2) to be, the *death, burial and resurrection* of Jesus Christ, for us, according to the Scriptures. Christians are "*dead with Christ, from the rudiments of the world*"—that is, for Christ's sake they have ceased to live in sin. They are "*buried with him by baptism*," and "*are risen with him*," to "*walk in newness of life*." In the 2, 3 and 4 verses of the chapter from which I have read, the apostle says: "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." This *death, burial and resurrection* with Christ involves the *teaching, faith, repentance and baptism* of the commission, which we have already seen must precede remission. And here the apostle says to the Christians at Rome: "Ye have obeyed

from the heart, that form of doctrine delivered you—being THEN [not before] *made free from sin.*" This passage, the gentleman, of course, cannot believe. He believes that persons are "made free from sin" as soon as they believe on Christ, and before they obey any "form of doctrine;" and consequently, when they do obey the form of doctrine, they cannot be "then made free from sin"—having been made free *before*.

As I before remarked, this *death, burial and resurrection*, with Christ—this "form of doctrine"—involves the teaching, faith, repentance and baptism, of the commission. And it also involves the "birth of water and of the Spirit." Hence, following the *death, burial and resurrection*, we not only have *freedom from*—or remission of sins—but "*newness of life.*" In this "death to sin," and "burial in baptism," the *spirit* and *water* are both present. And at this point, the subject enters into Christ, or into the kingdom of God, and begins the *new life*. And hence this change is called a *birth*—because there the new life begins, and there the subject becomes "a servant of righteousness." And, by the way, it just now occurs to me, that Mr. L. called upon me to "show some analogy between baptism and a birth." If he had said, between the *work of the spirit* and baptism, and a *birth*, he would have done greater credit to himself, and justice to me. The *change*, effected by the spirit and baptism, is such, that, at that point the subject *begins a new life*. Such is a birth. There is one point of "analogy," at least. But, in turn, I must now catechise Mr. L. a little: "What analogy is there between the" influence of the spirit upon the heart *alone*, and a birth? Can he tell?

VI. "*Which some time were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" 1 Peter iii., 20, 21.

It is not my purpose to enter into any general exposition of this passage. It is unnecessary. Peter says: "Wherein [the ark] eight souls were saved by *water*. The like figure [antitype] whereunto, baptism, doth also *now save us.*" The apostle does not say, that the eight souls were saved by *water alone*; neither does he say, that baptism *alone* now saves us. Neither do I. Yet it is true, that in some sense, the "eight souls were saved by water;" and it is also true, that in some sense, "baptism doth also now save us." And this salvation, here predicated of baptism, is not a *future* salvation: "Baptism doth also NOW save us." The passage speaks of a *present* salvation. Now let us learn from the Savior himself, from this same Peter and other inspired men, *how it is*, that "baptism now saves us." The Savior says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be *saved.*" This is in the commission; and we have already learned, that the salvation of the commission is, simply, *remission of sins*. This the gentleman does not deny. Here we learn how baptism saves us: When we believe and are baptized we come to remission of sins. Now, we will hear Peter tell how baptism saves us. To the believers, at Jerusalem, who asked, "What shall we do?" he said: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins,*" etc. This is the same apostle who said afterward, in his epistle—"Baptism doth also now save us." Let us hear Annanias to Saul: "Arise and be baptized, *and wash*

away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Thus we see how it is, that, "*Baptism doth also now save us.*" Mr. L. may say, that the apostle adds—"not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." True. Who believes that baptism is a "putting away of the filth of the flesh?" No body, I suppose. But, we are told, that we are saved "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" and, therefore, Mr. L. concludes, "not by baptism." One passage, or affirmation, of Scripture is true, and therefore another is not! About in this way the gentleman has reasoned during the discussion on this proposition. Here I present him a plain passage of Scripture, saying: "*Baptism doth also now save us.*" He will refute this passage, by finding one that says we are saved by something else! If there were a passage of Scripture to be found, saying, "*faith doth also now save us,*" would not the gentleman bring it forward, as directly against my proposition? He certainly would, if true to his precedents! But could I not as consistently argue from this passage, that we are saved by baptism, *without faith*? I certainly could, if such were my style of logic. But I believe we are saved by faith—"saved by grace"—by the blood of Christ—by the name of Christ—by the Spirit of God—by repentance—and I also believe, that, "*even baptism doth also now save us.*" But we are saved by none of these things *alone*. While the worthy gentleman prefers one passage of holy writ over another, and arrays one against another, I would harmonize all. All are true.

But now I must notice one or two little matters in the gentleman's last speech. He has been through two or three places, during our debate, so very small, that he was compelled to drop his *luggage*! He has again and again been compelled to throw aside *even his creed*! But he is not disposed to "own up," especially in the presence of so many of his own brethren in the ministry! To have to do so would be truly humiliating to a man of his dimensions! So he says he "only repudiates the 'references,' and not the body of the work." He compares these "references," as he calls them, to the references in our reference Bibles, and wisely asks me if I endorse the references in my Bible. This is entirely too small a place for a man of his dimensions to escape through. Bible references only refer from one passage in the Bible to another. But his creed references refer from the doctrines propounded in the creed *to the Bible for proof*. So that, when the gentleman "repudiates these 'references,'" he leaves the doctrines of his creed *without any proof*! And he also told us that these references were inserted in his creed after it was made, and by other men than its makers. This I deny. Let the worthy gentleman produce a copy of his creed that does not contain said references, and he will settle the question. This he will hardly do. For, as I understand the matter, his creed, references and all, was taken by the same body of men from the Old School Confession of Faith. So you see, friends, the sense of the framers of the gentleman's own creed was, that "born of water" (John iii: 5) refers to water baptism. Here, I still hold, that the gentleman has *deserted his creed*.

The gentleman undertook to prove that infants are sinners! How does this relate to the question we are discussing? I suppose he thinks if he can prove that infants are sinners, I must then either *baptize them* or give up my proposition. But he makes about as bungling an out trying to prove infant sinners, as he does meeting my arguments. He asks, "if infants are in a saved state, as he [I] affirms, why have all Adam's race gone astray?" I

will try to answer this question when he answers one still back of it: *why did Adam himself go astray?* Had he a "*depraved nature?*" If so, where did he get it?

But he quoted some Scripture. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." This is certainly true—but what has it to do with the question? It proves nothing relevant to our question, nor to infant depravity. What is the "carnal mind?" Will he tell us?

"They that are in the flesh cannot please God." True, of course; but what does it prove for Mr. L. more than myself? What does "flesh" mean in the passage? Let him tell us who it is that "goes astray, *speaking lies?*" Do *babies* "go astray, *speaking lies?*" This is one of the last passages I should have quoted to prove *infant depravity!* He wants a passage to say we are *born* astray, and not that we "*go astray.*" If infants are *born totally depraved*, as Mr. L. supposes, what do they "*go astray*" from when they are old enough to do so by "*speaking lies?*" Let him tell us.

Infants are not sinners—are not lost—and therefore they have no need of remission of sins, or salvation; and therefore have no relation to my proposition—no more than angels. And the gentleman may as well assay to deduce angel damnation from my position, as the damnation of infants.

The gentleman labored a little in his last effort to make it appear that I hold that none of the heathen, who have not the gospel, can be saved without baptism. This was not exactly fair. I have said nothing in any of my speeches about this class of persons; neither does my proposition affirm anything about them. Mr. L. seems to think the heathen may be saved by what they may learn from the book of nature, and he tells us there is no *baptism* taught in nature. Very well: I may admit all this—and how does it affect my proposition? Can the gentleman show us? If any are saved by what they learn merely from nature itself, and consequently without baptism, that does not affect my proposition in the least, as it only affirms that "*baptism is a condition of the gospel* [not of nature] precedent to remission of sins." Let the gentleman show that *the gospel* proposes to save or pardon any without or before baptism, and then he will affect my proposition, and not till then; *and this he knows as well as I do.* If the untaught savage is pardoned, he is pardoned without either the *faith, repentance, or baptism* of the gospel. But when the gentleman begins to preach to us about the salvation of the untaught heathen, he starts into "*deep water;*" and I should suppose that he would do well to keep out of *deep water* yet awhile.

But now, in the conclusion of this speech, I wish to ask my audience, what are we learning upon the subject of baptism from Mr. Logan? What is his position as to the design of this institution? Can any one here tell? I think not. I think we have all alike failed, thus far, to understand the gentleman. He has told us, again and again, that "*baptism is the seal of the Christian covenant.*" But he has told us fully as often that it is a "*mere outward ordinance*"—"an outward sign of inward grace"—"a mere emblem of purification"—and what else I cannot now recollect! But has he given us any authority for any of these assertions? Not a particle. No man that can talk at all could make a greater failure than the gentleman has made thus far in the discussion of this proposition. He has *talked* all the time, and that is all that can be said of his part of the discussion. And whose wit is so utterly barren that he cannot deny, and *say* something to

covet a subject in smoke? No wonder that a man should flounder, scatter, and run at large as the gentleman does when he occupies no position, and is afraid to make a stand anywhere!

More than once, my friends, baptism is said to be "for the remission of sins and nowhere, in all the Bible, is it said to be *"for" anything else*. And when a man says it is *not* "for the remission of sins," no wonder he is puzzled to find a tenable position. When the devil said to Eve, "thou shalt *not* surely die," he succeeded as well in finding a position afterward which was defensible, as any preacher can now who says, "baptism is *not* for the remission of sins."

I would be very much pleased if Mr. L. would select some passage of scripture, which, in his judgment, sets forth the true design of baptism. Will he do this? He certainly should, in justice to himself and his brethren.— *Time expires*.

MR. LOGAN'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, has again entertained you with a speech on his favorite doctrine of baptism for remission of sins, and I arise to respond to him again. After laying down his platform, and insisting on its correctness, he asks, where is the *danger*, if we will all come to it? If it was infallibly correct, and in accordance with the teaching of the Bible, there would be no danger; but right there is the danger and the difficulty. His baptismal remission comes into direct conflict with the great Bible doctrine of *justification by faith*, and nullifies it—or rather, that nullifies his doctrine, and scatters it to pieces like "chaff before the wind!" According to his platform, the sinner must have his sins washed away by the *water* of baptism, which comes in conflict with the Bible doctrine, that the *blood* of Christ washes away our sins! He is in a bad dilemma here; for he must take one to the exclusion of the other, as he cannot take both together—unless he makes *one figurative* and the other *literal* or real; and he will not admit this mixing up of the two, as we learned from him in reference to John iii: 5, in his comment on my interpretation of that.

My worthy friend endeavors to confound our doctrine with the Roman Catholic, and says that they accept our tradition, and that their principle is the same as ours! But assertions of this kind are easier made than proven. It is an easy way to excite prejudice against a denomination, to cry out "Romanism" against them!—and it is a favorite argument with my friend and his brethren to affirm that the sects," as they call as—at least the Pedobaptist denominations—are descended from the Roman Catholic church, and full of their errors and "abominations!" Now, as far as the Roman Catholics are right, and agree with the Bible, I am willing to agree with them. But, if I am not greatly mistaken, the *baptismal remission* and *baptismal regeneration* of my friend smell much stronger of "Romanism" than any of our doctrines, as they are the very teaching of the Roman Catholic church; and that church and the church of my worthy friend are the only two churches in all Christendom, of which I know anything, that do hold them, as they are rejected by every other denomination. So "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

It is as dangerous to believe too much as it is to believe too little, and bad to adulterate truth with error. But who is to be the judge in these

matters? Who is to decide what we are to believe and what we are not to believe? Each one is to act in this matter for himself, as he has to give an account to God. If we receive what the Bible teaches, we cannot err; and I have as much right to decide on what is its teaching as any one else has. The truth is, that this subject is to be decided by the BIBLE, fairly and correctly interpreted. That is to be the umpire between my friend and myself in the discussion of this proposition. What I mean by believing too much or too little is, that if we believe more than the Bible teaches, we believe *too much*; if less, we do not believe *enough*; and if we hold error, we are adulterating the truth with it! Well, we will let the audience, with the Bible for their guide, decide the matter. I am willing to stand or to fall by that divine volume.

My worthy friend said again, that the gospel was never preached until the day of Pentecost, and that the apostle Peter preached the *first* gospel sermon then that was ever preached! I am aware that this is a favorite affirmation of him and his brethren. But we will find that he is entirely mistaken on that point. Paul says: "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, *preached before the gospel unto Abraham*, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed."—(Gal. iii: 8.) Here we learn that the gospel was preached to Abraham ages and hundreds of years before the day of Pentecost, when Peter preached! And yet my friend says it was not preached until then! We also learn another very important fact here, and that is, that the heathen (the Gentiles) were to be justified "*through faith*," and not by water baptism! Again, Paul, speaking of the Jews in the wilderness, says: "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."—(Heb. iv: 2.) Here we learn again, that the gospel was preached ages and generations before Peter preached it on Pentecost; and yet my worthy friend says it was not preached until then! But this is not all yet. Our Savior preached the gospel himself long before that Pentecost: "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and *preaching the gospel of the kingdom*," etc.—(Matt. iv: 23.)

Again in Matt. ix. 35: "The poor have the *gospel preached* to them." And again, when our Savior sent out his disciples the first time, before that day of Pentecost: "And they departed, and went through the towns, *preaching the gospel*," etc. (Luke ix. 6.) I could give more, "line upon line," but these are enough; and completely falsify the assertion of my friend, that the gospel was not preached, until by Peter, on the day of Pentecost.

As my worthy friend is so strenuous in his views about the design of water baptism, and will have none pardoned, saved, and get to heaven, without it, I would like to know how he will manage about the great multitude that John saw, in Revelation. He says: "And after this I beheld, and, lo, a *great multitude*, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands, etc. (Rev. vii. 9.) And we are told again here: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have *washed* their robes, and made them white *in the blood of the Lamb*." (Rev. vii. 14.) Here we have the whole host of the redeemed, of all ages and nations—of all past time—and as they had *all* "washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,"

does it not prove, that there has been the *same* Church and the *same* Christ over it, in all time, from before Abraham down? And this accords precisely with what is elsewhere said of the Savior, as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." With these Scriptures before us, will my friend tell us, how any one has ever gotten to heaven, or can get there, *without the blood* of Christ? And were there not *children* too in this "great multitude?"—as it embraced all the saved and redeemed? This my friend cannot deny, without shutting them entirely out of heaven! And if *there* they must have been saved and purified *by the blood* of Christ; as all these, we find, were thus saved and made pure. And this will accord with what we find said of the *natural corruption* and *depravity* of the human race; as "all have gone astray." My friend tells us, that *adults* must be "born again;" but is silent on the subject of *infants* having to be made pure and holy, before they can enter heaven! Now they have a corrupt, unholy nature, which they have inherited from Adam; and consequently they must be cleansed and made holy, which has to be done by the blood of Christ, and in no other way.

My worthy friend says, that the *baptism* of a *Christian* is not enjoined in the New Testament, and is not Christian baptism—that baptism is not an ordinance in the Church of Christ, and belonging to that, but is placed *outside* of the Church, as the Laver was outside of the Tabernacle, which was *typical* of the Christian Church—and that none but a *believing penitent* is a proper subject of baptism. But has he *shown* that the baptism of a Christian is not commanded in the New Testament? Has he given us any *proof* on the point? Not a particle! We have nothing but his mere assertion in proof! Is not a *believing penitent*—a person who has really and sincerely *repented* of his sins, and *believed* on Christ—pardoned and accepted with God; and therefore a Christian? Most certainly. So it is, therefore, a *Christian* at last, that my friend has for his subject of baptism! If, as we find: "whosoever *believes* shall receive remission of *s i n s* a n d : "being *justified* by *faith* we have peace with God;" besides numerous other texts I could adduce, to the same import—if these passages teach the truth, the *believer* stands *pardoned* and *justified* before God. Whenever a man believes with all his heart on Jesus Christ, and rests on God with all his heart, putting his trust and confidence in him, he is forgiven, without having to "be baptized for the remission of sins;" and is then a fit subject for baptism, and not before. As to baptism not being an ordinance of the Church, and not belonging to it; if it is the door into the Church or Kingdom of Christ, as my friend must admit—the way by which persons have to enter it—it must be an ordinance of the Church, belonging to that, and cannot be separated from it.

My worthy friend adduces the case of Paul, as a strong proof text in favor of his favorite theory of baptism for remission of sins. Because Ananias said to him: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord;" he argues that Paul's sins were washed away in baptism! Now as the *blood* of Christ is the *only thing* according to the Scriptures that can take away sins, there could have been no literal, real washing away of Paul's sins—do remission of them — when he was baptized. He was pardoned before, when he repented of his sins and believed on Christ; and this washing away of sins when he was baptized, was merely *figurative*, and not real—unless my friend has sins washed away, by the

water of baptism! In illustration, we find the *beast* spoken of by Daniel, and by John, in Revelation, to be *figurative*, and not real and literal. Again, the bread and wine in the sacrament is called the "body" and the "blood" of Christ, which we know to be *figurative*, and not literal and real. The reality is *spiritual*—these, figurative and emblematical. Thus were Paul's sins washed away in baptism figuratively, and not really and literally. This my worthy friend will find to be the teaching of our creeds, and that they nowhere teach or give any countenance to his doctrine of baptismal remission or baptismal regeneration—that sins are really and literally washed away in the water of baptism. But my friend says that Paul's sins were both figuratively and literally washed away when he was baptized, and that this is the meaning of the expression. But he is inconsistent in that, and cannot sustain his position. How anything can be literal and figurative at the same time will be difficult to show. If one, it cannot be the other. We can with as much consistency prove anything to be white and black at the same time! How sins can be washed away by the *blood* of Christ and by the *water* of baptism, at the same time, it will be impossible to prove! The washing away of Paul's sins, then, when he was baptized, was entirely figurative and emblematical. Hence we find water baptism, as I have before shown, to be emblematical of the influences of the Holy Ghost upon the mind and heart of the sinner in cleansing him from sin by the application of the *blood* of Christ, which alone can take away sin. We hear John the Baptist saying, in reference to the Savior, "behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world and the great multitude that "no man could number," which John the apostle saw in Revelation, "washed their robes and made them white in the BLOOD of the LAMB."

My friend, as you have heard, has made very light of the *mourner's-bench*; and endeavored to cast all the ridicule and reproach upon it, that be could! He makes it out a mere human institution, the invention of men, and all that; and says that persons becoming happy at it, and rejoicing, and professing religion, is no evidence of remission of sins! Now, I would ask, is it not just as much evidence of pardon, as his water baptism? Our Savior said: "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted;" and we find these mourners *comforted* at the mourning-bench, in the pardon of their sins and accepted with God. No person can know that he is pardoned until he does so by experience. There must be such a thing as experimental religion; without which all the baptism in the world is not worth a cent! There must be the work of grace upon the soul—the operation of the spirit upon the heart, changing it from a state of nature to one of grace; and the spirit "bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God"

My friend is mistaken in what he says about my affirming that baptism was merely *human*. I did not mean, that it was from man, and not from God. I meant, that it was physical, a mere external, bodily ordinance, and that it could not, therefore, be ranked along with *repentance faith*, as equally a condition of remission of sine with these; which pertain entirely to the mind and soul; and are the divine instrumentalities in changing these; while water baptism, being an external ordinance, "an outward sign of the inward grace," and pertaining to the *washing* of the *body*, cannot reach the soul as these do. I admit baptism to be *divine*, as to its *origin*, as it was instituted and commanded by the Lord; and I have said that it cannot be neglected with impunity, where it is in the power of a proper

subject to submit to it; as no other *command* of the Lord can. But it is an ordinance in the Lord's house, and belonging to that, and not to the *world*, as my friend endeavors to make out—for those who have received the pardon of their sins, and been accepted of God; and who have been enabled to rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, and had the love of God shed abroad in their hearts, by the Holy Ghost, which has been given to them.

There is a great difference in believing *in* Christ and on him. To believe *in* him is to repose our trust and confidence in him for pardon and salvation, and embraces the faith that saves the soul; but to believe *on* him is merely to give the assent of the mind to the facts and truths of the Bible concerning him. The most wicked persons believe *on* him, while they have no faith and confidence, and repose no trust and reliance, *in* him. Hence no sinner can be a fit subject for baptism—not until he believes *in* him, and has an experimental knowledge of the pardon of his sins.

As to the *commission*, on which my worthy friend lays so much stress, that recorded in Matthew has no baptism as a condition of the remission of sins. It merely says, "go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," etc., but not a word about baptism as a *condition* of pardon! So he can get no "aid or comfort" here. In Mark it reads, "go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Here my friend *thinks* that he finds baptism as a condition of remission; but as the expression "shall be saved" refers to the future, he cannot affirm how far distant it is. Some think it means that he shall be saved here, in this world; others, again, that it refers to salvation in heaven. But there is a closing clause here in the commission which contains a salvo against my friend's baptismal remission: "he that *believeth not* shall be damned!"—*not* "he that is *baptized not* shall be damned." This shows that a person will not be damned for the *want* of water baptism, but for *not believing*; as *faith* is the great condition of pardon and salvation, and not water baptism, in Luke it reads, "that repentance and remission of sins shall be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Here we have no baptism as a condition of remission—only repentance, which includes *faith*, as they always involve each other, and where either one is not expressed, it is understood. So my friend can get neither "aid nor comfort" here!

As to my transposing the passage in Acts ii: 38, so as to make it read, "repent for the remission of sins, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," I will say that I am fully justified in it by other passages in the New Testament. We have but the one solitary instance in all that book of the expression, "be baptized for the remission of sins;" and shall this one be suffered to outweigh all the numerous passages on repentance and faith as conditions of remission, without the mention of baptism?—and must they all be made to yield to this one isolated passage? Let us go to Acts iii: 19, and we hear the same apostle saying, "repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the tiroes of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," but not a word of baptism for remission; and to Acts x: 43, and we hear him saying, "to him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth on him shall have re-

mission of sins," but not a word of baptism for remission! Here, in these passages, we have repentance and faith as conditions of remission of sins, but not a word about baptism being one! Peter preached according to the commission in Luke; and hence we find repentance and faith as the great conditions of pardon, salvation and acceptance with God, to the exclusion of water baptism. "He that believeth not is condemned already," says the Savior—not "he that is baptized not." And, except Paul's case, we have no case where baptism is made a condition of pardon; but we find *faith*, and *repentance* always required.

The great question is, what has God *commanded* us to *do*, in order to be saved? He has commanded men to *repent*: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now *commands* all men, every where, *to repent*." He has commanded men to believe: "And this is his *commandment*, That we should *believe* on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he has given us commandment." Now, if my worthy friend can *prove* that God requires baptism for remission of sins, all will be right.

He says that the expression: "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body," alludes to water baptism. Now, I would ask, if it is *by* the Spirit that the baptism takes place, how can it be *water* baptism? It must be the baptism of the Spirit, as it is by a Spiritual baptism that we get into Christ. Water baptism is, as I have shown, only figurative, and *emblematical* of the baptism of the spirit. It is to that what the *picture* of a person is to the *person himself*. The picture is the *emblem* of the person, who is the *reality*. So the expression, in Romans vi 4: "Therefore we are *buried* with him [Christ] by baptism into death," etc., does not allude to water baptism, but to the baptism of the spirit. As I have previously shown, it must be all *literal*, or all *Spiritual* one; and cannot be both, or part one and part the other; and I have shown that it is spiritual.

We find this spiritual baptism all through the New Testament, as the important, the indispensable, and internal baptism, without which there can be no real, genuine, heartfelt religion; while the water baptism is merely outward and emblematical. This spiritual baptism must be *experimental* with every man, who becomes a Christian.

My friend may talk about my *exclamations*, in the close of the argument; but I think that his are about equal to mine! And he has cause to utter exclamations, when we consider the critical conation of his cause, and see it tottering, as he endeavors to uphold and sustain it!—when we see where his position on this question places so many of the great, and good, and pious of the world! It cuts off all the holy men of past ages, who have not been *immersed* for the remission of sins! They thought they had obeyed God; but according to the theory of my worthy friend, they were all mistaken, and must be lost! Such a theory is too inconsistent with reason, justice and the word of God, to be from him; and hence I am compelled to deny and reject it! The person who becomes a Christian must *feel* that he is pardoned—must *feel* the love of God in him, before he can have the evidence of pardon.—[*Time expires*.]

