

# **BAGBY-TRICE DISCUSSION**

ON

## **The Design and Action of Baptism**

JAMES T. BAGBY (Methodist)  
Barlow, Ky.

W. HALLIDAY TRICE (Christian)  
189 Cox Street, Memphis, Tenn.

---

PRICE, 35 CENTS

---

Nashville, Tenn.

McQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY

1914

## PREFATORY NOTE.

In offering another book to the reading public, we propose to make therefor no apology whatever. The fact that there are many books before the people, and that the greater part perhaps touches some phase of the great theme of religion, we deem of insufficient purport to preclude the offering of this one. The publishers entertain sanguine hopes that a more thorough study of the issues of the following pages may serve to dispense greater Bible knowledge, and that the cause of our Master may be honored by this humble contribution to religious literature.

The occasion leading to the publication of this debate may be noted in the following facts: In February of 1913 Mr. W. H. Trice, of Union City, Term., who was at that time editor and publisher of *Truth and Freedom*, a small monthly religious journal, wrote and published an article entitled "Relics of Rome," in which he argued that *sprinkling* for *baptism*, together with a number of other religious practices, were traceable, in point of authority, to the Roman Catholic Church. This article fell into the hands of Mr. J. T. Bagby, who was at that time pastor of the Methodist Church at Obion, Tenn. Falling to agree with Mr. Trice, he wrote him a letter, in which he offered some criticisms on the position occupied by him in the article. This led to a rather lengthy correspondence on the action of baptism, which was printed in the above-mentioned journal. Mr. Trice suggested the publication of their correspondence in tract form for distribution, to which Idea Mr. Bagby did not incline, but suggested a fuller discussion of both the *action* and *design* of *baptism*, to which Mr. Trice agreed, and to which covenant the following pages attest their fidelity.

Having had an opportunity to examine a part of this debate while it was under discussion, I unhesitatingly pronounce it worthy of consideration at the hands of all who may have opportunity to read it. I consider both disputants sufficiently able to conduct a discussion on the above-mentioned issues to the end that the reader will be intellectually and spiritually benefitted.

With open Bible and heart, accompanied with a prayer for truth, let us "study to shew thyself [ourselves] approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." We commend it to you, dear reader, with a prayer.

T. B. THOMPSON,  
Campbell, Mo.

## **BAGBY-TRICE DEBATE.**

---

PROPOSITION: "The Bible teaches that baptism in water is a condition of salvation to a penitent believer," W. Halliday Trice affirms: J. T. Bagby denies.

---

### **TRICE'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.**

I am profoundly convinced that one of the best and most scriptural ways to expose error and elicit truth is in joint discussion. The apostle Paul conducted a dally debate in the school of Tyrannus for "the space of two years.". (Acts 19:10.) "The Prince of Peace" disputed with Sadducees, Pharisees, and Herodians. (Matt. 22.) If properly conducted, a religious debate is not a personal fight to gain worldly fume, but it is a faithful study and friendly comparison of honest differences to the end that man may be benefitted and God glorified. In this age of broad-mindedness (?) and extreme liberality (?) in religious matters it is refreshing to find a man who has the courage to "earnestly contend" (Jude 3) for that which he believes and practices, and I certainly admire the person who is willing to have his positions tested in the fires of controversy; hence I hail with delight the privilege of discussing these important issues with my worthy opponent.

I firmly believe that baptism is one of the conditions of salvation, otherwise I would not affirm this proposition; but if I am mistaken and my opponent is correct in his contention, my position is unquestionably safe. If God forgives the "penitent believer" before baptism, since he has commanded man to be baptized, surely he will not condemn him for submitting to the requirement; hence it is manifestly safe to be baptized. On the other hand, if my affirmation is true and a person falls to be baptized, thinking, as my opponent does, that he will be saved without it, he may be lost eternally. In temporal affairs we do our best to always be on the safe side of every disputed question. Why not pursue the same course with reference to eternal issues?

I shall now define the terms in the proposition, so that the precise point at issue will be perfectly clear. "The Bible"—the word of God. "Teaches"—to enlighten by express statements or necessary inference. "Baptism in water"—an immersion into the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I shall not make an argument on the action of. baptism at this time, as that will come up in the next proposition; but I desire to ask my opponent the following question: Is the immersion of a proper subject baptism? "A condition of salvation"—*not* the

prime or meritorious CAUSE of salvation, but it is *one* of the STIPULATIONS of the Lord to which man must submit before he is forgiven of his alien sins. "It is God that justifieth." (Rom. 8:33); but in the Christian dispensation, faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of justification. God healed Naaman of the leprosy (2 Kings 5:1-14). but not till he "dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God." There was no curative power in the waters of the Jordan: but God required him to dip himself, and he was not healed until he obeyed. God cured the Israelites of snake bite, but they were commanded to look upon "the serpent" of brass" before he healed them. (Num. 21:4-9.) No one thinks that there was virtue in the brass snake to counteract the poisonous effects of the fiery serpents, but we all believe that God healed them when they complied with the condition named by him. These examples enable us to see the point now under study. Man is saved by the grace of God (Eph. 2:8-10), and he is justified by the blood of Christ (Rom. 5:9); but in order to enjoy the favor of God and get the benefits of the blood of Christ he must comply with the conditions imposed by the Lord. I contend that baptism is *one* of the conditions of salvation to the alien sinner. "A penitent believer"—one who believes on Christ with all his heart and has determined to forsake sin and serve the Lord.

Before submitting my arguments, I want to call attention to a very important truth. In order to find the terms of salvation in this age of the world we must go to Christ after his coronation. The Lord said: "This is my beloved Son: hear him." (Mark 9: 7.) Again: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, HATH IN THESE LAST DAYS SPOKEN UNTO US BY HIS SON." (Heb. 1:1, 2.) There was a time when God spake to the people by the prophets, but he now speaks to us by his Son. Where do we find the sayings of the Son? In the New Testament, to be sure. The Old Testament is the word of God, but the New contains the words of Jesus, to which we must submit in order to be saved. The next question is: When was all power given unto Jesus, and when was his last will and testament made effective? Let the Book answer: "Jesus came and spake unto them, saying. All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28: 18.) "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. FOR WHERE A TESTIMONY IS, THERE MUST ALSO OF NECESSITY BE THE DEATH OF THE TESTATOR. FOR A TESTAMENT IS OF FORCE AFTER MEN ARE DEAD: OTHERWISE IT IS OF NO STRENGTH AT ALL WHILE THE TESTATOR LIVETH." (Heb. 9: 15-17.) These scriptures show, beyond all doubt, that the covenant under which we are was not "of force" until Christ, the testator, was slain, and that he was not given "all power" until he was raised from the dead. It is useless to go to his personal

ministry for a case of conversion. Should you find one. it would not be an example for us, as it would be before the death of Christ.

I shall now present some specific arguments and state them syllogistically.

1. The first is based upon the great commission as given by Mark. After Christ had been raised from the dead and all power in heaven and on earth had been delegated unto him, he said; "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 16:15, 16.) Christ declares that some one shall be saved. "He shall be saved" in the principal clause. What "he?" Just any he?" No. "He that believeth" only? No. But "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Savior Joined faith and baptism by the coordinate conjunction "and," which connects clauses of equal rank; hence they both look to the same end. (a) Faith is a condition of salvation. (b) Baptism in for the same purpose. (c) Therefore baptism is a condition of salvation.

2. The next argument is based upon Acts 2:36-38. The Holy Spirit, speaking through the apostle Peter, said to those persons who asked, "Men and brethren, what shall be do?" "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Repentance and baptism are joined by the coordinate conjunction "and," and "for" cannot have two meanings in the same place and at the same time; hence whatever repentance is for, baptism is also, (a) Repentance is in order to the remission of sins. (b) Baptism is for the same purpose. (c) Therefore baptism is a condition of salvation.

3. My third argument is deduced from the study of the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. Jesus appeared unto him and said: "Go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou *must* do." (Acts 9: C.) Ananias, whom Jesus sent to Saul, said unto him: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22:16.) Therefore to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins was what he **MUST DO**. (a) Whatever is necessary to the forgiveness of sins is a condition of salvation. (I) Baptism in the case of Saul was necessary to the remission of sins, (c) Therefore baptism is a condition of salvation.

4. My last argument for this article is based upon the truth that forgiveness of sins is in Christ, and that we are baptized into him. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Col. 1:14.) "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. 3: 26, 27.) to) Forgiveness of sins is in Christ, (b) Baptism puts one into Christ." (c) Therefore baptism is a condition of salvation or forgiveness of sins.

Before I close this address I desire to ask some questions which I

think will bring out sonic vital points and serve to eliminate much unnecessary discussion. Please give them your attention in your first reply, as they are very important.

1. Can a man be saved who willfully refuses to be baptized?
2. Is baptism a Christian duty?
3. Do not nil Christian duties recur?
4. Does the word "baptism" in Gal. 3:27 mean water baptism?
5. Is baptism an act of faith? 6. Is baptism a work of man?
7. Are men Justified by faith or by faith only?

This ends my first article. If my arguments are fallacious and unscriptural. I urge my opponent to make it plain to our readers.

## BAGBY'S FIRST REPLY.

---

I do not doubt the sincerity of Brother Trice in affirming this proposition, but I do doubt the safety of his position if mine is true. Brother Trice leads an alien sinner to believe that salvation hinges on immersion; that a man may have everything else except immersion, and yet he is not saved; or, at least, he has no promise of salvation until he is immersed. This leads the sinner to think that immersion is the meritorious cause of salvation, and thus he neglects to "repent" from the bottom of his heart, and thereby becomes an unconverted church member without salvation. I know whereof I speak. I heard the gospel, believed it (gave it my assent), repented of my sins (as I thought and as many think), and was baptized into Christ, as Brother Trice would say; and I had no religion at all. One day I realized my lost condition, and, by the grace of God, cast myself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ, and was saved from all past sins. So, you see, it is not safe to teach that immersion is necessary for pardon; for many, like I was, will be deceived.