MR. SWEENEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — Our discussion on this proposition is drawing to a close; and as the arguments I have already introduced to sustain my affirmation remain unanswered, and almost

untouched, in my judgment, I shall in my present speech, after reviewing the ground we have gone over, introduce only one other argument. And even one more argument is more than is called for—so I think at least, and I believe those who have heard us thorough will concur with me.

In Mr. L's. last speech he says, "according to my teaching the sinner must have his sins all washed away by the *water* of baptism; and this comes in conflict with the Bible doctrine, that the blood of Christ washes away our sine!" I am not responsible for anything I have said about our sins being washed away in baptism, as I have only used that language *in my quotation*, from Ananias to Saul. But does my teaching, that "baptism is a condition precedent to remission of sins" come "in conflict with the Bible doctrine, that our sins are washed away by the blood of Christ?" Do I teach that baptism *alone*—without the blood of Christ—washes away our sins? Or does the Bible teach that the blood of Christ *alone*—without any faith, repentance or baptism—washes away our sins? Neither of these questions can, in truth, be answered affirmatively. Then where is the "conflict" between what I teach on baptism, and the Bible doctrine concerning the blood of Christ? There is none. But again: If because the blood of Christ cleanses from all sins, baptism cannot be a condition of pardon; then *faith* cannot be a condition, for the same reason. It is true, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin, *when we believe and obey the Gospel*. And it may be said, that we are cleansed by the *blood of Christ*; that our hearts are purified by *faith*; and that we have purified our souls *in obeying the truth*; and all this may be said without involving any contradiction. And I am satisfied our audience sees it thus, and all Mr. Logan's quibbles are in vain.

The gentleman had a good deal to say about the great "multitude" John saw, who had "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb but what bearing had all that on our proposition? Did he prove, that any of that "multitude" had, under the Gospel dispensation, "washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb," *without obedience to the Gospel?*" *Sow* do persons "wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb?" "Seeing ye have purified your souls, *in obeying the truth*," is the answer. Jesus shed his blood in his death; in the Gospel, his death is preached to the world; men *believe*, repent and are "baptized into his death," where they "have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Then they are "justified by his blood"—"justified by faith"—"saved by baptism"—and then they "have purified their souls in obeying the truth."

The gentleman told us again in his last speech, that "baptism is an ordinance in the house of God"—said I had "denied that it was, but offered no proof." And, pray, why should I "offer proof?" If the gentleman has any purpose to subserve by showing that baptism "is an ordinance in the house of God," then I submit, that he is the man that should "offer proof." Mr. L. is a great man to call for the "proof!" He well nigh goes into ecstasy when I am in the affirmative! He vociferously calls for proof. And if, perchance, to subserve his purpose, he affirms something and I deny it, he calls for the proof! He is all the time calling for proof—simply to keep up appearances. I have said, that baptism is between the sinner and the house of God; and that consequently, he must be "born of water and of the "Spirit," in order to get into the house, and this I have

already proved to the satisfaction of every unbiased mind in our audience.

My worthy friend said, with a deal of emphasis, that I had "produced but one solitary passage of Scripture, saying 'be baptized for the remission of sins.'" "*But one solitary passage!*" Then, according to Mr. L., my proposition hangs upon "but one solitary passage of Scripture." Is that "one solitary passage" of the word of God *true*, Mr. Logan? Please answer at your earliest convenience.

I must again notice what the gentleman has had to say against my argument drawn from our Savior's language, John iii. 5. He says the language here—"born of water and of the Spirit"—is figurative—or at least, that, "water" there is figurative, and means Spirit, while Spirit is literal; and he says a good many other things, all to elude baptism, so obviously referred to by the Savior, and made a condition of salvation, as I shown. I must call attention to that Scripture again. The Savior first says, simply, that, "except a man be born-again he cannot see the Kingdom of God." This is evidently a doctrine propounded in a figure. Nicodemus enquires, "*How can a man be born when he is old?*" And, now observe, in answer to the question, "*how can a man be born again?*" the Savior says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Thus *he explains how* a man must be born again; and this *explanation* Mr. L. calls a figure; and he attempts to explain it to us! He explains the Lord's explanation! And such an explanation as he gives! He quotes all the figurative language he can think of in the New Testament, to prove that the Lord's *explanation* of a figure is figurative! Here, as I have already shown, he takes ground against all scholars of any note, against all creeds, not even excepting his own! And why all this torturing, twisting, and turning? Simply to evade a truth; one, too, that still stands, and will when this world is on fire.

If we go to the preaching of the apostles, who had the keys of this kingdom, which was to be entered only by a birth of water and of the Spirit, we will see this birth illustrated in thousands of instances. They preached the Gospel by the Holy Spirit. When, therefore, the minds of the people were enlightened, and they were "pierced in the heart," it was an effect produced by the Spirit: and when they were baptized, which was done without delay, they were born of water and of the Spirit, and were consequently in the Kingdom of God. And to such an apostle could write—"ye are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been *baptized into Christ*, have put on Christ." And another: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. * * * And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." When a man hears "the word which by the Gospel is preached," believes and obeys it from the heart, he has passed through thy change that is called a birth, because there begins a *new life*—a godly life—a christian life. He has been born of incorruptible seed, by the word of God, in the Gospel. He has been born of the Spirit, because the word of God is the sword of the Spirit; the word of God is preached by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. He is born of *water* and of the Spirit, because the Gospel says, "He that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved.*"

I must notice once more the gentleman's manner of disproving my proposition. He gives but little attention to the proofs I introduce. Sometimes he merely says, that the baptism of the passage I may introduce, is "holy Ghost baptism." In fact, he seems disposed to make every passage in the New Testament, which refers to baptism at all, refer to "Holy Ghost baptism," unless it is one he has used to try to prove sprinkling, or infant baptism. And, as we have seen more than once, he makes a number of passages refer to "Holy Ghost baptism," which his creed uses to prove its doctrine of *water baptism*. And this he does, though he is *sworn* to defend the creed! He is loyal to his government only when it suits him to be loyal!

I discover that the worthy gentleman, in deciding whether passages, containing baptism, refer to *water*, or "*Holy Ghost baptism*," works by a rule; and as he has not given the audience his rule, I will do so for him, as I have eliminated it from his speeches. It is about as follows: All passages that he supposes can be used in support of his theory of *water baptism*, refer to water baptism; while all passages that cannot, and especially those that can be used against it, refer to "*Holy Ghost baptism*." And notwithstanding he has it rule so admirably handy, still he gets into trouble occasionally! This he does by using certain passages in support of his theory of *infant baptism*, which is *water baptism*, that give him trouble when he comes to the *design*: 'Such as Acts ii. 38, etc. Then he has to resort to *translation* and *transposition*; or make it all "figurative." After he has thus twisted and turned about awhile, he rolls in what, *he says*, he supposes to be counter-proofs. Let us notice them. "Therefore, being justified by *faith* we have peace with God." But this hicks one word, to make it opposed to my proposition. It lacks the *exclusive* word *only*. If the *only* were there, then it would evidently exclude baptism from justification, and refute my proposition; and it would as evidently exclude repentance, the Grace of God, prayer, and, in one word, *every thing but faith*. As the passage is, it excludes nothing; and every thing else, named elsewhere as a condition of justification, must be understood.

"*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." But, to suit Mr. L., this passage should read: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved, *without doing any thing else*." This would exclude baptism, repentance, prayer and every thing but faith. But as it reads, it excludes nothing. And we learn, that *within one hour*, the man so commanded, repented and was baptized; which shows, that as soon as the man *believed*, so that he could, he was commanded to take the other necessary steps to salvation. The gentleman has not found a single passage of God's word, predicating pardon of, or promising it to, *faith only*. Not one—nor can it be done. It would make the Bible flatly contradict itself, and consequently condemn itself! Just here I wish to call Mr. L.'s attention to a passage of Scripture, that he seems to have over-looked entirely, in all his readings: "Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God —John xii. 42-43. What will the gentleman say to this? Will he say, that these "chief rulers" who "did not confess" our Lord, "lest they should be put out of the synagogue," who "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God,"

were *justified, pardoned!* Surely not! Will he say, they did not believe? If he does, then will he be so kind as to tell us, whether the Holy Spirit *was deceived, or told a falsehood?* It says they "*believed* on him." Here the gentleman will have another occasion to resort to the miserable farce, that there are several kinds of faith. But the Bible knows but "*one faith,*" and that is alive, and that is a *working* faith. There is a faith which is "*dead, being alone.*" And this latter is the faith these "*chief rulers*" had; and that Mr. L. contends for—*faith only!* The faith the "*chief rulers*" had—*faith only*—is the faith these alien gentlemen around us have! They believe on our Lord, but, "*loving the praise of men more than the praise of God,*" do not "*confess him,*" and obey him. And Mr. Logan unkindly insinuates, that this is the faith of myself and brethren. I hope he does it ignorantly. Whether he does or not, we can forgive him, and pray for him. Our faith leads us to confess and obey our Lord, and urge it upon others.

The gentleman also quoted, "*The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin,*" and kindred passages. This I suppose he did to disprove my proposition. But this proof falls short. If he could find a passage, saying, "*The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin, without requiring anything upon our part*" then he could claim that baptism was excluded. But *faith, repentance, prayer* etc, would be excluded, too! And as he does not desire to have these latter conditions excluded from pardon, he must find this: "*The blood of Christ cleanses us from all sin, without baptism.*"

Again, the gentleman tries to show that baptism cannot be a condition of pardon, because we are said to be saved "*by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" But, are we saved "*by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*" *alone?* If so, then the Universalists are right, after all! The fact is, the gentleman argues a good deal like the Universalists all the time, on this question; especially when he gets on his "*horrific* argument." They, however, can exceed him in the "*horrific.*"

The argument, irrefragable with some, has come at last! "*We know experimentally, that we were pardoned before, and without baptism.*" I wish it distinctly understood, that I, and my brethren, appreciate good "*feelings,*" as highly as any people. But they, of themselves, are no reliable evidence of the remission of sins. Remission of sins is something that takes place, not in us, but in the mind of God—and is something done *for* us. And if we ever know it, the knowledge of the fact must come from God. Will Mr. Logan tell us *how* God revealed to him the fact that he was forgiven? Did God speak to him, and tell him, in so many words his sins were forgiven? Or did he just "*feel like*" he was forgiven?

I wish to put one straightforward question to the gentleman, which I hope he will answer as fairly as it is plain: Has he any better evidence that his sins are forgiven, or that he is saved, than "*he that believeth and is baptized?*" "*He that believeth and is baptized*" has the word of the Lord, "*shall be saved.*" If Mr. L. has better evidence of pardon than this, I want to know what it is? When any man, who has faith, comes to the point where the Lord says, "*shall be saved,*" he has as good evidence of his pardon as he wants. The trouble is, with such as desire stronger evidence than this, they have not faith in the word of the Lord. They want "*to ascend into heaven to bring Christ down.*" If these "*seekers of*

religion" could hear a voice from heaven, saying, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," I am inclined to think they would obey it gladly, and go on their way rejoicing; but they are afraid to trust this voice *in the Bible!* They are taught to *distrust the word of God.* The "mere word," with them, is insufficient. They want a new, special and personal revelation from God; and if I understand them correctly, many of them profess to have it. In this they are upon a par with Romanists, Spiritualists, Mormons, Mohammedans, etc., etc.! The Lord has made known to me the terms upon which I may be forgiven; I have complied with those terms; and now, can I doubt that I am forgiven? Not till I can doubt the word of God. This I can not do; for the "Lord is not slack concerning his promises." Heaven and earth shall pass away, but the word of the Lord endureth forever.

VII. My seventh argument is drawn from the following passages of the word of God:

"Therefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new."—2 Cor. v. 17.

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Gal. iii. 26, 27.

In these passages the apostle teaches as follows:

1. "If any man be *in Christ*, he is a new creature;" 2. The Galatians were *in Christ*, and 3. They got into Christ by being baptized into him. Then, if a sinner would be a "new creature"—have "old things" pass away, and all things to "become new," he must come "into Christ;" but to come into Christ, he must be baptized; and therefore baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins.

Just here I wish the gentleman to give us an answer—an unequivocal answer—to two plain questions: 1. Can a man enter into Christ without baptism? 2. Can a man obtain the remission of sins *without Christ*? The first question he may answer affirmatively, that a man *can* "enter into Christ without baptism." If he does, I hope he will tell us *how*? If he can show how any man ever did, or ever can, enter into Christ without baptism, he will certainly give me light by doing so; and he will also refute my last argument—one upon which I very confidently rely as being unanswerable.—[*Time expires.*

MR. LOGAN'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — As this is the last speech on this proposition, in which I am permitted to introduce any new matter, I must avail myself of the privilege of bringing up such proofs and illustrations as I have not yet noticed, as well as to attend to the arguments of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, to which you have been listening. It is important to remember the proposition, which he, has undertaken to affirm; that "Baptism is a condition of the Gospel, precedent to the remission of sins, equally important with repentance and faith." Now, while I admit repentance and faith to be conditions of the remission of sins, enjoined upon every person who has come to the years of maturity, and as indispensably necessary to pardon and salvation; I deny that baptism is a condition of remission at all, or has any thing to do with it. It is only a "sign and seal" of remission of sins—a *duty* enjoined upon Chris-

tians, with which it is necessary for them to comply, as with any other Christian duty. We never find the *want* of water baptism in the New Testament, as a ground of condemnation. *Unbelief* is all the ground of condemnation, that we find. While our Savior says: "He that *believeth* on [in] him is not condemned"—not in a state of condemnation—he says: "but he that *believeth not* is *condemned already*, because he *hath not believed* in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John iii. 18.) But according to the theory of my friend, he ought to have said: "but he that is *baptized not* is condemned," etc. But we have not a word of baptism in all of it! Will my worthy friend show us where the *want* of water baptism is made a ground of condemnation to a person? In John iii. 26, we hear our Savior saying: "He that believeth on [in] the Son *hath everlasting life*: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Here he says that he who believes in him, not only *has* life, but has *everlasting* life, without saying a word about baptism; or making that a condition; and this expression, in reference to believing in Christ, occurs no less than four times in this chapter. In saying, that "he who believes is not condemned," and "he who believes not is condemned already," our Savior *makes faith* the great principle of justification, and the *want* of that the only ground of condemnation; while *water baptism* does not come in at all, as either a *condition* of justification or pardon; or the *want* of it as a ground of condemnation. In John vi. 28, our Savior says: "This is the work of God, that *ye believe* on [in] him whom he hath sent;" but no baptism. And again, in John vi. 35: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that *believeth* on [in] me shall never thirst;" but no baptism again!—"And is baptized?"—not a word of it! Again, John vi. 47: "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life"; but no baptism here! According to this, *faith* introduces the believer in Christ into everlasting life; but *baptism* has nothing to do in the matter. In 1. John v. 1, 4, we read: "Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;" and: "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even our faith*." Now here we have the new birth mentioned twice, but nothing of baptism, or being "born of water." We are told, in this same connection, that "this is the *love* of God, that we *keep* his *commandments*;" and as baptism is a *command* of God, we cannot neglect it wilfully and with impunity, as we cannot any command he has given; and if we have the love of God in us, we will not do so. But the apostle says, that it is our *faith*, and *not water baptism*, that overcomes the world.

Again, the apostle Peter says: "Being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." [1. Pet. i. 23.] Here the apostle says, that we are "born again" "by the word of God," that is by *faith* in that word; while he says not a word about being born of water in baptism!

And again, John says: "He that *believeth* on [in] the Son of God *hath the witness in himself*," etc. (1 John v. 10, 12.) Here he says that the *believer* in Christ "has the witness in himself" that he is a child of God; which shows that it is *by faith* he obtains the evidence, and not by *water baptism*, which has nothing to do in the matter. I will admit that every baptized person—every one *immersed*, according to the baptism for which my friend contends—is "born of water," whether he is a believer or not.

But it is another, and a different thing to be "born of the Spirit." Such a person (born of the spirit) has the *witness* of the word of God in himself—in his own heart—bearing witness with his spirit, that he is born of God—without the aid of any water baptism.

Listen too to the language of the old patriarch Job: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." How did he know it? Not because he had been *baptized*; but by his *faith* in him. My worthy friend tries to make out that we are *deceived*, in our views on the subject of conversion, and on the evidence of pardon; but I have as much right to say that he and his brethren are *deceived* in their views on these things, as they have to say that we are. The Bible, as I have before said, is to be the judge in this matter; and I am not afraid to abide by its decision, Mr. A. Campbell, who occupies such a high position in the Church of my friend, as to be placed at the head of it, and whose opinions have such weight attached to them by his party, has no faith in the *unconverted* baptized. He believes, according to his writings on the subject, that persons must be *converted* before they are fit subjects for baptism; and I agree with him there. If a person is not truly converted to God, all the baptism in the world will do him no good! And as, on the one hand, baptism will do the *unconverted* baptized no good; on the other hand, the converted *unbaptized* will not be lost for the want of baptism.

My friend and his brethren may sneer as much as they please at us, because we say that the truly converted person "has the witness in himself;" but what of it? Their sneering at it does not prove that we are wrong, or that it is not so. What is it that they contend for, but a mere *water salvation*, which can do the sinner no good, and will avail him nothing towards the pardon of his sins, and acceptance with God! Of the two I had much rather have that system or theory, which requires him to have the witness in himself; as that is in accordance with the word of God, and will hold out, while this *water salvation* will *fail*, and leave him *without* the mercy of God, the pardon of his sins, and acceptance with him! See the thousands of their members, that become convinced of this; renounce a system so false and full of danger; and seek the pardoning mercy of God at the mourner's bench, and find that peace to their souls for which they had sought in vain, in this water salvation!

But I must notice the case of Cornelius again, as my worthy friend contends that he did not receive the remission of sins until he was baptized. Now what was his *character*? We are told that he was a *devout* man, and one that *feared* God with all his house, which *gave much alms* to the people, and *prayed to God always*." Where can you find a more acceptable character to God than this? And as proof that he was accepted by him, we hear the angel saying to him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are *come up* as a memorial before God." God heard his prayers; and according to the theory of my friend, he does not hear the prayers of a *sinner*—of none but the *converted*. Hence as Cornelius and his family were accepted by the Lord, they must have been converted, and stood pardoned and justified before him; and were in his Kingdom as soon as the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them. It was not until *after* that we hear Peter asking: "Can any man forbid water, that these should *not be baptized*, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"—and are told that, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." We are

told by Paul, that the "kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." It does not consist of such *material, physical* things as these, of which character is *water baptism*; but in the *spiritual* things of "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," of which character are *repentance* and *faith*, the two conditions of pardon and reception into the kingdom of God.

I would like to know of my worthy friend, if he can tell us *where* and *when* the *apostles* were pardoned? As he makes baptism an *indispensable condition* of remission of sins, "equally with repentance and faith," he will have to show us that they were *baptized*, before he can prove that they had the remission of their sins, on his theory. And if he cannot prove that they were *baptized*, how will he manage to get along with his system of baptismal remission? If water baptism was not necessary to their pardon and salvation, how can it be so necessary in the Christian dispensation, which they introduced? Were they not to be *examples* to be followed by the disciples of Christ? Here is certainly a *block*, and a huge one too, in my friend's way! Is he able to remove it? I think not. I would ask, where are all the pious and holy Jews, who lived before the Christian dispensation?— what has become of them? — as they were *not baptized*; and, according to the theory of my friend, could not have been saved! Paul has told us: "These all *died in faith*, not having received the *promises*, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and *embraced them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on earth." (Heb. xi. 13.) Hence they were all saved in heaven, notwithstanding the theory of my worthy friend, which would shut them all out! They had *faith*, and consequently *repentance* too, as these mutually involve and include each other. Paul shows that this long list of ancient worthies, (in Heb. xi. chap.) all "*died in faith*" and were saved; and that too without the water baptism of my friend! While *repentance* and *faith* were necessary, in order to their salvation, baptism was not, and had no agency in it. These have been *indispensable*, in all ages of the world, but baptism not; as these pertained to the *mind* or *soul*, and were necessary to the purification of the heart from sin, and to *Spiritual* life; but water baptism being a mere *external* rite, and *physical* act, cannot reach the conscience and heart, and affect and purify these; and therefore can have no agency in purifying the heart, and cleansing the conscience from sin!

But I must pay some attention to the remarks of my worthy friend, on our Confession of Faith. He has endeavored to show, that the Scriptural *references* were put in it, *when* it was *made*, and are therefore a *part* of it; and that therefore I am as much bound to adopt them as the body of the work itself! By the same parity of reasoning I can prove, that he is bound to adopt the *references* in his Bible; but no, he will take only such of them as suit him; and will not agree to receive them as a *part* of the Bible! Now I deny that the *references* were put in the Confession, *when* it was *made*. My friend ought to know, that where there are *references* attached to a Creed, the Creed is *first made*, and the *references* put in *afterwards*. But I have shown that, as these *references* were merely arbitrary, and not put in by the *framers* of the Confession, I am not bound to receive them; and I only adopt them as my friend does the *references* in his Bible—as far as they agree with my views of the truth of God. I am willing to adopt the *doctrine* of the Confession, but not the *references*.

I wish here to call particular attention to one clear and incontrovertible case of a man going to heaven without water baptism—one that my friend cannot possibly deny. It is that of the *thief on the cross*. He exhibited true faith in Christ, and repentance for his sins, as manifested by the request he made of the Savior: "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou *be with me in paradise*." (Luke xxiii. 42, 43.) Baptism in this case was impossible; and yet he was saved in heaven, by our Savior. Now if baptism may be dispensed with in one case, and the person get to heaven, it may be in all; and if *one* can get to heaven without it, of course *all* can.

I must here notice the remarks of my worthy friend, on last night, on "obeying from the heart the form of doctrine." Paul says in Romans vi. 17, 18: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Now my friend contends that this "form of doctrine" is *water baptism*, which he says is taught by the apostle, in this chapter, Rom. vi. 4: "Therefore we are buried with him [Christ] by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." This he says is *water baptism*, which must represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, and which can only be (according to him,) by *immersion*.—that the "obeying of the form of doctrine" was the immersion (baptism) of these persons!—that as they are said to have "obeyed from the heart" the "form of doctrine," there is a *heart-work* in baptism!—and that as it is said that they were "*then made free from sin*," when they were *immersed* (baptized) they then received the remission of their sins! Such is his reasoning, if I understand it. Now there is no proof whatever, that the apostle meant their being *baptized*, when they "obeyed the form of doctrine"—not a particle. It is all mere supposition and assumption on the part of my friend. The apostle speaks of *doctrine*, of *teaching*; and it was the "form" or *mould* of that to which he refers. It is a *figure* drawn from *moulding*—from the moulding of a vessel, or any thing that is moulded; and the correct rendering from the original (Greek) is: "ye have obeyed from the heart that *mould* of doctrine into which ye were *cast*." The true explanation of the passage is, that when they *believed* on the Lord Jesus Christ with all the heart, and truly and really *repented* of their sins, in compliance with the "doctrine" or teaching of the apostle, they "obeyed from the heart" the mould of doctrine into which they were thus cast; and were "*then made free from sin*," by receiving the remission of their sins. So we see that there is *no baptism* about the matter at all. But my friend makes his water baptism emblematical of the *burial and resurrection* of our Savior; and to be valid baptism, with him, it must represent these by *immersion*. I suppose, then, to carry out his figure, as our Savior was *three days* in the tomb, before he arose from the dead, he must keep his subject *three days* in the water, after he buries him, before he raises him out of it!! If he were to do this—and he ought to do it to be *consistent*—I expect that he would soon find himself out of subjects to baptize! They would object to such a *drowning* business as this! This too would be more in accordance with the *meaning* of the Greek word *baptizo*, for which he contended so strenuously, when on the first proposition; as

we found it to mean to *sink*, *drown*, etc., in the quotations he made from the Greek writers'

As my friend is down upon creeds so, and has had so much to say about our Confession of Faith, I will let him know, that he and his brethren have a Creed, at the head of which stands Mr. A. Campbell! His book called the *Christian System*, is just as much a Creed as any other Creed in the land; as it *contains* the *doctrines* to which they all subscribe. It is true, that they have not adopted it as a Creed, as Creeds are generally adopted by ecclesiastical bodies; but that is nothing, so it contains the doctrines they acknowledge, and to which they subscribe. It does not always require people to have an ecclesiastically acknowledged and published Creed, to have one. And they can have an *unwritten*, as well as a written Creed. The *system* of doctrines that they hold, is their Creed, whatever that may be—whether as embraced in Mr. Campbell's *Christian System*; or as preached from the pulpit.

I must notice Mr. Campbell himself, who, with all his concession, and apparent liberality of sentiment towards Pedobaptists, when it comes to the *nature* and *design* of baptism, is as strenuous and exclusive as my worthy friend! He says, there is no *evidence*, at least no Scriptural evidence, that pious Pedobaptists will be saved! Such a sweeping assertion as this, cuts off at least *four-fifths* of all these pious persons!—as he regards only those who have been *immersed* as having been Scripturally baptized. Mr. Campbell affirms that there are *no promises* to them, unless they are *immersed*! It matters not how deep and thorough has been their *repentance*, how strong and heart-changing may have been their *faith*—how sincere and acceptable may have been their *prayers*—how much *experimental religion* they may have—and how much they love the brethren, and have the witness of the Spirit—if they have not been *immersed* it will avail them nothing, in the great affair of salvation from their sins here, and eternal salvation in heaven! Now such a system of religion as this is too *inconsistent* with the word of God, and to repugnant to reason, common sense and Christian feeling, to have God's approbation, and to merit reception by mankind!

I have spoken of the necessity and importance of *prayer*, as a condition of pardon, as exemplified in the case of Cornelius—in the case of Paul, who was commanded to "call on the name of the Lord" when he was told to be baptized—by Paul himself, who says, "I will that men *pray* every where lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting"—and in other places in the Bible; and my friend says, that *prayer* is always *understood*! I would ask him most respectfully, is *prayer* a part of the commission? Is it in the discussion in which we are engaged? Why then does he want to bring in *prayer*? Obviously because he is afraid to leave it out!

But we have the case of Noah again to attend to. I contended, as you may remember, that the expression, "saved *by* water," was correctly rendered "saved *through* water." But as my friend is disposed to controvert it, I will say, that the Greek particle here is *dia*, "through." They were saved *from*, *out of*, etc., the waters of the deluge, and landed safely on dry land, in the postdiluvian world. Now notice what follows: "The like figure, [antitype,] even baptism, doth also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." What saves us? Peter says, the *antitype*.

Did he mean that it *really* saves us from sin? As it is a *figure*, (antitype) of course the language is figurative, and the *salvation* is *figurative*. The *real* salvation is *by faith* in the Lord Jesus Christ, and *not by baptism*—"by the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ." The "word of faith" is: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and *believe* in thy heart that God hath *raised him* from the dead, thou shalt be *saved*." And Paul says, in reference to the case of Noah: "By FAITH Noah, being warned of God, of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the *saving* of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became the heir of the *righteousness* which is *by faith*." This settles the question. But my friend says that baptism is not a *figure*. How will he get along here? According to his theory, the "like *figure*" here is baptism—"the like figure *even baptism*"—and yet he says it is not a figure! A figure, and yet not a figure!

My worthy friend has again referred to the subject of *infant baptism*, the proposition which we have already discussed, and with which we have nothing now to do; but as he has brought up the subject here, I must notice what he has said. His position on the design of baptism, leaves no room for them to get to heaven! If *none* but those who believe, repent and be baptized, can be saved—which is his theory—then infants cannot be saved; as they are incapable of attending to all these! He affirms that they are saved *by the resurrection* of Christ; but gives no Scriptural proof. I affirm that they are saved *by the blood* of Christ; and I gave as proof, that John saw *all* the multitude of the redeemed in heaven, so numerous that "no man could number" them; who had *all* "washed their robes, and made them white *in the blood* of the Lamb;" and *infants* must have been of this number, if saved at all; and consequently were *washed* and *made white*, or pure, *by the blood* of Christ. We learn from the Scriptures, that all mankind are by nature totally depraved—that they are "born in sin and conceived in iniquity"—that children "go astray as soon as they are born"—that "the heart" of man "is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked"—that "the carnal mind is enmity against God"—consequently, as my friend admits that all must "be born again," infants must be made pure from this natural corruption, by the blood of Christ, before they can be fit for heaven. Nothing is more plainly taught in the Bible, than the doctrine of the *moral depravity* of mankind; and the necessity of their being purified from this, by the *blood* of Christ, in order to be made fit for heaven!

In speaking of infants here, I mean infants *dying in infancy*; and when I affirm that they must be made pure and holy by the blood of Christ, I mean the application of his blood to them by the Spirit of God. Hence infants that die in infancy are regenerated and saved by the Spirit of Christ. And this is the leaching of our Confession of Faith, which is as follows:

"All infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth; so also are others who have never had the exercise of reason: and who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word."—*Confes. of Faith*, Chap. ii. Sect. iii. p 67.

The corruption of infants is in their bodies, in their flesh, and in their souls. My friend contends, that all mankind are *free agents*, as concerns religion—free to act or not act—to accept, or reject, the salvation of Christ, as they please; and condemns the doctrine of the natural corrup-

tion, and total hereditary depravity of mankind, as not in the Bible. Now if this is true, then infants can be kept pure and holy, and free from all sin and corruption! But what are the facts? We find them becoming sinners, and going astray, almost from the time they are born! Hence his doctrine here is *condemned*, both by the *Bible* and the *experience* of mankind!

A few words again, in reference to the passage in John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." My friend, as you recollect, contended that this had reference entirely to the *future*. If so, then Nicodemus, the very man to whom our Savior addressed the language, could not get into the kingdom! He said to him: "Verily, verily, I *say unto thee*, except a man be born," etc., showing that he had reference to that very time and not to the future.

So we see, from the arguments I have brought forward, in opposition to the theory of my friend, and the Scriptures with which I have sustained them—as well as from his own speeches—that he has completely failed to sustain his position on this question; and that his order of faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, is at variance with the word of God, and consequently will not do!—[Time *expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S CLOSING SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — The gentleman seems to have discovered that nothing is so important as a good beginning, except it is, perhaps, a good *ending*. What of his proof he does not introduce in the beginning, he reserves till the ending. The several passages of Scripture he read in his last speech I have already sufficiently noticed in noticing others of the same import; but I will notice them separately now before proceeding to recapitulate the argument.

"He that *believeth* on him is not condemned." This language was used before the gospel, in fact, began to be preached—before the Lord gave to his apostles the commission, containing the terms of remission for all nations. But had it been used since, there is nothing in it to disprove my proposition. It does not say, "he that believeth on him, *although he refuse to repent, pray or obey*, is not condemned." Thus much, at least, it should say to disprove my proposition, and the gentleman himself ought to know it. Did I not show, in a previous speech, that certain persons, when the Lord was here, believed on him, but fearing the Pharisees, and loving the praise of men, would not confess him? Would he say those persons were pardoned? Will he—dare he do it yet? Certainly not. Then why quote this passage? He had as well quote, "For we are saved by hope," and claim it as against my proposition!

The gentleman next quoted, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," etc. But this passage does not say, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, *actually in possession, without repentance, confession, prayer, obedience, or any thing else*"—does it? The worthy gentleman himself does not believe that faith is the *only* condition of "everlasting life." He will not avow it—nor will any body else, I presume to say. Then why should he quote this passage in this discussion?

"This is the work of God, that ye *believe* on him whom he hath sent," comes next. But to "believe on him whom he hath sent" is not the *only* "work of God"—is it? Not quite.

"Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is born of God"—and "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even our faith.*" But we are not "born of God" by *faith only*. The gentleman himself will not say we ate. Neither do we "overcome the world" by *faith only*. *Faith only is dead*. I would as soon attempt to overcome the State of Illinois on a dead horse, as to overcome the world by *faith only*. In the same letter from which the gentleman quoted this passage, the apostle says, "And every one that *loveth* is born of God." Why did not Mr. L. quote this, and claim that a man is "born of God" by *love only*? for certainly it would have had as much bearing against my proposition as what he did quote. But the fact is, none of these passages have any bearing against any thing taught elsewhere in the word of God, as I think I have already and sufficiently shown.

I was a little surprised to hear the gentleman quote from Peter: "*BeiDg born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." But I expect the gentleman expects to "surprise" me frequently. Though surprised a little, still I am ready for what may come. He tells us *how* we are "born again by the word of God"—"that is, by *faith* in the word." So the gentleman *explains* to us *how* we are born again, notwithstanding "the wind bloweth where it listeth!" When I attempted an explanation of this birth, he accused me of *presumption*, and quoted, "the wind bloweth where it listeth," etc., to show that the whole matter was inexplicable! But now *he* explains the matter with all apparent ease! He is certainly "convalescent!" His explanation is right, so far as it goes—that we are born by the word of God—"that is, by *faith* in that word." I move to insert after *faith*, "and obedience," and then I think the "bill should pass." The apostle says, in the verse next preceding, and in the same sentence from which he quoted, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in *obeying the truth*," etc., which shows they were not born by *faith only*. This passage is clearly against the gentleman.

"He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." The gentleman does not believe this passage of holy writ more firmly than I do. But the passage does not teach that whoever believes on the Son of God, though he may refuse to confess him, to repent of his sin6, to pray, to do any thing else than simply believe, has the witness in himself that his sins are forgiven. Will Mr. L. say that it does? It is all useless for the worthy gentleman to *swell* about the "witness of the spirit," as I believe as firmly in that as he or any other consistent believer in the Bible. I believe we "receive the promise of the spirit through *faith* and I also believe that the Lord gives his "spirit to them that *obey* him." But this is not the question we are debating to-day.

"The old patriarch Job" said: "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and he said this, "not because he had been baptized, but by his *faith* in him and therefore the gentleman concludes that we who live under the gospel can obtain pardon without obeying God! Is the gentleman determined to do nothing that Job never did? Surely the gentleman was not *serious*."

The gentleman calls on me to show where "the want of baptism is made the ground of condemnation." Well, this may appear smart to him and to his friends, but to me it appears exceedingly ridiculous. Does he not admit that to be baptized is a command of God? He certainly does. And is it no "ground of condemnation" for a man to willfully refuse to obey any com-

mand of God? But he says in the commission it is only said, "He that believeth not shall be damned and not, "he that is baptized not shall be damned." What does he mean by this? Do we not know that he that believeth not is condemned, though he were baptized a thousand times? Why, then, should the Savior make use of such nonsense as to say of unbelievers, "he that is baptized not shall be damned," since all unbelievers, baptized or unbaptized, are alike condemned? This is certainly about as *snail* a quibble as I ever heard. But, then, something must be said to fill up the time.

What the gentleman said about the thousands of my brethren who "become convinced," "renounce," etc., is neither *argument* nor *truth*. That's all.

Certainly the gentleman asked, how were the "apostles, and all the pious Jews saved, who lived before Christian baptism," only to have something to say; for he knows that I contend that the law of pardon under the new covenant went forth from Jerusalem, upon Pentecost, for the *first time*. I have-not said that baptism *always was* a condition precedent to the remission of sins.

The worthy gentleman is certainly entitled to great credit for his *courtesy*. He has only *occasionally* said "water salvation," "baptismal regeneration," etc., whereas others have met us with such argument at every point. I believe the gentleman has only resorted to this a few times, when utterly confused and out of anything else to say; and I therefore ask that he be excused, and set down as quite an urbane disputant.

Two or three times Mr. L. has informed us, that "baptism is a mere outward, physical act, and cannot reach the conscience or heart." What trifling! Have we not seen that it is called "the answer of a *good conscience* toward God?" and have we not seen, also, that it is called obedience "from, the heart?" Still, Mr. L. says, "it has nothing to do with the *conscience* or *heart!*" Well, it may be that *his* baptism, if he ever was baptized, was merely "outward and physical" while others have been properly baptized—"from the heart."

"The thief on the cross" comes next. Mr. L. is sure the "thief was saved, and taken to heaven, without baptism." And what of it! Had Jesus risen from the dead, and ascended on high? Had the law of pardon, under the Gospel dispensation, gone forth yet? No. Is a testament in force till after the *death* of the testator? Surely not. Then what if the "thief on the cross" was saved without baptism? What does it prove? Does it prove that men now, since the death of the testator, since the Gospel proclamation has gone forth to all nations, may be pardoned without complying with its terms? Surely not. Can we who live in the light of the glorious Gospel, who know its terms, who are on our feet and have opportunity to obey the Lord, be saved just as the "thief" was, who lived and died before the "Royal proclamation" was made, and who never believed that Jesus was the Son of God, till he was nailed to the cross of death, if he did at all? So we see this turns out not to be a clear case of pardon under the Gospel dispensation at all. Like other matters the gentleman has brought into this discussion, it is wholly irrelevant, having transpired before the Gospel proclamation was made, as even the gentleman himself has several times full; admitted.

I shall now briefly recapitulate the argument, and, so far as the affirmant is concerned, close the discussion of the present proposition.

I. My first argument was drawn from our Savior's language to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water and the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The kingdom of God, I showed, to be a state of justification or pardon. In it, all are justified, pardoned. Out of it, all are condemned, (*who art sinners*) in their sins. All, therefore, are in their sins till they "enter into the kingdom of God," where "we have redemption through his [Christ's] blood, even the forgiveness of sins." But to enter the kingdom of God, a man must be born of water and of the spirit—which I have shown involves baptism. Therefore, to enter into the kingdom of God, a man must be baptized; and, therefore, "baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins." To make this stronger, if possible, I quoted from Paul, that we are *baptized into Christ*—or, in other words, into the kingdom of God—"in *whom*, we have redemption, through his blood, *the forgiveness of sins*." Of course, it could not be expected that the worthy gentleman would say nothing in reply. But he has not, nor can he of any other living man, set aside this argument. He first said, this language was used prior to the setting up of the kingdom of God, and the institution of Christian baptism. This I was ready to admit; and showed that the language had a future bearing. Then the gentleman, taking leave of all authorities, not even excepting his own creed, which he is sworn to defend, denied that the passage has any reference to baptism whatever; and the last I saw of him he was disappearing is the "*figurative!*" I let him go. And, after being carried about for some time by the "wind," that "bloweth where it listeth," be returned, and *explained* the *inexplicable* birth, to be, simply the result of "faith in the word of God." *Faith and obedience*, if he please, and we are agreed.

II. My second argument was drawn from the commission our Savior gave to his apostles, authorizing them to preach salvation, or remission of sins among all nations. I examined all the records of the commission, and showed that it contained, 1 Teaching, 2 Faith, 3 Repentance, 4 Baptism, and 5 Salvation, or remission of sins. Mark has it: "He that believes and is baptized *shall be* [not has been.] saved." Here baptism is made a condition, going before salvation, if language can do that thing. It is made a condition in the same words that faith is. I had as soon deny that faith is made a condition of salvation, in the commission, as to deny that baptism is. Let it be remembered that what Mark calls *salvation*, and places after baptism, Luke calls "remission of sins." The conclusion is irresistible: That "baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins."

To this argument the worthy gentleman has said nothing worthy the name of reply. The fact is, there is no reply to it. It is an unanswerable argument.

III. My third argument was intimately connected with the foregoing, and was drawn from Peter's discourse at Jerusalem, upon the memorable Pentecost. The preaching of the Holy apostles guided as they were by the Holy Spirit, is the best commentary upon the commission known to me. In Peter's discourse, at Jerusalem, he first *taught* the people; secondly, they *believed*; thirdly he commanded them to "*Repent* and [fourthly] be *baptized*, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*"—Acts ii. 38. Here we have precisely as in the commission, 1, Teaching, 2, Faith,

3, Repentance, 4, Baptism, and 5, remission of sins. Mr. L. admitted, as you will remember, all I claimed, as to the meaning of *for* in this passage. He admitted that *for* means *in order to*. And when he did it, he gave up the whole controversy on the design of baptism! With his admission, as to the meaning of *for*, the passage reads thus: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *in order to* the remission of sins." What more do I want than this passage! But the gentleman takes the liberty of so *transposing* the passage as to make it worthless to me in the discussion. He reads it: "Repent *for* the remission of sins, and be baptized," etc. Thus he admits all I claim as to the meaning of *for*, and risks his case upon his transposition of the passage. Now, the gentleman must do what he has not yet done, and what no man under the heavens can do—defend his unauthorized, unwarranted and unreasonable transposition and perversion of God's word—else my proposition is established beyond all dispute, by this single passage of Scripture.

IV. My fourth argument was based upon the language of Ananias to Saul: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord"—Acts xxii. 16. The Lord appeared, personally, to Saul, who was yet a fierce opponent of his religion, and a furious persecutor of his followers. Seeing and hearing the Lord himself, Saul was convinced of his error, and became a believer; and immediately exclaimed; "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord answered: "Arise, go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou *must do*." Let it be remembered, that Saul was now a *penitent believer*. The Lord told this penitent believer, not that his sins were already forgiven, as my friend would have done, but to "arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou *must do*." There is something, then, that a penitent believer "*must do*." What is it? "Arise," said the man sent of the Lord, "and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Positively, this is so plain, that comment cannot make it plainer! But let us notice how beautifully it harmonizes with the commission, and with Peter's preaching at Jerusalem, already noticed. 1. Paul was *taught*, 2, He *believed*, 3, He *repented*, 4, He was *baptized*, and 5, He came to the *remission of sins*. Though he was a penitent believer before, he did not come to the remission of sins till he was baptized, as the expression, "wash away thy sins," clearly shows.

It was not expected that the worthy gentleman would find nothing to say to this argument; but what has he said, that merits the name reply? Just nothing at all.

V. My fifth argument was drawn from the following language of the apostle Paul:

"God be thanked, that though ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you: being *then* made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. vi. 17, 18. The death, burial and resurrection of Christ are the three fundamental facts of the Gospel. This, I presume, the gentleman himself believes. And we find that, in the former part of the chapter from which I have read, the apostle represents the brethren at Rome as being *dead to sin*, *buried with Christ by baptism*, and *risen with him*, to walk in newness of life. So, also, he teaches in the second and third chapters of his letter to the Colossians. The "form of doctrine," then, is a *death* [to sin] a

burial, (in baptism) and a *resurrection*, to walk in newness of life. When, therefore, a man has *died* to sin, (that is, ceased to *live in sin*) been *buried* with Christ in *baptism.*, and *risen*, to walk in newness of life, he has "obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine" of which the apostle speaks; and he is "*then* [not before] made free from sin." This makes "baptism a condition precedent to the remission of sins" The gentleman's reply was all *mistification*—nothing else.

VI. My sixth argument was drawn from the expression: "Baptism doth also now *save* us." I showed *how* "baptism now saves us," by referring to the Commission, and other passages of scripture: "He that believes and is baptized shall be *saved*;" "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*;" "Arise, and be baptized, *and wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord." These passages explain *how* it is, that "baptism doth also now *save* us," to the satisfaction of all who wish to know—others cannot be satisfied.

The gentleman had a deal to *say*, about this passage of God's word; but if any one here got any light, from all he said, such an one was more fortunate than myself. The argument stands untouched, and will stand.

VII. My seventh argument was drawn from the following passages of Holy Writ:

"Therefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature: old things are passed away: behold all things are become new"—ii Cor. v. 17.

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Gal. iii 26, 27.

If a sinner would be a new creature, have old things pass away and all things become new, he must come into Christ; but to come into Christ he must be baptized; therefore baptism is a condition precedent to remission of sins.

My friends, you have patiently heard my arguments on this question. I thank you for it. I might have added still others to the list—though probably to no advantage, as it is not well to have too much before us at once. I feel perfectly satisfied that enough has been said. Weigh the arguments fairly and candidly, as intelligent beings, who must give an account to God, and I am satisfied as to your conclusion.

You have also given Mr. Logan a fair hearing. You have heard all he could say against what he supposes to be a "most monstrous doctrine." He has said all he could say against it—as much as any man could say—and a good deal more than any man can say, in justice to his own conscience, who understands the position.

I must request you, respected friends, while the worthy gentleman makes his closing speech, to keep before your minds *my position*. "Baptism is a condition [simply a condition, not *the only* condition] of the *Gospel* [not of the *Law*, before the Gospel; nor of *nature*, to the heathen, but simply a condition of the *Gospel*] precedent to the remission of sins, equally important with repentance and faith." All conditions of pardon are "equally important," because all derive their importance from the authority that made them such, and all are made such by the authority of the Lord of heaven and earth.

In all candor I can say before the Lord who is to judge me at the last day, I never felt more profoundly penetrated with the truth of my affirmation than I do now, after hearing all the gentleman has had to say against

him just what we tell sinners to do: "*Repent of this thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee.*" We have here *repentance prayer and remission*; but not a word of *baptism*! How can this ordinance, then, occupy the position, in reference to remission of sins; which my friend gives it, when the apostle Peter himself prescribed these terms of pardon to this penitent?

We now come to the case of Noah again, as my worthy friend contends that water baptism is the "like figure" there. Peter says, that Noah and his family were saved in the ark "by water;" and I have shown that the Greek particle, *dia*, here translated "by," is correctly rendered "through." They were saved "through" or from water, by its floating the ark; and this is what *water* had to do with their salvation. Now, as I have shown, Christ himself is the *antitype* of the ark; and it is in and by him we are saved. Baptism is not a *figure*, and is nowhere represented as such in the Bible; but Christ is the real figure, or antitype of the ark, by which we are saved. And, as I have shown already, it is by the baptism of the Holy Ghost that we are introduced into Christ. In the "putting away of the filth of the flesh," we have the outward, or water baptism; and the apostle says, it is not by that we are saved; but by the "answer of a good conscience towards God," When we have our consciences purged from sin, by *faith*, through the washing of the *blood* of Christ. We find that the baptism of the Holy Ghost always *precedes* the baptism of water, as at the house of Cornelius.

As I have spoken of the *witness* of the Spirit, and shown the necessity of that, in conversion and the remission of sins, and that it must precede water baptism; my worthy friend says that witness is the Bible! Now the apostle does not say, it is the witness of the Bible, but the witness of the *Spirit*: "*the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.*" As we must have that witness *in us*, if it is the Bible, then we must have the *Bible in us*, or we cannot have that witness! Now the Bible is not called the Spirit, any where in it. Paul makes an important distinction between them. He says, that the word of God is "*the sword of the Spirit* —consequently it cannot be that Spirit itself. My friend says that it argues as much against *my* faith as his. Then we are even, and I am as well off as he is! But because I differ with him, as to the *design* and nature of water baptism and witness of the Spirit, he says that I am nearly a Quaker! Now he knows, that I do not reject water baptism altogether, as they do. I only wish to give it its proper place, where it really belongs and not to attach an undue importance to it, and exalt it into a Savior; and he may call me a Quaker for it, if he chooses! The Quakers are generally an excellent, pious, holy people; and contend for the baptism and witness of the Holy Ghost; and it is no stigma to belong to them; or for it to be said that we are like them.

My friend has given us Dr. Clarke's testimony in favor of his theory, on the witness of the Holy Spirit; but he does not let us know, that Dr. Clarke differs widely from him, in other parts of his writings; and agrees with *us*, in our theory of conversion! I hold that he is bound to take the *whole* of the *testimony* of a *witness*; and not garble such extracts from him, as happen to suit his particular purpose! The person must have the witness of the Spirit in the heart: and, I ask, if the witness is the Bible, how did God get to the heart when there was no Bible?—*before* there was any? And

we are told that he has never left himself without witness: "Nevertheless he left not himself *without witness*," etc. (Acts xiv. 17.) But I have quoted several passages, in proof of the theory of conversion, for which I am contending, to which my friend has paid no attention; as it is wise policy in him to pass over what he cannot meet and answer!

My friend says, that the Pedobaptists have no *intelligent* evidence that their sins are pardoned. Now, if they have the evidence required in the Bible, it is sufficient, whether, in his judgment, it is intelligent or not; and we have shown what that evidence is, and the importance of possessing it. Because we do not believe in *water* baptism for the remission of sins, and do not submit to *immersion* for that purpose, he says, that we do not *obey* the gospel! Now, I say so too, as to what he *calls* obeying the gospel. But I contend, that every one who sincerely and really *repents* of his sins, and *believes* in Christ, in so doing *obeys the gospel*, and is accepted of God through Christ.

My friend says that he and his brethren require *faith* and *repentance*, etc., as we do; and he thinks it will do no harm to go a little further, and require *baptism* for remission of sins too. But while I admit the necessity of *repentance*, *faith*, etc. I deny that baptism is required as a condition of remission. I reject it as such, because a *bodily*, *physical* act, requiring the *agency of human beings*; and contend that the conditions God requires are such as pertain to the *heart* and *soul* of man, and not such as have to be applied to the *body*!