The Bible, the word of God, the Old and New Testaments, is the criterion by which we are to determine the controversy, according to the proposition; and we are, therefore, at liberty to go to the "personal ministry" of Christ "for a case of conversion," or to any book of the Bible, so far as that is concerned; and every case of conversion we find either in the Old or the New Testament will be germane to the argument, because it is in the Bible, which is the term of the proposition, and I am surprised at my good brother's attempt to limit the term of the proposition, which plainly says the Bible. Besides, Trice does not understand Heb. 9:15-17. In the Septuagint the word "diatheke" is used to translate the Hebrew word "berith," which means *a* covenant and does not signify a will or testament. If Trice's argument were true that Jesus made his last will and testament and gave it validity by his death, then it is apparent that his resurrection three days later rendered it null and void; and if you are right in your opinion, now we have no new testament at all. See? So in Heb. 9 it is not two testaments, or wills, but two covenants, or agreements; and the death is not the death of a "testator," but the death of the sacrifice, which was offered after the ancient custom of sprinkling blood over the covenanting parties to seal the sacred covenant, which was of no force until the sacrifice was slain. The first covenant was sealed with the blood of calves and goats; the second covenant, with the blood of the Son of God, who was not only the mediator of the new covenant.

but also the sacrifice which sealed it, all types combining in him. (Heb. 9:15-26; 13:20; Ex. 24:4-8; Gen. 15:8-18; Mark 14:24.)

You ask: "Is the immersion of a proper subject baptism?" There is no authority for it in the Bible; yet reverence for the formula and charity toward the sincere lead me to recognize it as baptism.

You have given us some syllogisms, and claim through them to have proven the proposition. But I want you to bear in mind that logic has nothing to do with a proposition by itself. It is only in converting or transmuting certain propositions into certain others that the work of logic consists, and the truth of the conclusion is only so far in question as it follows from the truth of the premises. Now, in your first argument I find fault with your making your minor premise general when it should be particular, as that is the only place in the Bible where faith and baptism and salvation are mentioned together; and so you have violated the laws of the syllogism in reaching a general conclusion with a particular minor premise. Besides, this does not cover your case at all, because it says nothing about immersion, and that is the proposition you are affirming and the one thus far you are making a dismal effort to prove. Brother Trice, remember that baptism in water is the proposition you are trying to prove, and something more is requisite to constitute immersion than a passage of scripture in which the word "baptize" occurs. Baptism is not under consideration; but baptism in water is, and there is a great distinction; and if you will keep this in mind, it will "serve to eliminate much unnecessary discussion." Since you failed to show that baptism in Mark 16:16 means water baptism, much less immersion, I take pleasure in showing that it is spiritual baptism. Notice that the belief spoken of is a saving belief; and as baptism is joined to it by the coordinate conjunction "and," it, too, must be an act that the Bible puts emphasis on, and one that will put us in Christ. Keep this in mind also. A man believes with his heart. (Rom. 10:10.) It is the soul that sins (Ezek. 18:29) and needs conversion. (Ps. 19:7.) Therefore, as it is an inward thing that believes, sins, and needs conversion; as that "which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6); as by "one Spirit [not a middleman or carnal priest] we are all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13); as God (not man) has "set the members every one of them in the body" (1 Cor. 12:18); and as the Spirit is received by the hearing of faith (Gal. 3:2), we conclude that the baptism in Mark 16:16 is spiritual. With this the Bible agrees, for it says; "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." The Bible says of Jesus: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Matt. 3:11.) Jesus, therefore, baptizes with the Holy Ghost. Faith is the condition on which the Spirit is received. Therefore, without any violence to reason or revelation, we can read: "He that believeth and is [in the act of believing]"



baptized [with the Holy Ghost] shall be saved" from past sins. All common sense ought to satisfy us that if it is the soul that sins and needs conversion, then it must be Spirit baptism that is to be received on "the hearing of faith."

I want to call your attention to this truth: When leading words in the general vocabulary of the Bible become so mixed up with other words as to make their meaning uncertain, there is always found some text where the passage seems to be original and independent and uttered on purpose to meet the desideratum. So when we find "faith" and "baptism" mixed up so as to lead Brother Trice to think baptism in water is necessary to pardon, we turn to those passages! that are original and independent and that tell us exactly how one is pardoned. Here are some of them: "Thy faith hath made thee whole" (Matt. 9:22); "Thy faith hath saved thee" (Luke 7:60; 18:42); they that receive him are the children of God, even "them that believe on his name" (John 1:12); "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" (John 3:36); "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:43); "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved" (Acts 16:31). Now, if these passages do not teach that a man is saved by faith without immersion, then I am blind in my seeing department.

Brother Trice's position is against the plain word of God. We read: ' There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.' (1 Tim. 2:5.) Now, the Book says there is one mediator, and his theory makes three—namely, Christ, water, and the administrator of immersion. Such a theory puts the penitent sinner's salvation in men and water as much as in Christ, and is contrary to the Bible plan, which says that Jesus alone saves (Acts 4:2); and it does not matter if he does not teach that there is virtue in the water, it amounts to the same thing; for if a sinner cannot be saved without immersion, it follows that he cannot be saved without water and the administrator of immersion; and it does not matter which does the saving, the saving act cannot be done without all three being present. Therefore his position is plainly contradicted by the Bible.