But my worthy friend says, where baptism cannot be performed—where insurmountable obstacles are in the way, which render it impossible to submit to it at the time—the *intention* will be accepted by the Lord; and 'the *will* will be taken for the *deed*.' This is a "concession" I hardly expected from one so strenuous on the subject as he is; and I cannot see how he can reconcile it with his theory of the *indispensable* necessity of it, which he teaches, in order to remission of sins! Now, I ask, why cannot "the *will* be taken for the *deed*," as to *faith* too, as well as baptism? Why should that be overlooked by him?

The case of the thief on the cross again. My friend contends that this was before the beginning of the Christian dispensation, on Pentecost, when baptism for remission of sins was first preached and enjoined on the people; that, therefore, this case will not do as an *example* of remission of sins, under that dispensation; and that, as presented by me, it is a *mis-application* of Scripture—a *general* application of a *special* case. Now, I ask, was not the thief pardoned by Christ himself?—and was he not pardoned, on the conditions of his *faith* in Christ, and *repentance*, or penitence, *without baptism*? His language: "Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom," showed his *faith*; and his language to the other thief, for railing on our Savior: "Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?—and we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man [Christ] hath done nothing amiss,"⁵ showed his *repentance*.

And here I am reminded, that my friend affirmed, the *gospel* was never *preached* until Pentecost. Now I thought that I had sufficiently refuted this, by showing, from the New Testament, that "the Scripture foreseeing that God would *justify* the heathen *through faith*, PREACHED *before the GOSPEL* unto Abraham;" and that Paul says it was "*preached*" to the

it. He has said a good deal, but my position remains unshaken. And is this all that can be said? Are our opponents through? Then will our position stand forever! Mists may be thrown around it, and its lustre may be obscured for a day, but like the Sun marching behind a pavilion of cloud, it will beam forth at last all the brighter for the transient obscurity.—[*Time, expires.*

MR. LOGAN'S FIFTH REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—In my last speech, I spoke of the *failure* of my worthy friend. This was so evident, that I think all concerned could see it. But I do not blame him for it. As I have said before, he is a man of talents and learning, a man of unusual ability for his age; and I am disposed to attribute his *failure*, Dot to any fault of his, but to the badness of his cause, and its want of support in the word of God.

My worthy friend was down upon Universalists and Universalism; and, if I am not mistaken, endeavored to show, that our theory of conversion and religion leads to Universalism. He also spoke of the "*horrific speeches,*" which, he says, I have been making! Now, as to the charge of the tendency of our doctrine to *Universalism*, he will have that to *prove* to this audience, before he can make them believe it. But he understands the art of playing upon any thing, which he thinks will excite *prejudice* in the community against us! Hence the charges of *Romanism* and *Universalism*! As to making "*horriSc speeches,*" I think that my worthy friend cannot be easily beaten at it, if we are to judge from his last speech! His exclamations at the horrible, in reference to my arguments and positions, were plenty enough! If we are to believe him, our doctrine is the most terrible and horriSc of almost any in the world! But to proceed.

My friend endeavored to convict us of not going according to the commission—because, I suppose, I endeavored to show that, according to the commission, *repentance* and *faith* were the conditions of remission of sins; and that *water baptism* had nothing to do in the matter, as a condition, but came in afterwards, as a *command* of God and a *Christian duty* for the admission of the penitent, pardoned believer into the Church. Such I understand its position and design to be, according to the commission; and as we find subsequently, in the word of God, according to the *teaching* of the apostles, and the manner in which they *carried out* that commission; and as we see in the Acts of the Apostles.

I therefore deny the charge, that we do not go according to the commission; and I have the same right, and as much ground, to say, that my friend and his brethren do not go according to it!

The great question is, what are we to do to be saved? Because I have been contending for *faith* in Christ, as the great principle of pardon and salvation, to the exclusion of *water baptism*, my friend accuses me of requiring *nothing but faith*, and of teaching that persons are pardoned, justified and saved by *faith alone*, to the exclusion of every thing else—of any other condition! Now, have I not said, again and again, that faith always involves and includes *repentance*, which is always understood as a condition, where it is not expressed?—have I not made repentance the first condition, as involving and including faith, which is always understood where it is not expressed?—have I not brought ID prayer too as required?—and have I Dot

affirmed, that a true, genuine repentance always *ends* in faith? I therefore deny the charge; and say that I have never affirmed we were saved by *faith alone*. Because I exclude his *water baptism* from being a condition, and contend for *faith* as the great principle, I suppose that I must have it all by *faith alone*! I would like to know which is best, *faith alone*, or *water alone*? I am aware that in the commission, in Mark xvi. 16, our Savior said it "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but does that necessarily and invariably make *baptism* a condition of salvation? I affirm that it *does not*; when we compare this with the commission in Luke, and the subsequent teaching of the apostles; and take the rule of interpretation, which all admit that "Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture." But the last clause of the, commission in Mark, *qualifies* the first: "he that believeth not shall be damned"—not, "he that is *baptized not*." If baptism is here made a condition of remission of sins, *equality* with faith, according to my friend, why did our Savior not include the *want* of it, along with unbelief, as the ground of condemnation? Why did he make *unbelief* the *only* ground? Plainly because *faith*, without baptism, is the ground of pardon and salvation; as we learn in various passages of the New Testament, already quoted, where we have faith, without baptism, as the ground and condition of remission of sins, justification, and acceptance with God. In Luke, as I have shown, we have *repentance* and remission of sins, but not a word about baptism! Now, if Peter went beyond this, then he did that which he was not authorized to do. But my friend shows plainly, that he is not willing to take the Bible as it is, and to take all its parts together! He had rather take such passages as suit his particular purpose; and pass the others over? And when forced by me to notice a passage, that conflicts, with his theory, he has an easy manner of explaining the meaning away!

I affirm that our Savior never told Peter to preach baptism as a condition of remission of sins. He gave a *general* commission to all the apostles; and a *special* one to Peter, to open his kingdom to the Jews and the Gentiles; not in that special commission, we have not a word about baptism! Peter made the confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" and we hear John saying, in reference to faith in the great truth, embraced in that confession: "These [signs or miracles] are written, that ye might *believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and *that believing, ye might have life* through his name"—but nothing of baptism! Again, hear the same apostle, John: "Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ, is *born of God*" but not a word of baptism! Let us go to Acts iii. 19, and bear what Peter says, in his second discourse: "*Repent ye* therefore, and be *converted*, that your sins may be blotted out, etc.; but not a word about baptism! And by the way, we must interpret his discourse, on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 38,) by this, which would make the passage read "*Repent* for the remission of sins, and be baptized," etc. Let us hear Paul and Silas to the jailor at Philippi: "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou *shalt be saved*, and thy house"—but not a word about baptism! Here we have *faith* three times, and *repentance* twice, as the conditions of pardon and salvation; while baptism occurs only *once*, in the single, isolated passage in Acts ii. 38! Peter said at the house of Cornelius, that "*whosoever believeth* on him *shall receive remission, of sins*." [Here Mr. Sweeney called on Mr. Logan to quote the

passage correctly, as in the Book.] Well: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." This makes their *faith* at least the *condition* of their pardon. And this is confirmed by what follows; for at this point, "while Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost *fell* on all them which heard the word." Here was *evidence*, that when they believed, they were pardoned and accepted of God. And *then* Peter asked: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which *have received* the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Yes, we are told here, "that on the Gentiles was also *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost;" and they were then and there accepted by the Lord as his people; and then afterwards baptized.

But we must notice the case of Saul again. My friend tries to make out, that I denied this to be a case of *water* baptism. But he is mistaken. I never denied that it was *water* baptism. It is not a literal or spiritual baptism, but a *figurative* baptism; and the washing away of Saul's sins, was not a literal, or real washing away of them, but a *figurative* one. The literal and real washing away of his sins took place, when he *repented, believed, and prayed* to God; and was effected by the application of the *blood* of Christ, which alone can Wash away sins. We find that water baptism is a *symbolical* or figurative *washing*; and represented as such in the Bible. Ezekiel, the prophet, says, in reference to this symbolical washing: "He shall *sprinkle clean water* upon you, and you *shall be clean* from all your filthiness and all your iniquities."

As to the case of the jailor, which my friend renders it necessary for me to notice again, he ought certainly to have a *notch* for his *repentance*, which he puts in the place of the washing of the stripes of Paul and Silas by him! How that can be made to stand in the place of his repentance, is a little more than I can see; or I expect than this audience can! I can get along with the jailor's case, however, without this, as faith and repentance are involved in each other, and the mention of his *faith* implies the existence of his *repentance*; while his baptism took place after these—after his sins had been pardoned—and then it was, that he "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." The reply of Peter to the penitent Jews, on Pentecost, is all the *Shadow* of baptism for remission of sins, that my friend can get from the word of God! Truly such a cause must be a bad one, when it hangs on so slender a thread as this! I have quoted passage after passage showing that *repentance* and *faith* are the conditions of remission of sins; but my friend pays no attention to them, or, at least, to but very few of them! They do not suit his theory of baptismal remission; and therefore he has no use for them!

My friend contends that, a *change of feelings* is *no evidence* of pardon, and as nothing to do with it. What! *we feel* the heart changed from the love of sin and the world to the love of God and holiness; and no evidence of pardon! — *we feel* the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit; and no evidence of pardon!— *we feel* the love of God shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Spirit that is given unto us; and no evidence of pardon! But do not wonder at it; as my worthy friend, never having *experienced* the *conversion* for which we contend, this *change of feelings* would be no evidence to him, as he is an utter stranger to all such things; and relies on a water salvation!

My friend says, that there is no *mystery* about conversion. As the nega-

tive has the right, I believe, to respond to all the arguments of the affirmative, I will read here what the apostle Paul says on the subject: "But we speak the wisdom of God *in a mystery*, even the *hidden* wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." (1 Cor. ii. 7.) Now here we have a *mystery* spoken of, in reference to the wisdom of God, in the plan of conversion and redemption. Again: "But the natural man *receiveth not* the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can ire know them, because they are *spiritually discerned* (1 Cor. ii. 14.) If the natural man, the unconverted man, cannot comprehend or receive the things of the Spirit, of course they must be a *mystery* to him. This will be reply sufficient on that point.

As to the Pedobaptists, about whom my friend says he knows so much, as he was raised among them etc. and their religious sentiments; I can tell him that I know all about them myself, and know what their sentiments are; and hence it will not do for my friend to charge *ignorance* on me, as to our own teaching. I can say, as to myself, I *know* that my sins are pardoned, though I have never been "immersed for the remission of sins;" because I have the *repentance*, and the *faith*, and the *evidence* of pardon. I have the Spirit of God bearing witness with my spirit, that my sins are pardoned, and that I am born of God, born of the Spirit, born again: I have *felt the change* from the love of sin and the world to the love of God and of holiness; and therefore I have the *feeling* and the *evidence*, and can say that I *know* my sins are pardoned, and I have passed from death unto life. With me it is a matter of *knowledge* and *experience*. But my friend ignores all this, and rejects this evidence, because he is a stranger to it!

As my friend is so strenuous in his views of baptism for remission of sins; so confident of the correctness of his position on this question; and contends so earnestly that a person must be baptized before he can have the *evidence* of *pardon*, and that then he is *certain* to have it; let us see if we cannot find a case in the New Testament, where an individual was *baptized*, and failed to obtain the remission of his sins! We are told of Simon Magus, in Acts: "Then Simon himself believed also: and when he was *baptized*, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs that were done." (Acts viii. 13.) When Peter and John came down to Samaria, and he saw that by the laying on of their hands the power to work miracles was conferred, he offered them money to give him the power of thus conferring the Holy Spirit. Now notice the reply of Peter to him: "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for *thy heart is not right* in the sight of God. *Repent* therefore of this thy wickedness, and *pray* God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art *in the gall of bitterness*, and *in the bond of iniquity*" (Acts viii. 20, 28.) Here, although Simon had been *baptized* (having believed,) he is told by Peter, that his heart is wrong, "not right in the sight of God," and that he is "in the *gall of bitterness* and *bond of iniquity*." And yet he had been *baptized*! The apostle gives him the character of a wicked, unregenerate *simmer*, who had never received the pardon of his sins! And what does he then tell him to do? Does he tell him to! "f-be *baptized* for the remission of sins?" Not at all; and yet - he ought to have told him so, if my friend's theory is correct. He told

Jews in the wilderness, etc. So my friend's affirmation here is *contradicted* by the language of the Bible itself! The language of the Bible, that our Savior was "as a Lamb *slain* from the foundation of the world," shows that all the saints, in all ages of the world, and all who have been saved, have had the pardon of their sins and been redeemed, by his sacrifice and *blood*, by *faith* in his *blood*," which was "shed for the remission of sins."

As my friend opposes the doctrine of the *natural corruption* and *depravity* of man, I will say, that not only do the Scriptures teach it in the clearest and most explicit manner, but we see every day, with our own eyes, in the disposition and conduct of *children*, that they are "prone to evil"—that they are *naturally corrupt*—and that the child has *corruption in its soul*! The taint has been inherited, and come down from Adam; and "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean." As Mr. Wesley says: "I have shown that this *natural corruption* cleaves to *every child* of Adam."

My worthy friend says that the "one hundred and twenty" on the day of Pentecost, were "the *charter members* of the Christian Church." Now if his position is true, in reference to the gospel's never having been preached until then, and baptism for the remission of sins having been instituted at that time, the apostles were *never pardoned*, as we have no evidence that they were ever baptized! I asked him to tell me how they got to heaven, but he failed to do so! He says that Pedobaptists detract from the importance of baptism, because they do not look at it just as he does—do not hold that it is for remission of sins—that without it we cannot be regenerated and saved, etc. Now I deny that we detract any from its importance and design. No, we endeavor to give to it the design and character that Christ and the apostles gave it, and neither more nor less. And I will here add, what I have before affirmed on this subject—that no man who wilfully neglects to be baptized, when in his power to do so—no real penitent believer. I mean—can ever get to heaven!

But I must notice again what my friend says about our Confession of Faith, or "Creed," as he calls it. He says that the *references* were put in by the framers of it, when it was first made. Now I deny it; and I call upon him to produce such a copy of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, if he is able to do so; and we can then see whether he is right on that point or not. It is a very easy matter to *affirm anything*; but quite a different one, when it comes to *proving it*; and the *proof* is what we want here.

In conclusion, I am not going to astound the audience by exclamations of wonder and surprise; or by reckless and daring and unqualified assertions; or shock them with "horrific speeches!" I am not going to affirm that I *know* I am *right* on the subject of religion, and that all the balance of the world are *wrong*! I am not going to tell the sinner, that he must be baptized for the remission of his sins, in order to be saved; and that if he is not, he must be lost!—but to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and he shall be saved"—to "*repent and believe the gospel*," coming to Christ as the only Redeemer and Savior of the world, relying on him, and putting his trust in him for life and salvation; and he will in no wise cast him off! And when he has done all this; *feels* that God has forgiven his sins for the sake of Christ; *feels* the pardoning mercy of God in his soul; *feels* that he

has the witness of the Spirit in his breast; the Spirit bearing witness with his spirit, that he is a child of God, an heir of heaven; and *feels* the love of God shed abroad in his heart, by the Holy Spirit which is given to him; then he is a *fit subject* for *baptism*, and can comply with that command of the Savior. But let him not *trust* to the *water* for pardon and salvation; or he may find himself in a dangerous and soul-destroying error!

With all due deference for my worthy and estimable friend, to whom I have to stand opposed, in this discussion; with all the respect I have for his talents, learning and ability; and with all the regard I have for him, as a Christian and a gentleman; I must say, in all candor and sincerity, that I believe him to be in a most egregious error, in affirming that Christian baptism is a condition of remission of sins, of equal importance with repentance and faith! And I must not only say this, but I believe, that by such teaching he is leading *thousands astray*, and causing them to rely on the water of baptism, in connection with a mere historical faith and external reformation, for the pardon of their sins, salvation, and acceptance with God; when they should rely upon the *blood* of Christ and *the baptism* of the Holy Ghost! While such have to look at the water of baptism for pardon, when they were "immersed," I can appeal to the evidence of pardon, salvation and acceptance with God, which I *feel* within my breast, the witness of the Spirit, and the love of God and of the brethren! And lastly I can say, that in this discussion I have relied upon the word of God for testimony, and adduced that in support of every position I have taken, and to prove every argument I have advanced,—[*Time expires*.

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

"All infants dying in infancy, and all others who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth."

— [MR. Logan AFFIRMS.

[MR LOGAN'S FIRST SPEECH.]

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We are now about to enter upon the discussion of our fourth and last proposition, which reads as follows:

"All infants dying in infancy, and all others who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth."

According to our arrangement I affirm this proposition, while my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, undertakes to *deny* it. And I must here say, that I am utterly at a loss to see how he can deny anything so plain as the language of this proposition is! He is bound to admit the final salvation in heaven of infants dying in infancy, and idiots, or those who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word of God, as all such cannot be morally responsible to God for their conduct. He cannot and he will not deny this; and he is also equally bound to admit that they must be thus saved by Christ. This he cannot and will not deny; and he must admit, too, that they cannot be saved without *means*. He must admit all this; and how, then, he can deny the proposition I cannot see, and am at a loss to know. The question, then, is not as to *whether* they will be saved; but *how?*—as they must be saved in some way, and by some means. So far, then, as *the plan* of salvation through Christ is concerned, I cannot see how my friend can deny the proposition under discussion. I cannot see how he can do so without denying infant salvation altogether.

I affirm, then, that infants dying in infancy, and all others that are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word of God, are saved by the Spirit of God, if they are saved at all—I mean, by Christ through the Spirit. And in affirming this, I do not wish to be understood as meaning that it is by the Spirit alone, to the exclusion of the *blood* of Christ. Of course, as *all* who go to heaven must have "their robes washed and made white *in the blood* of the Lamb," they, too, must be washed, and made white and fit for heaven in that blood; which shows that there is something in them—that natural corruption, inherited from Adam, which, as Mr. Wesley says, "cleaves to *every child* of Adam"—from which they must be cleansed and made pure and holy and fit for heaven—as we shall endeavor to show hereafter. That blood must be applied to them by the Spirit; and hence they are saved by Christ through the Spirit. God saves them as he saves all others, by Christ through the Spirit, "who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth" as in conversion, according to what our Savior told

Nicodemus—as the correct rendering of the Greek word *pneuma*, which is translated; “wind” in the common version of the Bible, is “spirit”—“the Spirit operates where he pleaseth, and thou bearest the report of him, for seest the effect of his work in conversion] but canst not tell whence he cometh and whither he goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” This is the operation of Christ through the Spirit, “who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth.” To take the whole of this proposition together, weigh it well in the mind, and see its consistency with the teaching of the Bible, I cannot see how any truly Christian man can object to it. I cannot see how he can deny it, without denying the very Bible itself.

Now, as the doctrine of *human depravity*—of the *natural corruption* of man—is the ground on which the necessity of this work of Christ’s, through the Spirit, in order to infant salvation, rests, I infer that my friend’s main objection to this proposition will be that man is not *naturally* depraved, and that there is no such thing as the innate, inherent corruption of human nature. Now this proposition does not assert the moral depravity of man, but teaches it incidentally, as implied by the necessity of the work of Christ, through the Spirit, in order to the salvation and regeneration of infants dying in infancy, to purify them, make them holy, and fit them for heaven. And by their *regeneration* I do not mean my friend’s birth “of water and of the Spirit;” but their renovation and purification, as this is the meaning of the word “regeneration” in the New Testament, (Matt. xix. 28) “And Jesus said unto them, [his apostles,] “Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the *regeneration*, [renovation] when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” The word occurs but once more in the New Testament, where it means the same, in Tit. iii. 5–7: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy he [God] *saved* us by the *washing* of *regeneration*, and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost; which he *shed on us* abundantly *through* Jesus Christ our Savior; that being *justified*, by his *grace*, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” Here we have the whole plan of salvation: the *saving*, the *washing* by the blood of Christ, by which we are renovated, or made *new*, (“if any man be in Christ he is a *new* creature”); the *renewing* itself by the Spirit; and the *justification* by the *grace* of God.

I shall now proceed to show from the holy Scriptures themselves that man is *morally depraved*—as the Bible is the great volume that is to decide this question and the proposition under discussion—that he is *naturally* corrupt—and that this *hereditary depravity* belongs to the whole human race. And I will call particular attention to the proofs that I shall produce in confirmation of these assertions. The first passage that I shall produce is in Psalms 1: 5, with the two preceding verses :

“For I acknowledge my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me. Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest. Behold, I was *shapen in iniquity*; and *in sin* did my mother *conceive*, me.” Never was there a clearer case of this moral depravity. The Psalmist goes back to the very *conception* of him by his mother, and says that it was *in sin*; and that the very growth of him in the womb, until he was born, was *in iniquity*! And if this was the case with David, “a man after God’s own heart,” can the rest of the human race be excepted? No; this was

only a *specimen* of the whole human race, who are all "conceived in sin" and "shapen in iniquity." And if such was his conception and his growth before birth, certainly he was *born* in sin and iniquity! My friend has stated that mankind are not naturally depraved, but that they are born pure and uncorrupted, and *become* morally depraved. But this completely refutes his position, as it shows that persons are by nature inwardly and morally depraved, and their sinning is the result of this depravity, the consequence to which it leads.

The next passage, to which I shall refer you, is in Job xiv. 4, and is a confirmation of what I have read from the Psalms;

"Who can bring a *clean* thing out of an *unclean*? not one."

Job had just said: "Man that is *born of a woman* is of few days, and full of trouble; and then, evidently *in reference* to this, he asks the question, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" If, according to the Psalmist, as we have quoted, mankind are "conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity," they are morally corrupt and "unclean," which is evidently the meaning of the patriarch. If mankind then—in the days of Job—had an *unholy nature*, they must have it *now*. The truth is, they have *inherited* it from the first man, Adam, who by his fall, lost the moral image of God and that holiness of nature, with which he was created, and became morally corrupt, and his moral depravity has been inherited by the human race, and come down from father to son, to the present time! If the *fountain* is corrupt, the *stream* that flows from it must be *corrupt* too. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." If the *tree* is corrupt, the *fruit* will be *corrupt* too. Says our Savior: "every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a *corrupt tree* bringeth forth *evil fruit*;" and: "Ye shall know them *by their fruits*;" and again: "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a *corrupt tree* bring forth good fruit. Wherefore *by their fruits* shall ye *know* them." (Matt.

vii. 16-20.) The same *test* holds as good now as it did then; as mankind have been naturally the same, in all ages since the fall of Adam. The "evil fruits," the sins and crimes of mankind, show that the *tree* that bears them and from which they come, is "evil," or naturally corrupt, "a *corrupt tree*;" and consequently the fruit that springs from it, which it produces, will be "corrupt!" Hence the *tree* has to be *made good*, for its *fruit* to be good: "make the tree good, and his fruit good;" which shows that the tree, mankind, by its having to be *made good*, is *naturally* "corrupt" and "evil."

Again, we will listen to what is said in Job xi. 12 :

"For vain man would be wise, though man be *born* like a *wild ass's colt*,"

Here we have another proof of the natural corruption, the moral depravity, of man. He is said to be *born* like the colt of the wild ass—a fit illustration of the *natural* state of man, as we see in *savage* and *heathen* life, before he is brought under the converting influences of the Spirit of God—the wild ass's colt being remarkable for going *astray*, for a wild, unruly *evil* disposition, "*vicious*," as we say sometimes in reference to bad horses. And we hear learn, that that is the state in which man is "*born*." There must be something *inherent* in man, born with him, that causes him thus to go astray as soon as he is born!

But we will hear Job again, on the same subject:

"What is man, that he should be *clean*? and be that is *born of* a woman, that be should be *righteous*?"

Here we have the same allusion to the natural moral depravity of man, as inherited and born with him. It is as much as to say, that man is naturally unclean—that being born of woman, he is morally depraved, and needs the righteousness of God, to purify him from his natural corruption and depravity. It was that, into which Adam fell when he transgressed, and which caused him to discover his nakedness, and filled him with guilt and shame!—which caused him and Eve to hide themselves from the presence of the Lord, "behind the trees of the garden." The inquiry of the Lord: "Adam, where art thou?"—was asked, not because the Lord did not know where they were, but to call his attention, and impress his offence and guilt upon his mind.

We will now hear David again, Psalm 1. viii. 3:

"The wicked are *estranged from the womb*: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."

Here we have the same again—the same evidence of human depravity and corruption. The Psalmist says that the *wicked*—and all men are "*wicked*," in a state of sin and rebellion to God, until they are regenerated by the Spirit, and converted to him—that they are estranged from God from the very womb, and consequently *born corrupt*; and, as an evidence of it, they *go astray*, into sin and wickedness, as soon as they are *born*; and we see the evidence of it, around us every where, and every day of our lives! Hence it is said, that they are "every one gone back." Now what was true in David's day, as to these things, is equally true *now*, in our own day, and we see the same results of this natural-born, inherent corruption and depravity of man!

We will now hear Solomon, the wise son of David, on the subject, Prov, xxii. 15:

"*Foolishness is bound up in the heart* of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him."

This is the same as to say that *corruption* is bound up in the very hearts of children; and hence they have to be *corrected* in order to get it out of them. If such be the case, it must have been *born in them*—must be *inherent* in their very natures—another evidence of the doctrine of natural corruption and hereditary moral depravity. The disposition and tendency of the human race to good and to evil are like the rolling of a stone. It is difficult work, and requires great and constant effort to roll a large stone up a hill, particularly if it is a steep one; but it requires no effort to roll it down it. The *natural* law of the attraction of gravity will carry it down, without any effort to help it along; and so the *natural* corruption and depravity of the human heart incline man to evil rather than to good; while the performance of good, living a righteous and holy life, requires constant effort, because foreign to the evil nature of man. It is the *natural* inclination of the mind that leads it away from God and from holiness. Hence we hear St. Paul saying:

"For I know, that in me (that is, in my flesh) *dwelleth no good thing*: for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would do I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. * * * I find, then, a law, that when I would do good evil is present with me. * * * But I see another law in my members, *warring* against the law of my mind, and bringing me *into captivity to the law* of sin which is in my members."—Rom. viii, 18—23.

Here we have the moral depravity of man graphically portrayed by the pen of inspiration, and by one who knew well the human heart; and what that heart and disposition were then they are now.'

We will next go to the prophet Isaiah, and hear what he has to say:

"Yes, thou heardest not; yea, thou knewest not; yea, from that time that thine ear was not opened: for I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a *transgressor from the womb*."—Isa. lxxviii. 8.

Here the prophet represents man as being a transgressor from the very womb—from his birth—fully agreeing with the passages we have already quoted, and implying his natural corruption and depravity; for what else, besides the natural disposition, would cause him to be a sinner from his very birth?

Let us now go to the New Testament, and hear Paul on the same subject:

"They are *all gone out of the way*, they are together become unprofitable; there is *none* that doeth good, no, *not one*."—Rom. iii. 12.

Why had all gone out of the way, and become unprofitable?—why were there none that did good? Plainly, in consequence of their moral depravity and corruption, natural to the human mind; and for no other reason that can be assigned. It is the invariable result, when man is left to follow his own natural inclinations, desires and appetites! If man, then, ever gets to heaven, his *nature* must be *changed*; and changed by the regenerating and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. The apostle, says further, that "the way of peace have they not known"—never having become acquainted with it because of the natural wickedness of their hearts; as the apostle had just said: "Whose mouth is full of cursing! and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways."—Rom.

iii. 14—19. And the condition in which he describes the Gentile world, in the first three chapters of this epistle, could only have been brought about by the operation of causes such as I have spoken of—the hereditary corruption and depravity of human nature.

We will hear! the apostle again in this same epistle:

"Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death hath passed upon upon all men, for that *all have sinned*."—Rom. v. 12.

Here he refers to the very origin of sin and death, the transgression of Adam—the fountain head of this hereditary depravity, from which it has flowed down, in a stream of sin and death, to all his descendants! As Paul says that "*all have sinned*," and gives that as the reason why death has passed upon all, they must have sinned *in Adam*, in some sense; and I can see no other way in which they could have done so but by *inheriting* the sinful and corrupt nature he received when he fell. Thus "*all have sinned* and come short of the glory of God;" and *all* must be redeemed in some way, before they can enter heaven. But to return to the reasoning of the apostle. Adam was the federal head and representative of the whole human family; and when he sinned and fell, *all* mankind sinned and fell in him, and will have to be redeemed in some way, by Christ, the second Adam, before they can be made pure, holy and fit for heaven. And as, in consequence of the sin and fail of Adam, "death passed upon all men, for [because] all have sinned—in him—it passed upon *soul* and *body* both. As Adam, when he fell, *died a spiritual* and *moral* death, so did his posterity in him; and as he brought himself into a state which eventuated in *physical*

death, so he detailed it on all his descendants. Thus "in Adam all die," and consequently must have died as he did.

But let us hear Paul again on this subject. He says in Corinthians:

"For the love of God constraineth us because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were *all dead*: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again."—1 Cor. v. 14, 15.

The apostle says here that mankind are "ulldead" Now in what sense were they thus all dead?—as it must have been in some sense—the whole man dead, soul as well as body! Evidently in the sense above, for which we are contending here—*morally* and *spiritually*, as well as physically. This is given as the reason, by the apostle, why our Savior died for all—that he might redeem mankind from sin in this life, and from the grave hereafter.

We will now turn to Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, and hear him there :

"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom we all had pur conversation in times past in the lust of the flesh and of the mind; and were *by nature the children of wrath*, even as others."—Eph. ii. 1—3.

Here Paul tells the Ephesians, in the first place, that they were once *dead* in trespasses and sins, implying that moral and physical death, of which we have been speaking; and, in the second place, that they were once *by nature*, the children of wrath, as others. If man, then, is a child, of wrath "*by nature*," he *must be naturally* corrupt and depraved, as we have been contending. I wish my friend to remember this—when, where and how we get *our nature*. I have affirmed my doctrine to be, that "all infants dying in infancy are *regenerated* and *saved by Christ, through the Spirit*, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth and if all mankind are *by nature* the children of wrath, *infants* must be too; and hence they must be made pure and holy—"regenerated and saved by Christ"—before they are fit for heaven; and this, I affirm, must be done by the Spirit of God, "who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth," as we have already shown.

We must now go back to the Old Testament, to the case of the antediluvians. We are told:

"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."—Gen. vi. 5.

Here we are told that the corruption of mankind had become so great and universal that *every imagination* of the thoughts of his heart was *only evil continually*! Now the term "heart" in the Bible, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, represents the soul of man, and stands for that; and as the thoughts of their souls were only evil continually, they must have been completely and entirely corrupt. It was one continual stream of corruption, starting in the fall of Adam, and continuing to increase and spread until it filled the whole earth, and all mankind became totally corrupt! Now the *moral depravity* of man, the *natural corruption* of the human heart, inherited from Adam, was the *cause*; and we here see so soon the melancholy *effects* on his descendants! Hence Job says: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" What more could be expected, at that age of the world, and so soon after the fall of Adam, from the hereditary moral depravity of man, than the spread of the taint, until all had become corrupt ?

When we go on down to Jeremiah, we hear him saying:

"The *heart* it *deceitful* above all things, and *desperately wicked*: who can know it?"—Jer. xvii. 9.

He gives us the same account of the human heart, that all the other inspired writers do, as to its inherent corruption and natural depravity—that it is not only *deceitful*, but deceitful "above all things;" and not only *wicked*, but "desperately wicked!"—all plainly implying an inherent *moral depravity*, inherited from Adam, and covering the soul, like the leprosy the body of man! Hence a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, nor a bitter fountain send forth sweet waters. The tree itself must be *made good* first, and the fountain *purified*.

We turn to David again, and we hear him saying:

"For their is no faithfulness in their month; their *inward parts* is *very wickedness*; their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongue."—Ps. v. 9.

The point here is men's *hearts*, "their inward parts," which he says, are so wicked, that they are very wickedness itself! If such is the condition of mankind, before their hearts are changed by the Spirit of God, it must be the result of a *natural cause* acting upon them, which we find to be the moral depravity and corruption, inherent in the human heart; and which leads them to this "very wickedness," of which the Psalmist here speaks, as belonging to "their inward parts."

Let us now hear him, who made man, and knew the human heart—"who spake as never man spake"—the Lord Jesus Christ. We hear him saying:

"There is nothing from without a man that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, these are they which defile a man."—Mark viii. 15.

"Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man: but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man."—Matt. xv. 11.

"Bat those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth *from the heart*; and they *defile* the man. For out of the mouth proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man."—Matt. xv. 28—20.

Notice, that our Savior says, it is not that which goes into the man that defiles him, but that which comes from his heart. This entirely confirms our position, and shows that the *heart* of man is *naturally* depraved and morally corrupt. Else why are such the *fruits* of it?—why does it send forth such *streams*?—why do such evil effects result from it? Mark it, such evils are said by our Savior, to come from the *heart* of man; and they show it to be completely tainted with a hereditary moral depravity!

Another fact in connection with this subject, and the next statement I shall make is, that God has chosen all mankind to a *State of probation* in this life—one of trial and discipline—and it is left with them whether to accept the means he has proposed to them for the attainment of eternal life and salvation, or to reject them; as he does not force these things upon them. His Spirit strives with all men, as we learn from what the Lord said to Noah, in reference to the antediluvians: "My Spirit shall not always *strive with man*;" and from Paul in Corinthians: "A portion of the Spirit is *given to every man* to profit withal." If the man will yield to the striving of the Spirit—will yield up his heart to it—to its regenerating influences—and will come to that point when he can say :

"Here, Lord, I *give myself away*,
"Tis all that I can do"—

and will put his trust in Christ for pardon, life and salvation—*repenting* of

his sins, *believing* on him with all his heart, and relying upon him—he will be pardoned of all his sins, and accepted of the Lord as his child and an heir of heaven and everlasting life. But if he resists these strivings of the Spirit, and persists in his resistance and rebellion to God, he will withdraw his Spirit from him, his day of grace will be past, and God will “give him over to hardness of heart and reprobacy of mind.” The Spirit *sanctifies* and *purifies* all those who yield to his strivings, and become the children of God, by being born of the Spirit—“born again.” And as *all* have to be sanctified and purified by the Spirit before they are fit for heaven, all infants dying in infancy must too; and, in the language of our proposition, “are *regenerated* and *saved* by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth.”

But my worthy friend will *confine* the operation of the Spirit to the *word* of God—will restrict and limit it to that: If this be true, and infants must be saved by Christ, through the Spirit, it is impossible for them to be saved, according to his theory, as they are incapable of repenting, believing and being affected by the word of God, and they must all be lost! The Spirit has gone, and will go, where the Bible has not gone, never been, and may never go, and there operate on the mind and heart of man! Hence I contend for the Spirit’s operating “when, where, and how he pleaseth.” We may restrict the *word* of God, but we *cannot restrict his* SPIRIT, in its goings forth and its operations! “The Spirit operates *where he pleaseth*, and you hear the report of him; but you cannot tell whence he cometh and whither he goeth.”—John iii. 8. This is the language of the word of God—it is decisive—and it cannot be disputed by my friend. If the operation of the Spirit is to be restricted to the word of God, as he contends, what are to become of the *heathen*, who have no Bible? On his theory here they must all be lost!—there can be no salvation for them! But let us hear what Paul says on the subject:

“For when the Gentiles [Heathen] which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.”—Rom. ii. 14,15.

Here Paul says that when the heathen, who “have not the law,” or word of God, “do by nature”—in that state of nature in which they are—what the word teaches, they, not having that word, “become a law unto themselves,” or are accepted of God as though they had his word, and were walking according to what it requires; and that, by their conduct and character, they show its effects, “written *on their hearts*”—their hearts being regenerated and purified from sin; and he appeals to the *witness* of their *conscience* as a guide to them, and their thoughts accusing or excusing one another in accordance with this. Now is there no operation of the Spirit here? Most certainly there is in all this; and yet they have not the *Bible!* Here, then, we have the operation of the Spirit without the word of God. And when the North American Indian acts in accordance with what is required by the “Great Spirit” in whom he believes, is there no operation of the Spirit in his case? And yet he has no Bible—no word of God—nothing but “the light of nature” to guide him in these matters.

Now it must be admitted by all who believe in the Bible, or are acquainted with its teachings, that no person can get to heaven in any other way than by Christ’s plan of salvation, or through him. There is no exception

in the human race; all who go there must get there through him and by that. If infants dying in infancy get there, it must be through the merits of Christ's blood and death. Man by nature is corrupt and morally depraved; and *infants*, partaking of that natural corruption and depravity, if ever they get to heaven, must have their natures changed in order to do so. They have "all gone astray"—"there is none that doeth good, not one." This is the reason why I preach *experimental religion*, as well as because it is taught in the word of God—because man must be changed—"must be born again," born of the Spirit of God—and his unholy nature must be changed and transformed by the renewing of his mind into one that is pure and holy. We have an illustration of this in the case of a bad and wicked man, when in company with pious and holy men; he cannot enjoy himself because he is a stranger to the grace of God, and the depravity and corruption of his heart will cause him to seek companions like himself. Man is in possession of an unholy nature, that causes evil thoughts in him, and prompts him to acts of sin and wickedness; and it must be *changed* by the regenerating and renewing influences of the Spirit of God, operating upon his heart, and changing him from the love of the world to the love of God—from the love of sin to the love of holiness!

I cannot, for my life, see how my worthy friend can dispute the doctrine for which I am contending, contained in the proposition we are engaged in discussing. He must certainly think, in controverting it that children will get to heaven in some other way than through Christ! What is the statement of the proposition, for I wish here to call particular attention to it?—that all infants dying in infancy, and all others, as idiots, etc., that are not capable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word of God, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who works when, where, and how or as he pleases. Now I cannot see how or on what grounds there can be much difference here between my worthy friend and myself. He must admit that none can get to heaven without being in Christ, or through him; and how he can show that it is in any other way than by Christ, through the Spirit of God, I am unable to see. He must admit, too, that Christ has not *two* plans of salvation, but that he has only *one*. And if he has only one plan of salvation, it must be the same for *all*, for infants and all others. That he saves infants in one way, and adults in another, would make him have two plans, one for each—inconsistent with the word

God—and which I think my friend cannot show from the Bible. The *natural mind*, we find opposed to God. "The *carnal* mind is *enmity* to God," says the apostle, "for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be;" and, as he continues: "So then they that are *in the flesh* cannot please God." The natural, carnal mind, then, must be *changed* before man is in a state to be pleasing to God. And as *infants* have this mind or disposition, and are tainted with this natural corruption, where they die in infancy they must be changed—regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit—before they can become fit subjects for heaven.

According to the theological system of my friend, the *heart* is already *right*, and needs no changing; it is the *conduct* that needs changing, and must be changed! But if the nature of the heart is such as described in **the Bible**—if it "is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked"—if **out** of the *heart* "proceed evil thoughts, murders," etc.—and if it is as described in various other places in the Bible—there must be a *change* of

heart, a radical, thorough change, before a person can become a Christian, and fit for heaven; and this change must be effected by the Spirit of God operating upon it. Without this change of heart from the love of sin and of the world, to the love of God and of holiness, there would be no change of *conduct* or character in man. As the heart is the *fountain* from which flow the words and actions of man, it must be *changed* and cleansed from sin before the stream flowing from it will be pure and holy.

My friend has much to say, in opposition to the Pedobaptists and their system of religion; and contends against their doctrines as false and opposed to the teaching of the Bible; but, I ask, who at the present day are doing nearly all that is done for the conversion of the heathen? I reply, that it is men who are like the Pedobaptists. It is they, principally, who are engaged as missionaries, in preaching the gospel to them, and who are translating, and publishing, and spreading the word of God among them. But where are the missionaries of my friend's Church among them? I have never yet heard of but *one*, Dr. Barclay at Jerusalem! They had better do a little more for the poor heathen, before they talk as much as they do about the Pedobaptists!

As to our system of conversion, which my friend regards as so erroneous, soul-destroying, and inconsistent with the Bible, I can appeal, not only to my own *experience*, but to the experience of my brethren, who know, by what they have *felt*, that they have passed from death unto life, and have *tasted* that the Lord has been gracious to them, in the pardon of their sins and conversion to God. They *have felt* the regenerating influences of the Holy Ghost upon their souls: and *feel* the love of God shed abroad in their heart» by the Holy Spirit which he has given them; and hence they have the Spirit bearing witness with their spirit, that they are the children of God—heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; and thus are enabled to rejoice in the hope of the glory of God! But my worthy friend and his brethren scoff at all such *evidences* as these, and reject them as inconsistent with the word of God! They have no use for them! The reason is obvious. They have *never felt them* themselves, and are strangers to them! They have no use for *feeling* in religion, and reject it! But I want a religion I *can feel*; and I have no use for the cold abstraction, called *religion*, that gets into the *head*, and never reaches the *h e a r t*! A *heart-felt* religion is what I want; and that is all the kind that will do man any good! It will do to live with, and to die with both.

When we look at the natural depravity of the human heart, and its deep moral corruption; and that, in the language of the prophet:

“The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it.” (*Isa. i. 5, 6.*) We see the necessity for a *change* of *heart* in man, to purify his heart from the love and corruption of sin, and change it to the love of holiness and of God. And whenever this takes place—the moment the soul rests on God, and throwing itself on the mercy of Christ, relies on him for pardon and salvation—that moment its sins are all pardoned, and it is accepted of God!

My worthy friend and his brethren may condemn the *mourner's bench* as much as they please, and scoff at it, and deride it, and call it what they please; but they cannot injure it, and keep people away from it. Too many have found Christ precious to their souls at it, in the pardon of their

sins, for people to give it up, and exchange it for a *water salvation*, that excludes the *blood* of Christ, and gives no real, 'permanent peace to the soul! As good men as ever lived, have here found pardon and peace to their souls; and were made just as sensible of the change that had been wrought on them, as they could be of any thing in: the world. They thus *know* that they are pardoned, and have passed from death unto life; because they have *felt* the change—have the witness, and *feel* the love of God in their souls. But my friend will say, that this is *all delusion*, and that there is no reality in it. Well, let him say so, if he chooses; but it will not make it so. If "delusion," it is a glorious delusion, since such happy effects result from it!—[*Time expires.*

MR. SWEENEY'S FIRST REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — The proposition which the worthy gentleman has engaged to prove to-day, is undoubtedly a most singular one. How he, or any other man, has ascertained that "infants dying in infancy, are regenerated, and saved by Christ through the Spirit," is what I am exceedingly anxious to know! And, though we have had quite a lengthy, *miscellaneous* speech, yet I have received no light on the main question—not a ray!

In our correspondence, I tried for some time to agree with Mr. L., upon a proposition embracing the difference between us, on *Spiritual influence in conversion*—and, strange as it may appear, we landed upon the proposition before us! I, and my brethren, believe, that in conversion the Holy Spirit operates *always through the truth*; while our religious neighbors, Mr. Logan's party with others, believe and teach, as this people well know, that the Spirit, in conversion, operates *immediately* upon the sinner's heart. The gentleman said as much, as I understood him, in his speech just delivered. But when, in our correspondence, I offered to affirm, that, "*in conversion the Holy Spirit operates always through the truth,*" I found the gentleman unwilling to deny it. He said he believed it; that his Confession of Faith taught it; that he knew no one who did not believe it! I then cited a clause in his Confession—which, slightly modified, forms our present proposition—as inconsistent with his concession. Whereupon he offered to affirm that clause, with slight modification, as a proposition to be discussed; and utterly failing to do any better, I agreed to deny it. And I am consequently here, to hear him try to prove this very singular proposition. If he can do it, then I shall acknowledge he is a most extraordinary man; for the proposition is certainly a most extraordinary proposition; and can not be proven in any ordinary manner, nor by any ordinary effort. There is not one word in the whole Bible about any such "regeneration" as that in his proposition. And I discover the gentleman is aware of the fact; and hence, he is trying to prove up the old worn-out doctrine of "total hereditary depravity," that he may *deduce* infant regeneration from it! He goes in for *inference* and *deduction* again!

It is most devoutly to be desired, that, if Mr. L. *does* know anything about the "regeneration of infants dying in infancy," he should enlighten us a little on this very profound subject. But as he has despaired of doing it, and undertaken to prove the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, I, of course, being the respondent, will have to talk about depravity too. I do not believe in the regeneration of infants dying in infancy, as the gentle-

man's proposition affirms; nor do I believe there is any *necessity* for it, in order to their happiness in heaven. I do not believe that infants—the *souls* of infants—inheriting any corruption from Adam, or from any body else, that makes it necessary for them to be regenerated in order to their eternal happiness in heaven. They are fit for heaven without any such regeneration as the worthy gentleman talks about. They need only a *physical* change—a change of *body*—you may call it a “regeneration” if you choose; but it is wholly *physical*—pertains to the *material*, and not to the *spiritual* nature.

The Worthy gentleman, so far from being able to prove that infants inherit spiritual corruption, or spiritual death, from Adam, can scarcely prove, that they even inherit their *spiritual nature* from him! Therefore, before he undertakes to prove that we inherit depravity *in our spirits*, from Adam, the gentleman would do well to prove that we *inherit our spirits* from him; and this is a work that, I predict, he will hardly accomplish. We have “fathers of our *flesh*” and a “Father of spirits.” Paul says: (Heb. xii, 9.) “We have had fathers of our *flesh* which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of *Spirits* and live?” Our *fleshly* nature, with all its corruption, and with all our consequent *physical* ills, we inherit from Adam I freely grant; but that we inherit any “*spiritual death*” from him I squarely deny, and call for the proof. Every *soul* dies for its own sins. The Lord says: “All souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the Son is mine: *the soul that sinneth it shall die.*” Ezek. xviii. 4. The soul whose noble faculties, whose God-like attributes, have never been prostituted by sin to the service of the devil, is not “dead in trespasses and sins.” “The soul that *sins, it shall die.*”

The gentleman manifested great adroitness, in getting the doctrine of total hereditary depravity before you in so very mild a form. But as we are now fully in for a discussion of this doctrine, I intend you to have a full and fair view of it. I shall lay it before you in all its original and naked ugliness; and that I may not be accused of unfairness, I shall do so in the language of its own staunch advocates.

1. We will hear the PRESBYTERIAN CONFESSION OF FAITH:

“The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the *guilt* of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of Ms nature, whereby he is *utterly* indisposed, disabled, and made *opposite* to *all* that is spiritually good, and *wholly* inclined to *all evil*, and that continually.”—Page 151.

2. In the second place we will hear the “SHORTER CATECHISM”:

“The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell consists in the *guilt of Adam's first sin*, the want of original righteousness, and the *corruption* of his *whole nature*.”

3. In the next place we will hear the BAPTIST PHILADELPHIA CONFESSION :

“Our first parents by this sin, fell from their original righteousness and communion with God. and we in them, whereby death came upon all, all becoming dead in sin, and *wholly* defiled in all the *faculties* and *parts of soul and body.*”—P. 24.

4. Now we will hear the METHODIST DISCIPLINE:

“Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his *own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.*”—Art. 7.

5. John CALVIN, in his *explanation* of this doctrine, says:

"Original sin seems to be the inheritable perverseness and corruption of our nature, poured abroad in *all parte of the soul*, which first makes us deserving of God's wrath, and then also bringeth forth those works in us, called, in Scripture, the works of the flesh. These two things are distinctly to be noted, that is, that, being thus *in all parts of our nature, perverted, and corrupted*, we are now, even for such corruption, *only holden worthy of damnation,*" etc.

6. W. W. PERKINS:

"In reprobate infants, the execution of God's decree is this: as soon as they are bom, for the guilt of original and actual sin, being left in God's secret judgment unto themselves, they dying are rejected of God forever." vol. i. page 107. fol. 1603.

7. Twiss:

"Every man that is damned, is damned for original as well as actual sins, and many thousand infants *only for original.*"—*Riches of God's Love*, fol. 1653, pp. 149, 186.

8. ARTHUR HILDERSHAM:

"There is in them (infants) a natural proneness, disposition and inclination to every thing that is evil; as there is in the youngest lion, or of a bear, or of a wolf, unto cruelty, or in the egg of a cockatrice before it be hatched. You have heard it evidently proved, I. That all infants are sinners, and deserve damnation. 2. That many infants have been vessels of wrath and fire brands of hell."!—Hildersham's Lectures on 51st Psalm.