Brother Trice, your second argument (Acts 2:36-38) does not fit your case at all. They were Jews, church members. He charges them with being the murderers of Christ. They denied that he was the Christ—called him an "Impostor" and a "malefactor." They went not only under the old covenant, but they had crucified the Mediator till the new covenant. Thus they had a double duty to perform—to repent of their sins and to make a public atonement for the murder of Christ. Having publicly denied that he was Christ at the bar of Pilate, they must now publicly acknowledge him as the true Christ by being baptized in his name. This was all the atonement they could make for crucifying him, and so it was required of them. As they

were under the old covenant, the same as Moses was, and as Moses sprinkled "all the people," telling them that God had enjoined it upon them (Heb. 9:19, 20), the inference is that they were sprinkled; and if they were not. it yet remains for you to make it plain to our readers that they were immersed, for as yet you have not done so. Sec?

I find fault with your third argument, because it does not loach what you say that it does. The Greek implies: "Standing, he was \_ baptized, having washed away his sins in calling on the name of the Lord." Six English versions translate it "In calling on the name of the Lord." So his baptism was not immersion and was not for remission of sins. Sec?

Answers to questions: 1. If he refuses to be immersed, yen. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. No. 5. No, it is the sign and seal of faith. C. Water baptism is. 7. "By faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3:28.)

## TRICE'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

I appreciate the kindly disposition exhibited by my worthy opponent in his reply. All discussions should be conducted in this spirit, and I feel sure this one will be. I shall now examine his address and show that it does not refute my arguments.

You say my position is unsafe, because it "leads the sinner to think that immersion is the meritorious cause of salvation." You are badly mistaken. I have shown that baptism is NOT "the meritorious cause of salvation," but that it is one *of the conditions of salvation*, just as faith and repentance are terms of pardon. When you teach that "he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16), does that lead the sinner to think that FAITH is "the meritorious "cause of salvation?" "When Jesus said, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish"" (Luke 13:3), did he lead sinners to think that repentance is "the meritorious cause of salvation?" Certainly not. Then why does teaching that baptism is a condition of pardon lead one to so think?

You refer to your experience, and confess that you did not really believe and truly repent, but state that you were deceived and "had no religion at all." It is possible that you were deceived about this important matter, and I do not think such a one is a "penitent believer;" but since numbers of persons who contend as you do have thought they were saved and afterwards decided they were not, I am sure this does not militate against the position that baptism is a condition of salvation. I insist that genuine faith and repentance "from the bottom of the heart" are prerequisites to baptism, while you contend that such a person is already saved. This is the reason my position is safe and yours is dangerous. If a man is saved the very moment he believes, as you think, a penitent believer certainly has remission of sins; and unless you can show that *God* will damn a person for being baptized, my position is unquestionably safe. But if I am correct and you are wrong, the person who fails to obey the Savior in baptism is in great danger. In all of my teaching and practice I endeavor to be scriptural, and at the same time occupy a safe position if I should be mistaken; and yet there are some who say such is a "dangerous doctrine." Before passing from this I desire to ask some questions on the subject of religion: (1) What do you mean by the expression, "I had no religion at all?" (2) Is it something man can err?

In regard to what you say about the Bible being the criterion; I have this to say: I believe the entire Bible; hence I believe that God "hath in these last, days spoken to us by his Son." (Heb. 1: .2.) Is it not

true that the sayings of Christ are in the New Testament? Do you not Know that baptism is a New Testament ordinance, and that it is performed in the name of Christ? (Malt. 28:19, 20.) Then why fill a lot of space expressing wonderment that I go to the New Testament to study the subject of baptism?

Possibly I do not understand Heb. 9:15-17; but suppose it should read "covenant," was it of force before Christ died? When was "nil power" given unto him? You certainly know that it was after his resurrection; and if you rightly divide and properly apply the word of God, you will come this side of the cross to find the terms of admission into the new covenant.

I am astonished to hear you say there is no authority in the Bible for immersion, and still say you "recognize it as baptism;" but as we will need that on the next proposition, I will pass it by for the present.

You next come to my first argument and take some very unusual positions in your *different* efforts to refute it. You first say the syllogism is fallacious, because the minor premise is particular and the conclusion is general. Your reason for so contending is, this is "the only place in the Bible where faith and baptism and salvation are mentioned together." You must admit that in this case salvation is promised after baptism; and unless you can find an example of salvation before baptism under the new covenant, you are the one who has the premises mixed.

But after this you admit that baptism, being connected with faith by the coordinate conjunction "and," is "an act that the Bible puts emphasis on. and one that will put us in Christ." What has become of the "particular premise" and "general conclusion?" The only difference between us is, you say the baptism here mentioned is baptism of the Spirit, while I contend that it is water baptism performed in the name of the Spirit. I shall now show that your contention is wrong, and that my argument is proven by the Bible and approved by you. In giving his account of this same commission, Matthew 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." (Matt. 28:19.) This shows beyond question that the baptism of the commission was administered by men into the name of the Spirit. My opponent uses this formula when he baptizes people, I am sure. You correctly say: (a) Jesus baptized with the Holy Ghost. (b) The baptism of Mark 16:16 is performed by men. (c) Therefore it is not the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Again: (a) The measure of the Spirit called a baptism was a promise to be enjoyed. (Joel 2:28; Matt. 3:11.) (b) The baptism of the commission is a command to be obeyed, (c) Therefore this is not the baptism in or with the Spirit. To show still more conclusively that you are mistaken about persons being baptized in the Holy Spirit in this age, I will name several other reasons: (1) There are only two recorded accounts of the baptism in the Holy Spirit

(Acts 2 and 10). but the baptism of the commission is for every creature. (2) The baptism in the Spirit was attended by miraculous manifestations, and the days of miracles are past. (3) "All flesh," which means all nations—Jews and Gentiles—were to receive the baptismal measure of the Spirit. (Joel 2:28.) The Jews received him at Pentecost and the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius; hence he came upon "all flesh." Therefore that promise was fulfilled about A.D. 41, and there has not been such a miraculous manifestation of the Spirit since. (4) Paul says there is "one baptism." (Eph. 4:6.) Brother Bagby affirms that the sprinkling of water upon a proper subject is baptism. Therefore one of three things is true: (1) Bagby and all others who practice water baptism are sinning; (2) two equals one; (3) or people are not baptized in the Holy Spirit in this age.

But you quote: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. 12: IS.) I believe the passage, but it does not teach that *the Spirit is the element in which the baptism is performed*; but the baptizing is done by the authority or instruction of the Spirit. Suppose I should say twenty persons were baptized by J. T. Bagby into the Methodist Church; would you think Bagby was the *element in which* or *with which the baptisms* were performed, or would you think he was the *agent* that did the work? When the Spirit through Peter told the Pentecostians to repent and be baptized, and they obeyed him, they were baptized by the Spirit. This certainly explodes your theory of Holy-Spirit baptism, which necessitates a miracle every time a person is converted.

But still being dissatisfied with his attempt, he quotes a number of passages which mention faith and salvation, and concludes (?) that baptism is not a condition of salvation! Had you answered question No. 7, "Are men justified by faith or BY FAITH ONLY?"-you would not now be filling space with such irrelevant scriptures. Here is his answer: "By faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3:28.) If that is not an evasion, I never saw one. I believe your statement with all my heart, and I also believe that persons are justified by faith; out for the following reason I do not believe that they are justified by FAITH ONLY: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and NOT BY FAITH ONLY." (James 2:24.) Will you please answer that question in your next reply?

The passages you cite neither disproved my position nor prove your contention; but that all may see your efforts, I will examine them. "Thy faith hath made thee whole." Why did you not read the connection? Let us read it, and I think the reason will be apparent: "And, behold, a woman, *which* tons diseased *with an* issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and *touched the hem of his garment*: for she said within herself. If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole. But Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her, he said. Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole."

Matt. 9:20-22.) Why did you quote this? You started to "tell us exactly how one is pardoned." The casual reader can see that this refers to the healing of a physical ailment and does not "tell *exactly how one is pardoned*" of sins. You next cite Luke 7:50 and 18:42. neither of which sustains the doctrine of salvation by faith only. The first tells, of the woman who washed the Savior's feet and wiped them with her hair. Is that a case of salvation by faith only? The second tells of the blind beggar who said to Jesus: "Lord, that I may receive my sight." Jesus said: "Receive thy sight, thy faith hath saved thee." Brother Bagby, is this another case that "tells us exactly how one is pardoned?" You next say: "They that receive him are the children of God, 'even to them that believe on his name.'" Let us read it and see if he has given the correct Idea: "He came unto his own, and bin own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he POWER TO BECOME THE SONS OF GOD, EVEN TO THEM THAT BELIEVE ON HIS NAME." (John 1:11, 12.) You say the believer is a child of God; the Bible says he has the POWER OR RIGHT TO BECOME ONE. I like the Bible better. "He, that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" (John 3:30) you quote next. Do you mean that every person who believes on Christ, and that *only*, hath eternal life? "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:31, 32.) Are these already FREE and children of God, Brother Bagby? Jesus says: "Ye are of your father the devil." (Verse 44.) Therefore a believer on Christ is not necessarily a child of God, and you have not told us yet "exactly how one is pardoned." In order to see that John does not mean one who believes only, hut the obedient believer, let us read the verse in the Revision: "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that *obeyeth not the Son shall not see life.*" "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) Who received the remission of sins? The one who believes only? No, but he that *gets unto* or through the name of Christ. Men are baptized into his name. (Matt. 28:19.) Therefore the baptized believer receives remission of sins. I thank you for suggesting my fifth argument.

"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved." (Acts 16:30.) Why did you not read the connection? Was Paul laboring under the great commission, or did he mean to contradict the Savior? Here are two statements: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;" "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" Do they contradict? According to Bagby, they do; but according to the Bible, they do not. Paul did not say, "Believe only, and thou shall be saved;" but, as the context shows, he taught the same doctrine that Jesus preached: "Relieve on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved, and thy 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; and *was baptized*, he and all his, straightway." The passages to which you refer mention faith, but do not mention baptism; therefore you conclude: "Now, if them' passages do not teach that man is saved by faith without immersion. *then I am blind in my seeing department.*" Wonderful logic! Repentance is not mentioned in those passages; hence if man is not saved by faith without repentance, you are blind in your seeing department!