From the foregoing extracts I have read we have a pretty full view of the doctrine of "total hereditary depravity." By going back to the *Creeeds* and their exponents, we get the doctrine as it has been taught for hundreds of years—as it is in all its enormity and hatefulness! As we have seen, it teaches that infants inherit "*utter perverseness and corruption* of nature, poured abroad in *all parts of the soul*," which makes them "deserving of God's wrath;" and some say that they, "dying, are rejected of God forever," and that "only for original sin!" And consequently, "that many infants have been vessels of wrath, and fire-brands of hell." Mr. L. is an advocate of this doctrine very materially modified, and adapted to the light and spirit of this age. He believes that infants inherit this "*utttter perverse-ness and corruption* of nature;" that "there is in them a natural proneness, disposition and inclination to every thing that is evil; as there is in the youngest lion, or of a bear, or of a wolf, unto cruelty, or in the egg of a cockatrice before it be hatched;" but he thinks that "all infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and *saved* [from the 'wrath of God,' of course,] by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleases." Your infants, mothers, are, *while they live*, very much like unto the "young lion," "the bear," "the wolf," the *adder*—are, indeed, very *devilish*—as vicious as the devil himself—for you know he can be no more than *totally perverse and corrupt*. *While they live* they are such characters, and only "deserving of the wrath of God." Some teach that they are delivered from the wrath of God" when baptized! But Mr. L. has them justly exposed to the wrath of God *till they die!*—then they are "regenerated and *saved*"—from the wrath of God, to which they have been exposed, and which they have only deserved, all their lives—"by Christ, through the Spirit!!" Blessed Lord, didst thou not take infants into thine arms and call them blessed?

But friends—*mothers—fathers*—I know you desire to hear something other of your little, lovely, *innocent* babes, than this doctrine of "total hereditary depravity" teaches. Hear the Savior of the world:

"And Jesus called a little child unto him; and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except you 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 greatest in the kingdom of heaven."—Matt. xviii. 2, 3, 4.

Now, let it be observed, that this "*little child*," according to Mr. Logan, was "utterly perverse and corrupt;" was "totally depraved," was "deserving only of the wrath of God;" for infants are not "regenerated and saved" till they die. Then, I suppose, the Lord taught his disciples—"Except ye be converted, and become as this little child"—that is, "utterly perverse and corrupt," in "all parts of the soul," "exposed to the wrath of God"—"ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven!"—did he?

Again our Savior said: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." That is, I suppose, of such "total depravity," of such "utter perverseness and corruption"—of such "lions," "bears," "wolves," etc., is the kingdom of God! What nonsense!

But a few hours since, we all heard this same man, Mr. Logan, contending most earnestly and devotedly, that infants of believing parents are "born within the pales of the church." Now he says, they are born vicious as the "young lion," or "bear," or "wolf"—"utterly perverse and corrupt." He now believes, at least, that they inherit corruption in such a sense, that they must be "regenerated and saved," before they can go into heaven. Children born "corrupt," "lost," and consequently, need "regeneration" and "salvation;" and yet they are "born within the pales of the Church!" "Total depravity," "utter corruption" born into the Church! Positively, this needs some modification, or rectification, or some thing else! The fact is, the gentleman has got his doctrines tangled in his own brain. There is nothing plainer to my mind, than that "infant regeneration," and "infant baptism" both grew out of the doctrine of "total hereditary depravity." Total depravity is the ground of the phantasm—"infant regeneration." It is also the ground of "infant baptism." Until quite recently, the whole matter was perfectly simple and easy of explanation: "Infants must be regenerated, because they are totally depraved; and in order to their regeneration, they must be baptized." This was the doctrine in past ages. This was the doctrine of Wesley, in his "doctrinal TRACTS;" and this is the doctrine of the M. E. Discipline yet. But our friends, in modifying these doctrines so as to adapt them to the light of the present age, have got them wonderfully tangled up; so that explanation is out of the question! Hence it is, that Mr. L., though a man of clear mind, one day has infants born "holy," and "within the pales of the Church;" and the next day, he has them all born "utterly perverse and corrupt," and contends (not that they are entitled to baptism, because "holy," and "in the Church, but") that they must be "regenerated and saved," or they will be damned!

But I must now notice the quotations the worthy gentleman made from the Bible—not to prove his proposition, but to prove "total hereditary depravity." But before doing so I wish to state just how much I deny. I deny that infants are depraved by nature in any such sense as to make their regeneration and salvation necessary to their going to heaven. There have been great sinners in all ages of the world, I freely grant. Men, and nations, have become wretchedly wicked, and deplorably corrupt. I also grant, that it is possible for a man to become totally depraved. But when a man becomes totally depraved, he is then as bad as the devil himself! for the devil is no more than totally corrupt.

1. "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother concern me." Might not the sin in which David was shapen and born, have been in the people or generation among whom he was born, and not in himself? I may illustrate this by a like expression: "and now hear we every man in our own tongue *wherein we were born.*" Was the tongue or language in which they were born, in them at, or before, their birth? Language is not *natural* to man. No more was the sin *natural* to David, wherein he was born. It was not *his sin* wherein he was born. Sin was common among the people, in the generation, among whom he was born. This is all he meant by this hyperbolic language. David was born in sin just like others are borne in a tongue. That this language is highly figurative, or hyperbolic, it seems to me every one ought to see. It is like the following: "I am poured out like water and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels." "And my bones are consumed." "All my bones shall say, Lord, who is like unto thee." "I am a worm and no man," etc. Such language is not to be taken as strictly *literal*. And this is true of much of the prophetic language of the Bible, as I presume the gentleman is aware.

2. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one."—Job xiv. 4. Job is speaking of man's *physical* weakness, and the shortness of his days. And, hence, this passage is entirely irrelevant. And even this language is hyperbolic: "He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down." This is not true in a sense *strictly literal*, of man. Again he says: "He fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not." These expressions, in connection with the one quoted by the gentleman, show that Job is speaking in a manner highly figurative of the shortness of man's life, and of his *physical* weakness, and not of any such depravity as the gentleman is trying to prove.

3. "For vain man would be wise, though man he born like a wild ass's colt."—Job xi. 12. Thus, ladies, and gentlemen, are you complimented by grave divines! This language is not Job's; nor is it the language of any good man. Assimilating a mother to a wild ass, and her babe to the colt of an ass, is not the work of God, but of the Rev. Mr. Zophar, a false friend of Job, whom God had convicted of falsehood. So this passage proves nothing for Mr. Logan. And if I am not mistaken he is too decent a man to adopt the sentiment of the passage, as his own.

4. "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."—Ps. lviii. 3. This passage of Scripture is evidently highly figurative, also; but, nevertheless, it is about the last one I should quote, to prove hereditary total depravity. It says, the wicked *go astray.*" What do they "go astray" *from*? From total depravity? they are born totally depraved, and then "*go astray,*" they must *go astray* from total depravity! But the passage tells *how* they "go astray." They go astray, "speaking lies." This is the kind of depravity I believe in. Men "go astray, speaking lies." Mr. L., needs a passage, saying, "*all* (men, not merely the wicked, are *born* astray." But, then, he may ask, is it not said that they go astray "as soon as they be born?" This, as I have already said, is hyperbolic. David did not expect to be understood, to say that the wicked "speak lies" "as soon as they are born," *literally*. He simply teaches what we all see is true, that at an early age persons become wicked.

5. "Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction shall drive it from him."—"Prov. xxii. 15. Is Solomon speaking of *babes*? He is speaking of such persons as can be *corrected*—"the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." If this "foolishness" is total hereditary depravity, then the "rod of correction" can drive out total depravity! and this is precisely the reverse of the gentleman's doctrine. There is no total depravity in the passage.

6. "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil that I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me; for I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."—Romans vii. 18-23.

This passage the worthy gentleman quoted, leaving out two very important verses. But why he should quote this passage at all, to prove total depravity is a mystery to me. Did he show how this Scripture proves the doctrine he is contending for? He certainly did not—nor can he, or any other man.

Why does the apostle use the *explanatory* phrase, "*that is, in my flesh?*" Does it not seem that he would guard his readers against the very perversion of his teachings of which Mr. Logan is guilty, in quoting this passage, to prove the monstrous doctrine of total depravity? Does Paul say, that in his *Spirit* there was "no good thing?" Certainly not! Indeed, he says the very opposite, in one of the verses the gentleman omitted: "I delight in the law of God, after the *inner man*," and "serve with my *mind* the law of God." The outer man—the *flesh*, was carnal, "sold under sin." But with the mind—the spirit—the inner man, he recognized the law of God as right, and fought against the *flesh*. Singular total depravity this, indeed!

I freely grant, that in the *flesh* there is "no good thing." "The flesh lusteth against the *Spirit*, and the *Spirit* lusteth against the flesh." Here is a war in man, between the *Spirit* and the *flesh*, and as long as this is true, the doctrine of *total* depravity is false. The gospel is a grand and powerful reinforcement, sent from heaven to the struggling spirit of man, by which the *Spirit*, which "delights in the law of God, and which is not totally depraved, is able to overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil." The worthy gentleman will hardly prove by this passage, or any other, that *Paul* was totally depraved.

7. "And thou wast called a transgressor from the womb."—Isa. xlvi. 8. This is a very bold example of Scripture hyperbole, and was spoken with reference to a nation, the "house of Jacob." The house of Jacob had long been a transgressor, is all that can be understood by this language. *Literally*, a nation or an individual cannot be a transgressor from the womb.

8. "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."—Rom. iii. 12. There is no *hereditary* depravity in this language, but the reverse. "They are all gone out of the way"—but not *born* out of the way. They are "together become unprofitable"—not *born* unprofitable. "There is none that *doeth*

good"—not none that *can* do good! The gentleman wants a passage to Fay, "All men are *born* out of the way; they are together *born* unprofitable; there is none that *can* do good, no, not one, all being *born* utterly *perverse* and *corrupt*." But the gentleman read further, Paul's description (or rather that of the prophet quoted by Paul,) of the *Jewish nation*: "Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness." Is this predicable of *babies*? Does Paul say, infants are *born* with their "mouths full of cursing and bitterness?" Surely not! "Their feet are swift to shed blood." Are the feet of little babies "swift to shed blood?" "Destruction and misery are in their ways." "Destruction and misery" in the ways of *infants*!! Mothers, did you know that before Mr. Logan told you?

9. Mr. Logan seems very confidently to rely on the expressions, "dead in trespasses and sins," "and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."—Eph. ii. 1—3. But these passages prove nothing for him. In fact the expression, "dead in trespasses and sins," is decidedly against him. The gentleman supposes men are *born spiritually dead*. But Paul teaches that the Ephesians were "dead (not in Adam spiritually as well as physically, but) in *trespasses* and *sins*." It was by *continued* trespassing and sinning that they *became dead* to righteousness. "They had *gone out of the way*; they had *become unprofitable*; there was none of them doing good," and consequently they were "dead in trespasses and in sins." And as a consequence they "were, *in truth*, the children of wrath, even as others." The word (*phusei*) here rendered "nature," means *certainly, truly*; and when thus rendered we have, instead of "by *nature* the children of wrath," "*truly* the children of wrath," which is evidently the apostle's meaning. Dr. Clarke so translates this word, *phusei*, in more than one instance: "When the Gentiles do *by nature* the things contained in the law," etc., he says means, "when the Gentiles do *TRULY* the things contained in the law," etc. Again: the passage in Gal. v. 8, "ye did service unto them which by *nature* are no Gods," he translates, "ye did service unto them which *CERTAINLY* are no Gods." These passages, then, simply teach, that, by continued *trespassing* and *sinning*, the Ephesians were dead to righteousness, and were consequently "*indy* the children of wrath." But if from this language we are to understand that God's wrath burns "with furnace heat" against unoffending and unconscious babes for being born with a wicked nature, as Mr. Logan supposes, then all my long cherished views of justice and of goodness are utterly confounded! What a view it gives us of our heavenly Father! Can any infant prevent its own origination, its existence? has the nature of an infant been, in any sense or degree, the result of either its own will or conduct? Certainly not! Then I say, that attributing to God wrath against unconscious infants is a libel against his divine character, and shocking to the finer feelings of humanity!

Paul says: (Col. iii. 5, 6,) "Mortify therefore your members which ere upon the earth — fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry; *for which things' sake* the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience." For the sake of the many bad things here mentioned, "the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience." But my friend says the wrath of God burns continually against *bales*, while they live, on account of *the nature which he gives them*!! And this horrible doctrine he undertakes to prove by Paul!—that same Paul who says of children, "*now are they HOLY.*"—1 Cor. vii. 14.

10. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."—Gen. vi. 5. This passage, in its connection, only shows that the world *had become very wicked* in Noah's time. Still, Noah was "found righteous in his generation," wicked as it was. The passage simply teaches that men had become wicked and corrupt of heart very generally; not that they were *born so*, as Mr. L. would have us believe; but they had *become so*. For we learn at the 12th verse of this chapter that "all flesh *had corrupted his way*." Of course, then, all were not *born corrupt*—"totally *perverse and corrupt*"—or all flesh could not have "*corrupted his way*." And by reading the whole chapter we may learn exactly *how* "all flesh had corrupted his way." This passage is no witness for the gentleman to prove *hereditary total depravity* by.

11. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?"—Jer. xvii. 9. The prophet, in the chapter from which this is taken, is speaking of the wickedness of the "house of Judah," and of the desperate tendency of the heart of Israel to idolatry; and is not speaking of the hearts of *babies*; and consequently the passage proves nothing to the point. It does not even prove the *total* depravity of the "house of Judah," much less the *hereditary total* depravity of all infants! It is the *sin of Judah* the prophet speaks of, and not the sin of *Adam*.

Besides, Dr. Clarke, who believed in total depravity with Mr. L., says: "My old manuscript Bible translates thus: "Shrewd is the heart of man, and unsearchable; who shall know it?" And what is there in that about "hereditary total depravity?"

13. "For there is no faithfulness in their mouth; their inward part is very wickedness; their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongue."—Ps. v. 9. Did David speak thus of *babies*! Are *their* throats an open sepulchre! Do they "flatter with their tongue!" Surely not. In the next verse he says, after asking the Lord to "destroy them," to "let them fall by their own counsels," "*for they have rebelled against thee*." Instead of infants, he is speaking of persons who "*had rebelled against God*."

18. "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him; but the things which come out of him, these are they that defile a man."—viii. 15 of Mark. This passage, with two others like it, the gentleman quoted. In this, as in the other passages quoted, the Savior is telling what "*can defile a man*." "Defile a man!" If a man is *born totally defiled*, how *can* any thing "defile" him? From the very fact that certain things are said to "defile a man," we come irresistibly to the conclusion that man is *not born* totally defiled or depraved. So the worthy gentleman's own Scripture is against him again.

Just here the gentleman turned aside and gave us quite a speech upon spiritual influence. After referring to, and most egregiously misapplying, a passage or two of Scripture, he informed us that "the Spirit has gone, and will go, Where the Bible has not gone, and may never go, and there operate upon the heart of man." Now if the gentleman will agree to prove this proposition, I will freely give him two days to do it. Let him show wherever and whenever ones single individual was regenerated by the Spirit without the truth if he can. Will he try it? We shall see. Why, he has despaired even of proving that the Spirit regenerates infants dying in infancy, and is only trying to prove hereditary total depravity to *infer* it from!

I was surprised to hear him talking about the Gentiles doing "by nature the things contained in the law," I thought he believed our nature to be *totally corrupt!* Did the Gentiles do by *total corruption* the things contained in the law? Surely not! He has men *by nature* children of wrath, and by nature doing the things contained in the law, all in one speech! Curious *nature* this!

The worthy gentleman is decidedly the greatest man for *inference* and *deduction* that I have ever met with. He undertook to prove his doctrine of infant baptism solely by inference and deduction. He has undertaken to prove the doctrine of infant regeneration solely by inference and deduction. He tries awhile to prove hereditary total depravity to infer it from; but failing to do so, even to his own satisfaction, he is now trying to *infer* hereditary depravity from the fact that men *do sin*. He would *infer* depravity from the fact that men sin; and then from depravity he would *infer* infant regeneration!

But suppose he could prove that all men inherit total corruption; even then infant regeneration would not follow; for his *elder brother*, "Hildersham," might be right, "that many infants have been vessels of wrath and fire-brands of bell!" So, we see, that if he succeeds in proving the doctrine of hereditary total depravity, though *I* might then admit infant regeneration, some of his elder brethren, most genuinely orthodox, would not; and hence he would have a war at home, before he could have all the infants saved!

But he asks, "why do men sin, if they do not inherit morally depraved natures?" I will dispose of this question, for the present, by asking, why did *Adam* sin? Was it because he had a "depraved nature?" If so, from whom did he get it? From whom did *he* inherit his "perverseness and corruption," that caused him to sin? When the gentleman answers this question, then I will tell him why men now sin.

The gentleman may apologize for sinners that they sin because they have by inheritance a depraved nature; but how can he apologize for Eve, and Adam? Did they have depraved natures? and if so, where did they get them? If the simple fact that men sin now, proves that they have by inheritance a depraved nature, will not the fact that Eve and Adam sinned, upon the first temptation, prove that they had by inheritance a depraved nature too?

I do not believe that Adam sinned because of any irresistible impulse of his nature, nor do I believe men do now. Adam sinned because he *could*, and was persuaded *or* tempted to do so. So do men now. But none are necessitated to do so by the conditions of their nature. If it were true, as Mr. L. preaches, that all inherit a moral nature "utterly perverse and corrupt," then all who are not regenerated would be sinners *just alike*. But this, we know, is not the case; and this, with me, is an entire refutation of the gentleman's doctrine. As to what the child will do, and as to what kind of a man it will make, much depends upon its training, and upon the circumstances within which its character is developed. A child may be "trained up in the way in which it should go;" but this could not be done if it were true that every child inherits a nature by which it is "*wholly* inclined to *all* evil, and that *continually*," as this mischievous doctrine of hereditary total depravity teaches.

Be not discouraged, mothers; despair not of your children, but train them

up as they should go: bring them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and your labor will not be in vain.

The worthy gentleman manifests quite an anxiety for the "salvation of infants"—indeed, he seems a little troubled about the matter! He seems to think that if they are not regenerated and *saved* when dying, they cannot be saved at all. Tam sorry to see him in trouble, especially when there is no cause for it. I never have been troubled about "infant salvation," and never expect to-be. And moreover, I find nothing in the gospel about the "salvation of 'infants'"—no more than about the salvation of angels! It is time to talk and trouble ourselves about the salvation of any thing when it is *lost*. Jesus came from heaven "to save the lost." The sick need a physician, and hot the whole. I am concerned about the salvation of the "*lost*," "the *sick*"—about sinners. Infants are pure, holy, blessed; they are specimens of greatness in the kingdom of God—"of such is the kingdom of heaven," said our Lord, who will raise them from the dead as unconditionally as they go there in Adam.— [*Time expires.*]

MR. LOGAN'S SECOND SPEECH.

MESSES. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — As we have agreed to confine our speeches to thirty minutes each, instead of forty, as before, I must notice a few things, in the speech of my worthy friend, Mr. Sweeney, which I have penned down, in as brief a manner as I can, but as fully as my time will admit of.

My worthy friend has affirmed, that infant salvation is not in the Bible, and cannot be found there. This seems to me to be one of the most reckless assertions a man can make, in reference to the word of God!—as well as one of the most inconsistent! What! we are to learn the destiny of the human race from the Bible, according to him, and as we all agree; and yet we cannot ascertain from it the eternal destiny of the largest class of it that die; for it is said, that the largest portion of mankind die in infancy! Now, I affirm that the salvation of infants can be found there. Did not our Savior say: "*of such* is the kingdom of heaven?"—and: "Except ye be *converted*, and become *as little children*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven?"—and does not this imply infant salvation, and teach it as plainly as language can? Most assuredly it does; and yet my friend says, it is not in the Bible! Again: "And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one such child in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me. but him that sent me." (Mark ix. 36, 37). Here we have infant salvation again; as our Savior makes the receiving of a child in his name the same thing as receiving himself and God; and as the receiving of Christ by faith constitutes a person a Christian and brings him *salvation*, this as plainly implies and teaches *infant salvation* as any thing in the Bible can; and yet my friend says, it is not in the Bible! If not there, where is it to be found? Does my friend, by denying that it is there, mean to convey the idea that there is *no salvation* for infants dying in infancy?—that they are lost, or there is nothing of them after death?

Now I do not mean to imply by the remarks I have made, and the quotations I have given, that infants have no *natural* corruption and depravity about them; as I have shown, by numerous passages of Scripture, that

all mankind, since the fall of Adam, are born with depraved and corrupt *natures*; and that "this corruption cleaves to every child of Adam;" but as my friend had denied that the *salvation* of infants dying in infancy was in the Bible, I wished to show, from the language of our Savior, that it was thus implied, and taught; as they are not responsible to God as moral agents, not knowing good from evil, nor being capable of having their "senses exercised" in this way; but would be "regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth purified and made white by "the blood of the Lamb," and freed from all their natural corruption and depravity. Hence the argument of my friend is a very lame one! If infants are naturally pure and free from all corruption, as he contends, why is it, that when they come to years of maturity or responsibility, they have to be regenerated and born again?

My friend would have infants already in the kingdom of Christ, from birth, as our Savior says of children, "*of such is the kingdom of heaven*"—I mean, according to his reasoning—and yet, when they come to years of responsibility, they must *become* members of his kingdom! His argument, then, is a lame argument. I will illustrate. By the law of the State of Illinois, a man must be of a certain *character*, or he must take the *oath of allegiance*. He must be *born* a citizen, or, if a *foreigner*, he must take the oath. Now my friend, according to the tenor of his reasoning, has infants born citizens, according to the *character* he gives them; and yet, as soon as they become responsible, moral agents, they must *take the oath of allegiance to Christ!* Now how one can be a citizen of one kingdom here, and not of another, I cannot see. If already a citizen, why does he have to *become* one?

My friend harps upon the passage, "Except ye be *converted*, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." He lays great stress upon the term "*converted* and endeavors to argue from the passage, that infants or children are not *naturally* corrupt; because a person, in being converted, must *become as they are*. Now what is *conversion*, or the meaning of the term? It simply means "a turning"—a turning away from one thing, and turning to another. All *conversions* of adult persons do not imply, or include regeneration; as we have *political conversions*, *temperance conversions*, etc. But regeneration is not always conversion; as it means to be born again and born of the Spirit; while conversion merely means "a turning," as I have said. The meaning of our Savior's language is, that a man must become humble, docile, teachable, etc., before he can enter into the kingdom of heaven; and it has nothing to do with the subject of regeneration. My position here is confirmed by what the Savior says: "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their hearts, and *should be converted*, and I *should heal them*." (Matt. xiii. 15). Here we have the *conversion* first, and the healing, or *regeneration*, afterwards—showing that they are not one and the same thing: but that the turning away from sin and to the Lord comes first, and the regeneration, or birth of the Spirit, next, and after it.

My worthy friend, in order to evade my arguments, and get around the doctrine of the hereditary moral depravity and corruption of mankind, which, as I have shown, is so abundantly taught in the Bible, affirms that infants

do not inherit their souls from their parents. But I contend that they do inherit them, as well as their bodies, from their parents. It is according, to the laws of nature, that they should inherit them; and we often see the child, not only having the features of its parents, but their very disposition, faculties, traits of mind, etc. If children do not inherit their souls, they must be the direct gift of God; and every soul ought to be just alike!—and the soul ought to be as large, and perfect, and in possession of all its faculties at birth, as much as ever afterwards! But what is the fact? — that we see the soul small and feeble at first, like the body, and developing and growing as that does! When the Lord created Adam, he “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul;” and we are told, in reference to Seth, his son, that he “begat a son in his own likeness, after his image” (Gen. v. 3.); of course receiving from Adam, his soul and body both. Now if infants do not inherit their souls, as well as their bodies, from their parents, I want my friend to tell me where they get them?—as they must get them somewhere. I want him to tell me when and where God gives the infant its soul? — if it does not inherit it as it does its body.

My friend has been reading you extracts from Creeds and Confessions of Faith—from the Westminster Confession, the Baptist (Philadelphia) Confession, the Methodist Discipline, etc., to show they teach that mankind are wholly depraved, that original sin is damning, and all this; and has given you Calvin's explanation of original sin; and what does it all amount to? Just nothing at all in this discussion! They are not pertinent, in the least, to the subject before us; which is not about the total depravity of mankind, original sin and its damning, etc., but about the regeneration and salvation of infants dying in infancy, idiots, etc. The very reading of the proposition shows the irrelevancy of his extracts, and that they have no pertinency whatever to the question in debate: “All infants dying in infancy, and all others who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth;” but not a word about total depravity, original sin, etc.! Were I disposed I could take these Creeds, and from them defend the doctrine of the natural corruption and moral depravity of mankind, for which I have been contending; but it would not be pertinent, as it is the BIBLE, and not these Creeds, to which we are appealing, in this discussion, and which is to decide the question before us.