You say: "Now, the Hook says there is one mediator, and his theory makes three—namely, Christ, water, and the administrator of immersion." (1 Tim. 2:5.) In precisely the same way your theory makes six mediators—namely, Christ, faith, repentance, prayer, hearing, and -the preacher; for "how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Horn. 10:14.) With all my heart I believe there is one mediator between God and man; but that does not keep me from believing that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of salvation.

Your answer (?) to my second argument is rather to be pitied than censured, and really needs no mention from me. The Pentecostians were Jews and proselytes; but Peter was laboring under the world-wide commission, and said: "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 2:39.)

The third argument stands undisturbed. Why did you not rule it out on the same ground as the Pentecostians? Saul was a Jew, was he not? But you complain at the translations, and say the Greek "Implies" so and so. I do not feel able to make a new version of the Bible, but I do know that the Greek does not imply what you say.

You did not mention my fourth argument; but as it is before the renders, I will pass on.

I shall now refer to the question and close. You miss the point in the first. We will discuss immersion in the next proposition. Please answer this question: Can a man be saved who willfully refuses to be baptized? Do not hide behind "Immersion," but put your own construction on the word "baptize." You say that baptism is a Christian duty, and that all Christian duties recur. Should baptism be repeated weekly, monthly, or yearly? Since baptism is not an act of faith, and as it is impossible to please God without faith (Heb. 11: C), do you not sin when you baptize folks? You say water baptism is a work of man. I deny it, and demand the proof.

## BAGBY'S SECOND REPLY.

I appreciate beyond my power of expression the kind words of my opponent respecting the manner in which I reply, and I assure him I reciprocate the kind feeling from the depths of my soul. I have the tenderest regards for him, and am trying to teach him the truth that he may teach others the truth as "it is in Jesus."

After the smoke of battle has cleared away from my brother's second affirmative, I find my rebuttal arguments standing unmoved, still able to withstand the attacks of my opponent. They cannot be overthrown, because they are founded on the Bible, and Brother Trice cannot explain away the word of the Almighty God. But for the sake of ' my readers I will examine the errors of his second affirmative. I deny that you have "shown that baptism in water is *one* of the conditions of salvation," or that you have shown baptism in water at all. Every passage of scripture you cited in which "baptize" occurs the baptism would have been exactly convenient without adding to or taking from the Bible account one letter, syllable, or word. if it had been done by sprinkling. Sprinkling is the mode of the Old Testament; and if the New ever changed it, there is no record of it. Now, I will show that water baptism in the Bible is not immersion. Eph. 5:25, 26: "As Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing [cleansing] of water by the word." Now, let us see what this proves. What is done to effect the washing ("loutron") here? Two words are used—(1) "sanctify," (li) "cleanse." Notice the word "sanctify." How did they ritualistically sanctify the church or people? Heb. 9:13, 19 and Num. 19:13, 18 tells us it is done by sprinkling the water. "Cleanse." How did they cleanse them? Num. 8:7: "Thus shall thou do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle wafer of purifying upon them," Ezek. 36:25 refers to this cleansing and names only the sprinkling of water as affecting it: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean"—cleansed. There is no doubt that this mode is sprinkling.

All immersionists say that Heb. 10:22 refers to "Christian baptism," and Moses and Ezekiel say that the washing was done by sprinkling purifying water or clean water upon the parties. The word translated "body" in this text is used elsewhere to denote only a part of the body. See John 13:8, 9, 10; Matt. 26:7, "poured it on his head;" verse 12, "on my body," verse 10, "upon me." So when any part of the body is sprinkled, it is called in the Bible "washing" or "cleansing" the body, and that is Christian baptism. Then "the



washing of regeneration" is that "which he shed [poured out] upon us abundantly," which is a metaphorical use of words based on the *actual* pouring out of water on the subjects baptized, symbolizing the Spirit. (Isa. 44:3.) Now, this washing or cleansing is called by Paul in Heb. 9:10 "baptism," and he uses the same word ("baptismois") that Christ used in the commission, and in verse 13 he tells how the baptism was done: "Sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." Now, I have shown that sprinkle is baptism, and that it ritualistically cleanses and purifies. But Brother Trice was to affirm that immersion is baptism, and that it is essential to pardon; but so far he has produced no argument at all to prove immersion; and when I have asked him to do BO, he strokes his chin and remains painfully silent. Your argument that baptism in water is for the remission of sins has been perfectly refuted.

I am sorry for any man who does not know what having religion is... The very fact that you ask about it is proof positive that your position is dangerous. I mean when I had no religion I was out of harmony with God and was not regenerated or born again; but when I was born again, from that time on I have a personal experience, which gives rest to my soul, and I am now living in a conscious relation with God, and the Spirit of God dwells in me (1 Cor. 6:19), and God has given me his Spirit, as he gave him unto the Thessalonians (1 These. 4:8) and as he has given him to all who obey him (Acts 5:22). Brother Trice, have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed?

No, I do not know that "all power" was given unto Christ "after his resurrection;" for John says: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." (John 1:3.) I like John better than Trice. Certainly the sayings of Christ are in the New Testament, but very few of his sayings are recorded after his resurrection. No, I do not know that baptism is a New Testament ordinance. Baptism, according to the Bible, was instituted at the Red Sea, and administered by God himself nearly sixteen hundred years before there was a New Testament, and Paul says he would not have us Ignorant about it. (1 Cor. 10:1.) This is pure water baptism; and if you will read Ex. 14:22, 29; 1 Cor. 10:1; Ps. 77:16, 20, you will find that the mode was pouring rain from the clouds. As usual, you are wrong again. So you see that I have much room for surprise when you go to the New Testament to study the subject of baptism when it was instituted in the Old. Brother Trice, if I were to "come this side of the cross to find the terms of admission into the new covenant," I would cut out Pentecost: for Peter took his text from the Old Testament, from the prophets, and he explained and expounded as he went along, and occasionally he would read a selection from Moses. Brother Trice, you seem to think that John the Baptist and Christ and the apostles each had a Morocco-bound, gilt-edge copy of

the New Testament and carried it around with him for more than fifty years before it was written. The simple truth is, John had been dead something about one hundred and fifty years before the New Testament writings were adopted by the church as a part of the Bible. So the Old Testament is the one tinder which John baptized, the one out of which Christ preached and to which he appealed on all occasions. It is the only Bible out of which the apostles preached, and in keeping with which all the usages of the New Testament were planned. So if I were to come this side of the cross to find the terms of the new covenant, I would tear the New Testament all to pieces and cut out every conversion, for they all happened before the New Testament was written. How many more times are you going to try to tear up the Bible?

Brother Trice, all that were admitted into the new covenant, as I have shown, in the Bible, were admitted under the Old Testament, which is called "the scripture of truth." (Dan. 10:21.)

Again, Paul tells us as plainly as words can tell that the gospel was preached to Abraham (Gal. 3:8), and that Abraham received the gospel covenant in Jesus Christ, and that he was saved by faith. Brother Trice, if you are saved, you are saved by the gospel covenant in Jesus Christ, and Abraham was saved the same way. Is that not enough? lint I will yet give you a few passages to show that Christ existed in a real scriptural sense as the Redeemer and Savior from before the foundation of the world, and not "after his resurrection:" 1 Pet. 1:16-20; 2 Tim. 1:8, 9. Even the atonement is older than the race. It is the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8), who is the Savior of mankind. So we may truly have "hope of eternal life, which God. that cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Tit. 1:2.)

You need not be astonished at my saying there was no authority for immersion. If there is, give it.

I plainly refuted your position in your first argument, and showed by the Bible that the baptism in Mark 16:16 is spiritual; but you cite Matt. 28:19 to show that my contention that it is spiritual is wrong; but it does not refute my argument. The man part of the commission is only the sign and seal of the baptism of the Spirit. The Spirit is the agent by which we get into Christ (1 Cor. 12:13), the result of which is salvation; and since proselytes were always baptized to let the public know they had changed faiths, the command is: "Go, . . . teach (make proselytes of) all nations, baptizing them [or, as the Greek has it, "having baptized them"] in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup> Examine the meaning and order of the words as given by Christ: "Teach ["matheteusate"—i. e., take under tutelage] all nations, baptizing ["baptisantes"—or, "having baptized"] them: . . . teaching ["didaskontes"] them to observe," etc. This shows that after they had taken all nations under

tutelage and had made proselytes of them, after that they gave them the badge of citizenship, or baptized them; and then they taught them. This only shown that they were baptized after they had enlisted as pupils in the school of Christ, which they did by faith; and then in the act of faith, being baptized by the Holy Ghost and saved trout Bin, they were to take the sign and seal of this enlistment by being baptized with water. So your position is false, and is not "proved by the Bible." Of course the Holy Spirit was promised; and when any one is baptized by him, certainly he can enjoy him; but that does not prove that he docs not do the work in the commission as I said he did and as I have proved by the Bible. So there is no immersion here, and the man part of the baptism is only a sign of the faith and is not for life remission of sins.

Speaking about arguments that are "rather to be pillled than censured," I think your statement, "There are only two recorded accounts of the baptism" of the Holy Spirit, double discounts them all. But, Brother Trice, the Bible says no such thing. In Acts 8:17 we read that Peter and John went down to Samaria and prayed for those who "had received the word of God," and laid "their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Acts 19:6: "When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them." Acts 4:31: "And when they had prayed; . . . they we're all filled with the Holy Ghost." Acts 13:52: "The disciples were filled with Joy, and with the Holy Ghost." Deacons were full of the Holy Ghost. (Acts 6:3.) The Ephesians are commanded to be filled with the Holy Ghost (Eph 5:18); and Acts 5:32 says that the Holy Ghost as a witness is given to all that obey God. So you see that there have been many "such miraculous manifestations of the Spirit since." The fourth thing that God has set in the church is "miracles." Will you give me your authority for setting them out? God set them in. (1 Cor. 12:28.) Again you are wrong.

No, Brother Trice, Bagby and Paul are agreed on Eph. 4:6. There is but one baptism; that is spiritual; and water sprinkled on a person is water baptism and symbolizes that the one baptism has taken place. So Bagby is not sinning, as you Bald, and people are baptized with the Holy Spirit in this age when they exercise faith. (Gal. 3:2.) But Trice and his sect sin when they dip in creek water and falsely call it a "birth," for Spirit baptism only can baptize us into Christ; and the Spirit is the agent, and not the element, as you seem to think from your reference to being baptized into him. I answered every question you asked me. See my first reply.