My friend has commented pretty extensively on the quotations I have made, in defence of my position, in reference to the natural corruption and inherent depravity of mankind; and I must notice him some here. has David born pure and clean; though he himself says, he “was conceived in sin, and shapen in iniquity!” He has Job born clean and pure too, though Job says: “What is man that he should be clean?”—and that he is “vain,” and “born like a wild ass's colt!”—and, “how can he be clean that is born of a woman?”—and that “even the heavens axe not clean in his [God's] sight!” I quoted the expression from David: “The wicked are estrayed from the womb, they go astray as soon as they are born;” and my friend says, that it will not do for me to say they “go astray,” but are “born astray.” Very well, they go astray because they are born astray, as I have shown. I quoted from Isaiah, that man “was

called a transgressor *from the womb;*" and my friend emphasizes on the word "transgressor," and endeavors to show that there is no reference to any natural corruption, born with the person, but to his *becoming* a "transgressor" from wicked influences acting on him afterwards. But it resulted from the child's evil nature, which, like the attraction of the loadstone for the steel, led him into transgression! I also read the passage, (Rom. iii. 17,) "the *way of peace* have they *not known,*" to show the corrupt nature of the infant, as the *cause*; as the apostle represents them as never having known it; but my friend will not have it that way; but will have it, that they became strangers to it, by *becoming* wicked and by actual transgression—when they had *never known* it! I also quoted what Paul said to the Ephesians, (Eph. ii. 3,) that they had been "*by nature* the children of wrath, even as others," to show the natural corruption and inherent depravity of the human heart; but my worthy friend tries to make out, that it was by their "*conduct*" they became "the children of wrath," when Paul says they were such "*by nature,*" by their very natures! Whom shall we believe—him or the apostle? — since we have his *uninspired* assertion, and the *inspired* word of the apostle? To prove his position, my friend renders the first part of the verse, "among whom also we all had our *behavior* instead of, "our conversation," as in the common version; as he thinks the word "behavior" will aid him in making out that it was by their "*conduct*" they were "*by nature* the children of wrath;" as "behavior" and "conduct" are so nearly synonymous. But this will not avail him any thing, as Paul says "*by nature*" they were the children of wrath. For fear, however, that this would not do, he goes to Dr. A. Clarke—for he can call on these erroneous, schismatical and deluded Pedobaptists, when he gets into a difficulty, to help him out! — and says that Clarke gives the word "truly" as the correct rendering of the words "by nature;" so the passage would read, "and were *truly* the children of wrath," etc. Well, we will let him enjoy the subterfuge all he can; but remember that *Paul* says, they "were *by NATURE* the children of wrath, even as others" — by a depraved, corrupt, wicked *nature!*

My friend contends, as you have heard, that all infants *are born pure* and uncorrupt, and with no natural corruption or depravity about them; and yet he reasons, that they are to *be born again*, when they come to riper years, because they need a *second or new birth*, to regenerate them, save them from their sins, and introduce them into the favor of God. Now, if infants dying in infancy are saved in heaven, as he must and will admit, *what* are they *saved from?*—(since they must be saved from *something?*) —if, when it comes to years of maturity, it must be changed, born again, etc.! The infant is born *pure*, without any inherent corruption, and fit for heaven, according to his theory; and yet it *must be born again!!* I do not understand him!

My friend has told us about his being born and raised on Cumberland River; among the Pedobaptists, and that he knows all about them, what are their sentiments, etc.; and all about the origin of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, their doctrines, etc.; and attempts to make light of us, and expose us to ridicule, because we are named from a *river*; and says that we ought to go in for the *water*, on that account; and all that. Now, while I say that I think he has exhibited a good deal of *ignorance* of our system of religion, our teaching and doctrines, our Church government.

etc., why is he himself so difficult to be understood?—and why is his own system of religion so foggy, and so difficult to be comprehended! He may say what he please about Pedobaptists, and about our system of religion, and characterize it as delusion, and all that; but if it will save us from sin here, and in heaven hereafter—if it will enable us to have the witness of the Spirit of God; to *feel* the pardon of our sins and that we are the children of God; to *feel* the love of God shed abroad *in our hearts* by the Holy Ghost that is given to us—if it will enable us to *rejoice* in the hope of the glory of God; to “read our title clear to mansions in the skies;” and, above all, to triumph over death—if it can do all this, which we find from *experience* that it does do—it is sufficient for us, as it will do to *live with*, and to *die by*, and we need, we want, we require no other. A religion that will not do this, is worthless; and to rely upon such a one, is to lean on a broken staff; and such, I fear, is the theological system of my worthy and estimable friend; since he rejects these evidences as erroneous and delusive; and is disposed to rely upon that of a mere *external, bodily* ordinance!

And this reminds me of what my friend has had to say about the mourner’s bench. He says that I seriously *object* to Peter’s *answer* to the penitent Jews on Pentecost, when they enquired, “What shall we do?” that right there the road *forks*, and the *left-hand* leads on down to the *mourner’s bench!*—and, to carry on the illustration, the *right-hand*, I suppose, leads on down, to the *water!* But it seems to me, that every road that my friend and his brethren take, leads to the *water!*—for, broach what subject you may on religion, and off they go to *Pentecost* and the *water!* Water *baptism* seems to be the great subject with them, on which they are eternally dwelling and harping! Now, it is not true, that I object to Peter’s answer referred to—it is only their *interpretation*, and the use they make of it, to which I object. My friend says, that, when we get people to the mourner’s bench, we endeavor to make them believe they are the greatest sinners in the world, and that we teach a man must feel just as bad as he can possibly feel; and work on them in this way until we get them to the very lowest point; and that then a *reaction* takes place in their minds, which they mistake for getting religion and the pardon of their sins!—like the pendulum of a clock, (his illustration,) which, when the vibration carries it one way, must swing as far the other way! This, he says, is the philosophy and character of our conversions at the mourner’s bench; and that thus we *delude* the people into the belief, that they have got the pardon of their sins, and are leading them astray! I suppose, then, that our religion is a *reacting* religion, and a *pendulum*, system, according to my friend! Well, so it takes us to heaven—that is enough! As to our teaching a man, that he must believe he is the greatest sinner in the world, and the worst man, and must feel as bad as he can feel, and all; it may be the case in some instances, but it is not as a general thing. We hear Paul saying: “This is a faithful saying, and *worthy of all acceptance*, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners; of whom *I am chief.*” (1 Tim. i, 15). Here Paul says, that he was himself the “*chief*” of sinners; and that it was a fact, “*worthy of all acceptance*” that our Savior came into the world to save sinners; and of course such sinners as he was too, as he was saved by him! But my friend will not have it so—be will not have men to believe they are the worst of sinners. What I want is, for men to *trust*

in God, *repent* of their sins, *believe* on Christ with all the heart, and *give* themselves to God; and whenever they will do this, resting in God for pardon and salvation—that very moment, they will *receive* the *pardon* of their sins, and be made to rejoice in the love of God, and comfort of the Holy Ghost!

Because I have spoken of the *feelings* in religion, as an *evidence* of pardon and test of our acceptance with God, my worthy friend is disposed to reject them and ridicule the idea! He says that the Mormons, and the Catholics, and the Spiritualists, all *appeal* to this *test*, for the evidence that they are *right* in religion! But this is not a fair comparison or illustration. We appeal to *feelings* for a different purpose altogether, as an *evidence* of *conversion*; and not as a proof that we are correct in our religious sentiments.

My friend is a great man for *water*; but opposed to the *mourning bench*. Now, he may reject the mourner's bench as much as he pleases, and ridicule it; cast all the odium upon it that he can; and cry out *delusion* against it; but it will all be in vain! He cannot put it down! Too many thousands of the best and most pious men that ever lived, have there found pardon, and comfort, and peace to their souls, and been enabled to rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, and had the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost; to give it up, and throw it away!—much less to *exchange* it for the system of *water salvation*, for which my worthy friend is contending. When they *know* by their *experience* what religion is, and have *felt* its regenerating and happifying influences upon them, they will be loth to give up the mourning bench; and will cleave to it as they do to the Bible!—[*Time expires*.

MR. SWEENEY'S SECOND REPLY.

MESSES. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — The gentleman informs us, that the "debate is not about the total depravity of mankind and that, therefore, all I read and said, in my last speech was not "pertinent to the subject before us," which, he says, "is about the regeneration and salvation of infants, dying in infancy." I am aware, and have been all the time, that *the proposition* refers to the "regeneration and salvation of infants dying in infancy," and to *some body* else—I know not who it is—but I do contend that the *debate*, if there is any, is "about total depravity!" And the reason we are thus awkwardly before the audience, is, that the gentleman who is affirmant, *affirms* one thing, and tries to *prove* another! He affirms the doctrine of "infant regeneration and salvation," but is trying to prove the doctrine of "hereditary total depravity." If this is not a fair statement of the case, then I must own I am "in the fog," and do not understand the matter at all!

I have a very good reason for not saying much about the "regeneration of infants dying in infancy"—it is a *phantasmagory* that I *know* nothing about! And, moreover, to defend myself, I have not *bargained* to teach this people any thing about it. But Mr. Logan has. He affirms. And, now, if he knows any thing "pertinent to the subject before us," I hope he will let us have it—so that we may speak to the question. He is bound to prove to this audience, "that all infants dying in infancy," and some others, 'are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit;" or at least, be if bound to make an effort to do so. But what has he done thus far)

Nothing, but proclaimed his own defeat by dodging the question. But I must notice a few more things in the worthy gentleman's last speech.

He makes a great ado, and slightly mistakes, what I said about "infant ealvation." He thinks I made an "assertion" most desperately "reckless," when I said, "I find nothing in the Gospel about the salvation of infants." He immediately concludes, that I must, like some of his co-advocates of the doctrine of total depravity, believe in "infant damnation." From my statement—"that I find nothing in the Gospel about infant salvation"—he *deduces*, and charges upon me, "infant damnation." He might with as much propriety charge me with preaching *angel* damnation; for I said, also, there was nothing in the Gospel about their salvation! What a wonder that he did not deduce angel damnation from that! Angels are not lost, and hence the Gospel is not to save them. Nor are infants *lost*. They are not *sinner*s. They are not *condemned*—not *guilty* before God; and hence it is, that we find nothing in the Gospel about *infant* salvation. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all them that *believe*. All responsible men and women who believe and obey the Gospel, are *saved* from their sins. But infants are not *sinner*s—"they are *holy*"—and consequently do not need the salvation that is for sinners. All that die without actually sinning, will be as unconditionally raised from the dead by Christ as they go there unconditionally by Adam. And in this physical sense only do infants die *in Adam*, or *by* him.

But I was really amused when the gentleman was trying to show, that infant salvation is taught in the Bible. He quoted our Savior's language, "of such [little children] is the kingdom of heaven"—and, "except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"—and asked with an air of triumph, "does not this imply infant salvation, and teach it as plainly as language can?" It certainly "implies," that infants are pure, holy, humble and harmless, as God would have sinners to "*become*," and as they must become before they can enter into the kingdom of heaven; but it does not "imply infant salvation" so much as it shows, that they do not *need* that "regeneration and salvation" which the sinner must have. But according to Mr. Logan's doctrine, those very little children of which our Lord spoke were *unregenerate* and *lost*. They were not "regenerated and saved;" for this is not done till they *die*. "*Jlli* infants, *dying in infancy*, are regenerated and saved," etc., is the gentleman's doctrine. The very "little child" that our Savior "set in the midst" of his disciples, was, according to Mr. L., *unsaved*—was "utterly perverse and corrupt"—and was therefore "exposed to the wrath of God"—"only deserving of the wrath of God!" And yet our Savior said to his disciples: "Except ye be converted and *become as little children*, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God!" Surely our Lord had never learned this grand doctrine of hereditary total depravity! But I want to know of the gentleman, when *he* exhorts sinners to be converted, that they may enter the kingdom of heaven, if he wants them to be converted and become "utterly perverse and corrupt" in "all parts of the soul," as he contends infants, or "little children" are?

The worthy gentleman has been telling us a good deal about how soundly and gloriously and feelingly persons are converted at the mourner's bench; and now I wish him to tell us, if these persons, when converted, "*become as little children*"? If so, do they become as *living* children, or *dead*? If

they "become as little obildren" that have never "died in infancy," are they not *unregenerate, unsaved*? Are they not, though converted at the mourner's bench and without water, "utterly perverse and corrupt?" being "as little children?" Being "as little children," are they not "deserving only of the wrath of God?"

The gentleman informs us, that a man may be converted, and may become as a little child, and yet not be regenerated! He thinks our Savior, when he said, "except you be converted and become as little children you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," had reference to "humility" and "docility" merely. He means by all this, that little children are *humble*, because they are powerless to be otherwise—like the "*young lion or wolf*"—and that a man may be converted and become as a little child, merely in respect to *humility*, and enter into the kingdom of heaven without regeneration, and unsaved, as he claims that all *living* infants are! But we should remember, that our Lord says, of infants, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and that we must become as they are, in order to enter that kingdom. Children are *humble*, and we must humble ourselves; children are teachable, and we must become teachable; children are harmless, and we must be harmless; children are innocent, and we must become innocent; and, Paul says, children are *holy*, and we must be holy too, in order to enter into and enjoy the kingdom of God. But if children are such creatures as the advocates of hereditary total depravity would have us believe, then there would be as much fitness in saying, except ye be converted and become as little *wolves*, or *adders*, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, as there would be in saying, "ye must become as little children."

And, just here, I will call the gentleman's attention, once more, to Paul's language: "*But now are they [your children] holy*" (1 Con. vii. 14.) I am inclined to think the gentleman would do himself credit, to give some attention to this passage. There are some of us that cannot see how children can be "*holy*," and at the same time be such horrible creatures as the gentleman thinks they are!

The gentleman was a little wrong when he said I had "affirmed that infants do not inherit their souls from their parents." I *affirmed* nothing about that matter. I simply said, and I repeat it, that he cannot prove that they do. He is in the affirmative. And he is the man to *prove*, on this question. If he wishes to prove his position, that by inheritance every soul is utterly perverse and corrupt, it becomes him first to show us, that we inherit our souls at all from our fathers according to the flesh. He says the spirit of the child is like the spirit of the parent. But this is not true, according to his own doctrine, else the children of *christians* would be born pure and holy, as Christians are; and would consequently need no regeneration; and hence *all* infants dying in infancy would not be regenerated—only the infants of the unregenerate would, as only they would need to be.

He wants me to "tell when and where the infant gets its soul." But that's *his* business. Let him tell. I said, and I repeat, that God is the "Father of Spirits." Does the gentleman deny this? If so, he denies a proposition in Paul's own language! I say the Spirit comes from God, and at death, "the Spirit shall return to God *who gave it*." So said Solomon, at least. But I am aware, friends, that we are getting into "deep water" just here. But then we are somewhat excusable, as we are on a deep subject to-day. Our proposition is certainly a deep proposition.

The gentleman proclaims his own defeat by leaving the proposition he has engaged to prove, and preaching to us his *experience*, etc. He tells us that he and his brethren have "the witness of the Spirit," have "experimental religion"—a religion "that will do to live with, and to die by"—and that I and my brethren "rely upon a mere external bodily ordinance." I guess he is trying thus to convert me over! Now I shall say nothing about all this, save the last proposition—that I and my brethren "rely upon a mere external bodily ordinance." I suppose he means baptism by this "mere external bodily ordinance." He means, that we "rely merely upon baptism" for our salvation! I wonder if there is a man in the United States, "Southern Confederacy" and all, that believes that! Does Mr. Logan himself believe it? I cannot tell. But this I do know: *there is not the shadow of truth in it.* And when a preacher of the gospel throws himself upon such desperate courses, I shall not stoop to characterize the course as some may think it deserves, but shall pass it with a simple denial.

The gentleman complains that I have ridiculed the "mourner's bench." I suppose he refers to something I said while on the former proposition. But I flatly deny the charge. I have not ridiculed the "mourner's bench," or any other bench. I have, once or twice during the discussion, barely mentioned the institution, but have not ridiculed it, as the audience will bear me witness. But I cannot *mention* the "mourner's bench" without being accused forthwith of trying to ridicule the thing! I have long since discovered that it is annoying to its friends for us even to mention the mourner's bench! And I am not so certain but it annoys them a little to have to mention it themselves, in our presence. They are very tender, indeed, of this precious institution! And why are they so? There is "something rotten in Denmark!" They know that it is not a divine appointment—not from God. They know, as well as I do, that it is a human institution—an innovation. It has nearly supplanted the institution of the Lord Almighty—Christian baptism. And the very gentlemen who are so tender of the darling "bench," are all the time vainly trying to ridicule Christian baptism, by calling it a "*mere external, bodily ordinance*," etc. Let them alone, they are joined to their idol. *

About one-half of the gentleman's last speech was devoted to the proposition discussed yesterday and this morning. I shall not go back with him. I finished up my work on that proposition as I went, at least to my own satisfaction. The gentleman may feel that he has some "unfinished business" back there, but I have none. If the affirmant gives me nothing to do on the present proposition, then I shall do nothing.

I feel that it is entirely useless for me to notice again the gentleman's proof-texts. Not one of them related in any way to his proposition. Indeed, he did not quote them to prove his proposition, but to prove total hereditary depravity. And I am certain that I succeeded, in my first reply, in showing that they came far short even of that.—[*closes.*]

MR. LOGAN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I arise before you to make my third and last speech on this proposition, and the last one I expect to make in this debate, which is now rapidly drawing to a close. As I am not permitted, by the rules of debate, to introduce any new arguments, I will have to confine myself to the discussion of those already introduced,

and the notice of some of the things said by my worthy friend and opponent, Mr. Sweeney, in his last speech, in reply to mine that preceded it. I am aware that it is irksome, to both speaker and audience, to be so often traveling over the same ground, as has been the case with me in several of my speeches; but it has been caused by my worthy friend, who has pertinaciously assailed every argument I have advanced, again and again; so that I have been compelled to revert to the same arguments I have been using, and to the same scripture texts I have been quoting in support of them.

My friend has said that he believes I want to *convert* him. He is perfectly right; for I do want to convert him—or rather I would like to be *instrumental* in the hands of God in converting him to God, and from “the errors of his way”—from what I conceive to be a delusion and dangerous theory of religion, to the true faith—to that religion which is based on “*repentance* toward God and *faith* toward the Lord Jesus Christ”—which teaches the sinner to put his trust in God, and not in the *water*, and to rely on Christ, and not on *baptism*, for life and salvation—to mourn and agonize on account of sin, and *pray* to God until he finds the pearl of great price—until he feels Christ precious to his soul in the forgiveness of his sins, and has them washed away—not by the *water* of *baptism*, but by the precious *blood* of Christ, applied to his soul by the Holy Ghost—and is enabled to *feel* his regenerating influences; has the witness of the Spirit; can rejoice in the hope of the glory of God; and *feels* the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Spirit which is given to him! Such a religion as this will do to live with and to die by; and it is to such a religion as this that I would like to convert my worthy friend—I mean in sentiment—to such a one as that!

While we can have all these evidences of pardon and acceptance with God, *water baptism* is all the evidence that my friend and his brethren can claim! As a proof of this, when you ask them for the evidence of their pardon and acceptance with God, they point you—not to *repentance* and *faith*, or the *blood* of Christ, or the *witness* of the Spirit, or any of these evidences and tests of being the children of God which we find in his word—but to *water baptism*! Ask them when they were *regenerated*, and they have to point you to *baptism*! Ask them when they *received* the Spirit, and had the *love* of God shed abroad in their souls, and they have to say, at *baptism*!! Ask them when were they *born again*, and became the children of God and heirs of heaven, and the answer has to be, at *baptism*!!! Truly, it is a *water religion* and a *water salvation*! It is water, water, water, all the time! *Baptism* seems to be the alpha and omega of their religion—the beginning, the middle and the end of it! It is that first, that last, and that all the time! If this does not look like giving an “*undue exaltation*” to a mere external ordinance, I know not what does! Now I am perfectly willing to give baptism that place in the Christian economy which belongs to it; but I cannot elevate it to where it does not belong, and attach an importance and design to it which it does not deserve. And, as I have said I say again, that no one who is a proper subject of it—no *adult*, I mean—can willfully neglect it and be saved. God will not permit men to set his counsels and his commands at nought, or attend to them or not as they please, and come off guiltless! He requires *obedience* where it can be rendered, but will not punish any one for disobedience when it is out of their power to obey him. He “requires of a man according to what he *has*, and

not according to what he *has not*." But to proceed with my arguments and notices of my friend's last speech.

We are told in Matthew, after the account we have of the paying of the tribute money by our Savior, or rather by Peter for Christ and himself:

"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.'

—Matt. xviii. 1, 4.

Now my worthy friend contends from this that children are born pure and uncorrupt, and that there is no such thing as the natural corruption and inherent moral depravity of the human race! But let us look at the *design* of our Savior here. It was not to teach any thing of this kind, but to teach his disciples a lesson of *humility*. A contention had arisen among them, it seems, who should be greatest in his kingdom—exalted to the highest rank, or to occupy the chief place, to sit at his right hand, or be his prime minister; as the disciples, in common with the whole Jewish nation, were, it seems, expecting a temporal Messiah, or mighty earthly potentate or monarch in his character, and a secular kingdom; but as he came to establish a *spiritual* kingdom, he here begins to undeceive them, and to give them some idea of the nature and character of it, by giving them this lesson of humility, as we find him saying elsewhere: "Whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted, and he that exalts himself shall be abased" or made low. Let it be noticed, that they enquired, "who *is* the greatest," not, "who *shall be* the greatest;" implying that this kingdom had already begun and was in existence; and that he says, "who *shall* humble himself." So my friend can get nothing here to support his position. Again, when James and John, the "two sons of Zebidee," came unto our Savior, and requested of him that one of them might sit on his right hand and the other on his left, he told them, they knew not what they asked; and that this should be given to them "for whom it is prepared." We are told that when the ten (the other disciples) heard this request, "they began to be much displeased with James and John," and our Savior said to them: "whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." Here we have the same lesson of humility taught again; and we have, in the conduct of these disciples, an example or illustration of human nature—of its natural corruption and depravity!

I have shown that the disciples were expecting a *temporal* or secular kingdom instead of a *spiritual* kingdom, the kind of one, our Savior came to establish; and that, by what he said to them in reference to being converted, becoming as little children, etc., he intended to undeceive them, and teach them the true nature and character of his kingdom; and not to teach them that children are born pure and uncorrupt! And now I wish you to notice the course of my worthy friend. He has "turned a summersault," and taken a tack around, and adopted my arguments! He has turned completely around, and has to admit that mankind did become corrupted and depraved by the fall of Adam, and hence have a greater disposition to do evil than to do good! This is the tenor, the drift of his reasoning. He has them already regenerated—pure and uncorrupt when born; but they give

way to a wicked, corrupt disposition, become sinners, and have to be regenerated, or born again!

The case of Peter is one in point. He became the disciple of our Savior; and so strong was his faith in him as the promised Messiah, that, in anticipation of all the other disciples, when Christ asked them, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?"—he made the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" — for which our Savior pronounced a blessing on him, and gave him the promise of the "keys of the kingdom of heaven." And yet, after he was betrayed, Peter denied his Lord three times, and swore! What caused Peter to do this? He lost his faith in Christ, it seems, as the Messiah they were expecting; and under the influence of the corrupt, depraved disposition of human nature, he acted in the wicked manner, of which he was guilty! We are told in reference to Peter:

"And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have von, that he may sift you as wheat: but I. have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art *converted*, strengthen thy brethren. And he [Peter] said unto him. Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death. And he [Christ] said, I tell thee Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me."—Luke xxii. 31-34.

My worthy friend may say from this, that it was Satan who caused Peter to act as he did, and not his corrupt, depraved nature. To this I would reply, that Satan made use of that sinful *nature*—availed himself of it—to cause Peter to sin, as he does all who sin. And as the term "convert" means to *turn*, our Savior, meant, that when, after his resurrection, he should *turn or return* back to him, he must strengthen his brethren—for Peter went back to his old occupation of *fisherman*; but afterwards *turned* back to the Lord again. Hence we hear him saying: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us *again* to a *lively hope*, by the *resurrection* of Jesus Christ from the dead: to an *inheritance incorruptible, undefiled*," etc. That Peter became *penitent* we learn from the fact, that, after he had denied Christ, and the cock crew, when our Savior looked at him, he went out and "wept bitterly."

We have the lesson of *humility*, and not of the purity and uncorruptness of human nature, that our Savior taught his disciples, in the example of little children. Now what is the *nature* of the *child*, is the nature of the *man*; and the sin-loving nature and wickedness of the man, shows the corruption and depravity in the nature of the child. The only difference is, that these have not had time to become *developed* in the child; but are developed in the man.

My friend has brought up the case of Eve against the doctrine of the corruption and depravity of human nature. He asks, why Eve sinned? where was the corrupt nature in her case? and that, according to our doctrine of hereditary depravity, Eve must have had an evil heart, that caused her to sin, and must have inherited it from God! Now the case of Eve is not a fair illustration; as the human race are now placed in quite a different situation from what she was. The Devil caused Eve to sin, through the influence of *the temptation* he presented to her; but the Devil now uses the *corrupt nature* of man, along with temptation, to cause mankind to sin and become his servants! Since the fall of Adam, inheriting a depraved and corrupt nature from him, all have gone astray! "There is *none* good, not one. *All* have gone out of the way," or astray! And the corrupt,

evil nature of the child, is the very reason why children should be trained religiously—to counteract the influence of this evil nature—the very reason why parents should, as Paul tells them, “bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” Solomon says: “Train a child in the way he should go; and when he is old he will not depart from it and the poet says :

’Tis education forms the common mind,
Just as the twig is bent the tree’s inclined.”

As the tender twig is *lent* the tree will grow; and as the *child* is trained so will be the *man*; and hence the saying that, “the child is *father* of the man”—going to illustrate and prove the doctrine of the innate, inherent depravity of human nature. It is a natural law throughout the whole creation, that “*like produces like*”—*corn produces corn, wheat produces wheat*, etc. So the corruption and depravity in human nature, in the *child*, becomes *developed* in the *man*; and this corrupt and depraved nature descends from parents to children, and is reproduced in them, “*like producing like.*” Adam, we are told, “*begot a son in his own image and his own likeness.*” It is just as natural as for the germ of corn to come from the grain, for children to do wrong and act perversely; and it proves a *natural inclination* in them not to go right!

My friend says, that we inherit our bodies from our parents, but get our souls directly from God; but he fails to prove the last. Now in one sense we get our bodies from God; as he created man, and through the laws of nature he has given, and which he sustains, the human race is continued; as it is “*in him we live, and move, and have our being*” or as Paul quoted from a Grecian poet, “*we are his offspring.*” In that sense we get our souls too—indirectly, as we do our bodies.

RECAPITULATION.

I shall now proceed to recapitulate some of my arguments and positions. The audience will remember the numerous and various quotations I made from the Bible—from both the Old and the New Testaments—to prove the inherent natural corruption and innate hereditary depravity of the human race—all harmonizing with each other and with all the other teachings of the Bible. I showed that the *stream* would be like the *fountain*, from which it flows; and that to make the stream pure, the fountain must be purified; but that if the fountain is impure, the stream must be impure too! So with human nature—the fountain became corrupted in the fall of Adam; and the stream, the human race, has run on down corrupt to our own day! I showed, that if the *tree* was corrupt, the *fruit* must be *corrupt too*, according to our Savior; and the tree must be *made good*, before the fruit would be good—all referring to the same thing. “*How can ye, being evil,*” says he, “*give good gifts to your children?*”

My friend quoted the passage that I did from David, where the Psalmist says: “*Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me* (Psalms 1. i. 5;) and then endeavored to show that David had reference to the sins of his *mother!* But was David *mourning* over *his own*, or his mother’s sins? It was over his *own* sins. He says, it was *he* himself who was shapen in iniquity; and *he* himself, conceived in sin. Nothing can be plainer.

Again, my friend quoted from him, where he says: “*The wicked are*

estranged from the womb.; they go astray as soon as they are horn, -speaking lies;" (Ps. lviii. 3,) and endeavored to get around this, by contending, that David had reference to the corruption that took place *after* they were born, in consequence of the action of evil influences and examples upon them.; and that it was thus they went astray, speaking lies. But notice the order and reasoning of the Psalmist; according to which they are *born* estranged from God, and then *go astray*!

I also quoted from Solomon: "Foolishness [sin] is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him;" (Proverbs xxii. 15,) to show that it was from the natural corruption of the heart; but my friend disposes of this like the other passages I quoted—by having him born pure and uncorrupt, and the "foolishness" to enter into him afterwards! But the wise man says, that it is "*bound*" there, innate, inherent, natural!

Isaiah says of the wicked man, that he "was called a transgressor from the womb," (Isa. xlvi. 8.); but, says my friend, being born without any natural depravity, he *became* a transgressor very early in life, from the influence of evil upon him. At least that is the drift of his reasoning. But the expression, "*from the womb*" shows that he was *born* with the disposition and nature that made him one.

My friend laughs at my references to the corruption of the antediluvians, and regards them as wholly irrelevant and having nothing to do with the hereditary corruption of human nature. But I reply, that no other cause could have been adequate, so soon after Adam, to have produced such widespread and universal corruption of mankind, so that "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth!"

We have seen, that Jeremiah says: "The heart [of man] is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer. lxvii. 9.); but my friend will have it to *become* all this, and that it was not from the *nature* of man! But the prophet tells how it *is*, without saying that it *became* so; and leaves us to infer, that it was from a corrupt nature, inherent in man, and *born* with him. And in accordance with this, and in confirmation of it, we quoted the language of our Savior, that "out of the *heart* proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, thefts, fornications," etc. They come "*out of the heart*," because already there, as the offspring of a depraved, corrupt nature.

We also quoted from Paul: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," (Rom. viii. 7.); as a proof of the natural corruption of mankind; but my friend has the mind at first pure, in the *child*, and to become carnal in the *man*; but the inference from the language is, that this carnal mind, which is enmity against God, is occasioned by a natural depravity in man. Hence James says that "the friendship of the *world* is *enmity* with God." James iv. 4.)

These are only a few of the great number of passages on this subject which I adduced, and could have brought forward more; but several of which my worthy friend seems not to have noticed at all! They show most incontrovertibly, that man possesses a depraved, corrupt nature, inherited and born with him, which is developed in actual sin and wickedness!

Paul says in Romans, as we have already quoted: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," (Rom. v. 12.) Here the apostle

gays positively, that *all* mankind "have sinned;" and there was no other way, in which they could have done so, but in Adam, their federal head and representative, when he fell. This is plainly implied by the expression, "by *one man* [Adam] *sin entered* into the world and there was no other way for them to have sinned in him, than by mankind's *inheriting* his fallen and sinful nature; which is as plainly implied. As "death passed upon all men," *infants* as well as adults—as they are subject to *natural* death, why not to *moral* death too? What is there to exempt them from that, any more than to exempt adults from it? So far as *moral principle* is concerned, there is no difference between infants and adults—it is the same as to both.

I have contended that infants must be saved by the *blood* of Christ, I mean infants dying in infancy—as *all* the redeemed whom John saw, including all the redeemed of the human race, had "washed their robes and made them "*white in the blood* of the Lamb"—and the infants were there, or my friend must exclude them from heaven; and I now call on him, to show a single passage in the Bible, where any are saved *without* the *blood* of Christ, or in any other way than only through Christ! Ho may have their *bodies* saved in some other way; but what applies to the *body* applies to the *soul*.

In conclusion, as I have now gone over my recapitulation, I can aver my honesty and sincerity in all that I have said—in every argument that I have advanced, and every position I have taken. And what I claim for myself, I am willing to concede to my worthy friend, who has been my opponent in this debate; and while I believe him to be sincere, I must regard him as being *in error*, as to his religious sentiments on the points of difference between us. If I did not believe, in all sincerity, the sentiments I have been advancing, I would at once abandon them; but believing as I do, that they are true, and sustained by the word of God, I cannot give them up, or throw them away. My worthy friend has failed to convince me of their error; and what he has said has only confirmed me in them; while I doubt not, from every indication, that he is just as firmly fixed in his!

I return my thanks to the ladies and gentlemen of the audience for the long and patient attention they have given us, and their uniformly good behavior and orderly conduct. I also return my thanks to the moderators, for the impartial and dignified manner, in which they have presided over the discussion.—[*Time expires*].

MR. SWEENEY'S CLOSING REPLY.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I am before you to close the discussion on this proposition; and as we have by mutual consent dropped our proposition on the creed question, this speech will close the debate.

I am a little sorry to see the worthy gentleman manifest the spirit he does just at the close of our discussion. There was no call for the long exhortation of misrepresentation he gave us in his last speech. If he wishes to "convert" me, or any other sensible man, he has certainly taken the wrong course to accomplish his object. One of two things is manifestly true of the gentleman. Either 1st, He is most grossly ignorant of what we teach on baptism; or 2d, He is *disposed* to misrepresent us. If the first be true, then he is hardly excusable, for he should hold his peace. If the latter, then he is certainly less excusable.

He desires to be "instrumental in converting me to God." This is the "unkindest cut of all!" I claim to have been converted to God several years ago. And my *baptism* is not all the evidence I have of the fact. It is a fact of which I am just as well assured as I am that there *is* a God. I may be in error about some things that pertain to Christianity; and if I am, I should like to know it, and should be obliged to Mr. L., for any assistance he might give me. But the gentleman desires to convert me to a religion "which teaches the sinner to put his trust in God, and not in water; and to rely on Christ, and not on baptism, for life and salvation." This means, that I teach the sinner to trust in water, and not in God; to rely on baptism, and not on the Savior, for life and salvation! It is entirely unnecessary for me to say that all this is unfair and untrue: the audience knows it. Although we have never had access to this community, I am perfectly satisfied that the gentleman will fail utterly to make this people believe his charges.

We teach all men to "*trust* in the Lord and *do good*." We believe and teach that *Jesus* is the "author of eternal salvation to all them that *obey him*," and to none others. We also teach, that when the Lord comes to "be glorified in his saints" he will "take vengeance upon such as know not God and *obey not the gospel*." Baptism is simply an act of obedience to the Lord. As Me. WATSON, the distinguished Methodist divine, says, "*It is an act of faith in order to the remission of sins*." The Lord saves; but he saves the *obedient*; baptism is one among other acts of obedience, and is therefore simply a condition of salvation or pardon. But why need I repeat this? Am I not already understood upon this subject? And, by the way, I am devoting my time to a subject already discussed and dismissed. The regeneration and salvation of infants dying in infancy is our subject for today. But what have we learned about it? The affirmant is through, and what has he said at all relevant to the question? Certainly nothing at all. But he undertook to prove the doctrine of "total hereditary depravity," that he might thence *deduce* "infant regeneration," or "infant damnation," thinking, I suppose, that of the two I would choose the former, and thus admit his affirmation! But he has utterly failed to prove any inherent depravity, such as he contends for; in fact, he has manifestly despaired, and fallen back on the former proposition, and fails even to discuss that in anything like a fair way, but simply misrepresents the teachings of myself and brethren! He says we teach the sinner to trust in the water, and not in God!!

But he knows he is right, because he "feels" so and so! This is an argument *common*, not only to my friend and his party, but to many parties. The Mormons, Romanists, Spiritualists, Mohammedans, etc, all make this "feeling" argument! and it proves just as much for one as for another. The fact is, as I have repeatedly said, mere feeling proves just nothing at all. If a man will do just what the Lord requires of him in order to his salvation, he will be saved; and he will have the *word of the Lord for it*, and "good feelings," too.

Whenever the gentleman preaches the truth, I mean to give him full credit for it; and I can do so cheerfully, too. After all he had to say about our making baptism "essential to salvation," he gives us the following: "No one who is a proper subject can willfully neglect it [baptism] and be saved. God will not permit us to set his counsels and commandments at naught, and come off guiltless." Amen, to that! And, by the way, that is about as strong language as I have ever used in reference to the matter. The

gentleman is nearly "orthodox," after all! Of course God will not punish any one for not obeying, "when it is out of his power to obey." Who has said he would? I am sure I have not.

But when the gentleman gets me "converted," I hope he will not require me to preach "total depravity;" for I am certain I could never do any good at that. What! preach to a man that he is "utterly perverse and corrupt in all the faculties of his soul," and "wholly inclined to all evil, and only evil continually;" that he is Incapable of doing a good deed, or of thinking a good thought, and that he is thus bad by nature, and that the wrath of God burns with furnace heat against him continually for what he could no more avoid than he could make a universe; I say, must I preach this to a man to convert him, to turn him to God?

The gentleman gave us quite a discourse on Matt. xviii. 3, in his last speech. He thinks the Savior would have persons to be "as little children" only in *one* respect—they should be *humble* as little children are, but in no other respect should they be like children—lest, I suppose, they should be like a "young lion," a "bear," a "wolf," a "wild ass's colt," or something of that sort! But are we to understand the gentleman that a man can get into the kingdom of heaven simply by becoming *humble*, and this he can do without any purification of heart or soul? So I understand him. For when the Savior said "ye must be *converted* and become *as little children*" to enter the kingdom of heaven, he says he meant that they were only to become "*humble* as little children." Our Lord said of infants, "*of such* is the kingdom of heaven." Did he mean of such *humble* little "lions," "wolves," "tigers? Surely not. He meant "of such" bumble, pure, "holy," harmless beings "is the kingdom of God." And let it be remembered that when I call children "holy," I speak in the language of Paul: "now are they *holy*." And, by the way, I have *triumphantly* failed to get the worthy gentleman to notice this passage, though I have called his attention to it from the beginning of the discussion. What does this mean?

The gentleman thinks Peter's nature was utterly corrupt; and that it was on account of this inherent corruption, that he denied his Lord and "*swore*;" or at least, "Satan made use of his *sinful nature* and caused him to do it." Well, it was this same Satan who "*caused*" Eve to eat the forbidden fruit; and can Mr. L. tell us what "*sinful nature*" Satan "made use of" in her case?

The gentleman informs us that the nature of the *man* is the nature of the *child*; and that the only difference is, the nature of the man is "developed." This is rather bungling! But I suppose he meant, that the child is just as wicked, just as corrupt, as the most wicked and corrupt man, only it does not—cannot—manifest it, while an infant. But this I deny. The child is pure, harmless, "holy;" but evil *influences*, bad *surroundings*—which unfortunately our world is cursed with—make the *wicked man* what he is. It is not simply the "development" of his nature!

If the *nature* of a child is *inherently* and *essentially* corrupt, how could he be "trained up in the way he should go?" How could parents bring up their "children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?" And here I am reminded that the worthy gentleman tried to press some Poet into his service. But if I am not mistaken the Poet, even, was as little favorable to his notion as the Bible. There is no *poetry* in his doctrine—neither

truth nor poetry! The gentleman's doctrine of total hereditary depravity, can never have the virtue of being poetical!

The gentleman told us, that Eve and Adam sinned because they were *tempted*; but since then, men have sinned because they have "inherited a sinful nature." "Adam begat a son in his own image and his own likeness"—that is *morally*, he *assumes*—and so on down, all have inherited a depraved moral nature from Adam, upon the principle that "like produces like." Now let us try this "*principle*." He believes, we know, in a change "from nature to Grace." Then when a man is changed from nature to *Grace*, he is morally *pure* and *holy*; and as "like produces like," and children inherit their moral natures from their parents, his children will be pure and holy also! Will they not? Certainly they will. Then it follows, that only the children of *sinners* inherit corruption in a moral sense, and consequently only they need regeneration, and therefore it is Dot true that "all infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleases."

I cannot say, my friends, that I have noticed all the affirmant's *arguments*, upon this proposition, for arguments have been very scarce if I am a judge; but I think I can safely say, I have noticed about all he has *said* that was half way relevant to the question. And now I must make a brief recapitulation, and our discussion will be wound to a close.

Mr. Logan introduced several passages of Scripture in his first speech—enough to prove any proposition, if they had only been applicable—but these were not introduced to prove *his proposition*, but another, "Hereditary total Depravity." I then showed 1. That if the gentleman could prove his doctrine of depravity, that "infant regeneration" would not follow, as it might turn out that some of Mr. Logan's brethren are right, *who preach "infant damnation."* Take all the advocates of hereditary total depravity together, and more of them have preached *infant damnation*, than ever preached the kind of regeneration Mr. L., contends for. This shows most obviously, that even if I were to admit his assumption as to depravity, it would not follow that *his proposition* affirms truly. If I were to admit all he has *tried to prove*, still his *proposition* would remain without proof. But in the 2d place, I showed that his passages quoted did not prove his doctrine of depravity; but on the contrary, were clearly and forcibly against it! I will again notice a few of them: Genesis vi. 5. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." This passage, as I showed, only teaches that man, at that time, was very wicked—that "the wickedness of man was great in the earth"—but it says nothing as to how man *become* so wicked; as to whether he was so *hereditarily*, or had *become* so by *practice*. But at the 12th verse of this same chapter, the matter is explained: "And God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for [now follows the *cause* of all this corruption] all flesh *had corrupted his way* upon the earth." All men are not said to have *inherited* this corruption; but they "*had corrupted*" their way. But how could this have been the case, if those men had been *born totally* corrupt, as the gentleman contends? A man *born totally* corrupt, can never *corrupt himself*.

The gentleman also quoted, "They go astray as soon as they are born speaking lies." But does not this prove the reverse of what he quoted it to

prove? He aims to prove that all are *born* totally depraved; but his passage teaches that they "go astray." How? "Speaking lies." How could men go astray when they are old enough to speak lies, if they were all *born totally astray*? The worthy gentleman, failing to explain this to us, not only lost his "proof text," but found it turned directly against him.

"They are all gone out of the way. They have altogether become unprofitable" etc. This passage was shown also, not only to be not in his favor, but decidedly against him. These persons could never "have gone out of the way," if they had never been *in* the way—if they had been *born totally out of the way!*

The gentleman also quoted, "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins. Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we ail had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath even as others." But Paul did not say these persons "were dead in Adam's sin," as Mr. L. assumes; but that they were dead in *trespasses* [in the plural] and *sins*" By continuous *trespassing and sinning* they had *become* dead. But Mr. L. needs a passage that will testify that all men are dead, spiritually, in *Adam's sin*! But these Ephesians "were by nature the children of wrath," I am told. I showed you, that *phusei*, the Greek word here translated "nature," means *truly*; and that *Dr. Clarke*, as well as other scholars, have so translated it in several instances in the New Testament. Hence Paul simply teaches here, that by continuous "trespasses and sins" the Ephesians were "dead;" "and were *truly* the children of wrath even as others." To show you that the "wrath of God" cometh upon persons *for their sins*, and not on account of the nature they are *born* with, I cited Paul's language in Col. iii. 5, 6. "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry; *for WHICH THING'S SAKE* the wrath of God cometh on the children of *disobedience*." By "*disobedienee*" men "*treasure up to themselves* wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." So this passage makes nothing for the gentleman's position, but much, against it.

When Paul said: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," he had no reference to the kind of "death" Mr. Logan is contending for, as hereditary from Adam. I believe we all die in Adam, unconditionally—infants and all—but this is a *natural* death—a death of the body, and not of the soul. And from this death all are made alive in Christ, as unconditionally as all die in Adam. But *morally*, the law is, as I have shown, "*The soul that sins it shall die*"—and on account of *personal* transgression.

The infant bears the image of the "earthly" man, inherits physical ills and death, because "all have sinned"—all were represented in Adam, who was from the earth earthy—and will be raised from the dead in Christ. This is all the infant salvation I read of in the Bible—if indeed it may be called a salvation. This is all the infant needs. An infant is incapable of personal, actual sin, and is therefore, I hold, innocent, pure, harmless, "holy."

The worthy gentleman has discovered that "the multitude John saw" had "washed

their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Now, let it be noticed that the multitude John saw are represented as having "*washed their robes*"—did it themselves—"in the blood of the Lamb." This, of course, is figurative language, and means just what Peter meant when he said, "seeing ye have purified your souls in *obeying the truth*." The great multitude that John saw had "*washed their robes* and made them white in the blood of the Lamb"—had "*purified their souls in obeying the truth*." Do, infante "*wash their robes* in the blood of the Lamb?" Do they "*purify their souls in obeying the truth*?" Certainly not. They do not, can not, *need* not do so.

He calls on me "to show a single passage in the Bible where any are saved without the blood of Christ." But this assumes, if this question means anything, that infants are *lost*, are *sinners*, all of which I have denied from the beginning. No one, who is a *sinner*, who is *lost*, can be saved without the blood of Christ, I freely admit. But has he proven that infants are *sinners*, and *lost*? I have contended, and do contend, that infants, morally considered, are as pure and holy and harmless as the bright angels that shine in the blazing splendor of that heaven of light, nearest the throne of God. "In heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father"—"*Of such* is the kingdom of heaven"—"*But now are they holy*." Such are the emanations of the heart of heaven, mothers, concerning your infants. But this ugly doctrine my friend is preaching, makes them as the "*young lion*," the "*bear*," the "*wolf*," or the "*wild ass's colt*!" What a contrast!

I wish it most distinctly understood, my friends, that during this discussion I have not denied, that in all ages of the world men have been, and are yet, great sinners. Men have become most desperately and deplorably depraved. In the days before the flood, men were wretchedly wicked; and it was on account of this great wickedness that God determined to, and did, destroy man, save eight souls, with the flood of waters. But men were not *born* thus wicked; they became corrupt—"all flesh *had corrupted its way*," upon the earth. In the days of David and Solomon, there were very many very wicked men in the world; but their wickedness was not *hereditary*; for we learn that they had "*gone out of the way*;" they had "*together become unprofitable*;" they had "*gone astray, speaking lies*," etc. I simply deny, as you have all understood me doubtless, that men *inherit* their moral corruption and depravity from Adam. I will not thus apologize for the sinful man.

Nor will I agree that man *inherits* anything in his moral nature that *makes* him sin—compels him to pursue evil. And hence the infant needs no such moral regeneration, as Mr. L. preaches to us.

The fact, that men have very generally become sinful, does not prove that they have a corrupt *nature*, as my opponent has assumed in this discussion. Or if it does, then the fact, that Eve and Adam sinned, proves that they had sinful natures! And what other old Adam can we charge their sin to? How shall we apologize for them? Mr. L. should have explained this for us.

We are, it is true, in a worse condition than Adam was, before the fall, in at least two particulars: 1. We have, by transmission, a frail, corrupt, dying *physical* nature. So that we can all say with Paul, "I know that in me (that is, in *my flesh*) dwelleth no good thing." And again, "who shall deliver me from this *body of death*?" 2. We are born into a world where *sin reigns*; and are, consequently, surrounded by evil *influences* from birth. These influences lead us "*astray*" at a very early age. And the simple and well known fact, that the early influences thrown around a man have much to do in moulding his moral character, forever refutes the doctrine of total hereditary depravity.

Parents, your children are born with moral natures pure, innocent, harmless and holy; and you should therefore be watchful and careful that their early impressions are good. Teach them to "remember their Creator in the days of their youth"—"train them up in the way they should go"—"bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

My time is nearly expired. Let me say in conclusion, my friends, that we have had a very *general* discussion on this last proposition. We have had a little to say about a good many different matters. But certainly the gentleman's *proposition* has not been established. It has been almost entirely left out of the discussion. But I hope, after all, our discussion has not been altogether unprofitable.

I thank you, gentlemen Moderators, for the kindness, patience and impartiality you have manifested during our discussion. And you, kind friends, for your presence, patience and attention, are entitled to my heartfelt thanks. Nor am I unthankful to my friend, Mr. Logan, for affording me this opportunity of presenting what I believe to be the *truth* to this community. And may we all finally meet in heaven, to live together forever, is my prayer in the Redeemer's name.—[*Time expires*.]

[After a song, sung by the audience, Mr. S., being called upon by the President, pronounced the Benediction.]

Baptism not generic - 39

Baptism of hogs, - "Devil lost his bacon
baptized no more 40.

Concessions 43

37 Socinians

60 Christians (or Disciples) are the worst -
+ veriest - scrappers of Script. in all the
country

Water Baptism Def, 37,

Difference between { Bapt } Carson } 40
{ Baptiz } Campbell }