You did not refute one of the passages that I gave to show that a man is saved from past sins by faith, and the connection does not after the case at all. If faith in Christ is able to save a man from disease, it is able to save the soul from sin; and every one of the passages show that faith did the saving. Some of them refer to being saved from

sin, especially John 3:36; Acts 10:43; and Acts 16:30. Paul and Jesus both say that faith saves. Bagby says so, too. Trice says not, but faith and immersion do. Therefore, Trice, and not Bagby, is wrong. Paul did not say, "be baptized, and thou shall be saved;" but, "Believe, and thou shall be saved." And when he was saved, baptism did not unsave him, especially as it was a sign of his receiving the Spirit by faith.

As a man cannot by your theory be saved without immersion. I still way that it is against 1 Tim. 2:5, because you have to have the middleman before any one can be saved, thus having a man and water to come between a man and his Cod. As a man, by my theory, can be saved without a preacher and can without any assistance from man do what I say he must do to be saved, I have only "one mediator." Thus I am right and you are wrong.

Pity will not refute my second argument. As you did not try to answer it, it stands unmoved.

You know that your third argument is refilled. Paul was baptized standing, and his sins were washed away "in calling on the name of the Lord." All ancient English versions before James' read: "In calling on the name of the Lord." I believe that six versions are better than one; so Paul was saved in prayer, and not in immersion. I do not know whether you feel able to make a new version of the Bible; but some of your sect have fell able to do so, and have done it. But I do know that Paul was saved "in calling on the name of the Lord;" and he was not baptized in order to be saved, but because he was saved. Down you go again!

In regard to my not mentioning your fourth argument, I will say that I abundantly answered it in showing that "baptize" in Mark 16:16 is spiritual but I will notice it a little more. You cite Gal. 3:26.. 27. The Bible says that the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13), and not a man, is the agent by which this baptism is administered. You say man; the Bible says Spirit. I will take the Bible, for it is sure to be right. Besides, your proposition is immersion; that is Spirit poured. So you «re wrong again in it being water baptism, and you have produced no argument to show that it is immersion. Brother Trice, I do not know what you will do when you deny; but I do know that you have failed to produce one argument to prove, that immersion it baptism. As I have nothing else to do, having refilled till your arguments. I will give a few more objections to your theory. In 1 Cor. 1:14-17 Paul says: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, hut Crispus and Gaius. . . And I baptized also the household of Stephanas. . . . For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Notice the testimony here given: (1) Paul thanked God that he had left all the Corinthians in their sins, except two persons and one household, if baptism in water is essential to pardon; (2) Christ left out one of the essentials to pardon when he commissioned Paul to preach, if immer-

sion is necessary to pardon; for he says: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Paul says again that the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1:16.) See now what we have: (1) The gospel Eaves "every one that believeth." (2) If baptism by immersion is a part of the gospel that saves, and Paul was sent to preach that gospel, he was, of necessity, sent to baptize; but he says he "was not sent to baptize." Therefore, immersion is not essential to pardon, and there is not a single word in the Bible to warrant such an opinion; for if there was, Trice would show it, and this he has failed to do.

Brother Trice, I am disappointed in you; for I had heard that you occupied a solitary niche in the temple of fame as a debater; but instead of living up to your name, you have acted childlike and have taken, for granted the very thing that you were to prove, and have presented no argument to prove immersion at all. If I were you, I would never debate again until I learned at least one argument in support of my position; and I would get me up a nobler and more effective plea, even the Bible plea of justification by faith; and everywhere I went I would declare that true religion is an impartation of divine life in the human soul by the Spirit through faith in Christ Then you would know what having religion is.

## TRICE'S LAST AFFIRMATIVE.

---

I am indeed sorry that my opponent is so averse to this issue, and is so anxious to discuss the next proposition. He has spent about half of his time in his two replies combating immersion and endeavoring to show that sprinkling is baptism. I am affirming that water baptism is a condition of salvation; and if you think sprinkling is baptism, you should show that it is not a condition of pardon. At the proper time and place I will show that sprinkling is not baptism, but I do not propose to be drawn away from the design of the ordinance till we have finished this proposition. When you get in the lead on the action of baptism, I assure you that I will examine every passage you introduce and make an effort to show that they do not sustain your contention; but as we are not debating the ACTION, but the DESIGN, and as I do not want to "torment you before the lime," I will pass your arguments on sprinkling for baptism and continue to discuss the issue now under study.

But In your eagerness to get away from this issue you have actually made an argument on my side of the question.. You say that the people were "cleansed" and "SANCTIFIED" by sprinkling water upon them, but you contend that sprinkling is baptism; therefore, per your theory, baptism is a condition of salvation. Should you say the sprinkling cleansed the *body*, and not the soul, then I will show that sprinkling is not baptism. "When any part of the body is sprinkled, it is called in the Bible '*washing*' or '*cleansing the body*' and that is *Christian baptism*" (J. T. Bagby.) The apostle Peter says baptism is "*not the putting away of the filth of the flesh.* " (1 Pet. 3:21. ) So Bagby is wrong, and all that he has said about sprinkling the *body* or *flesh* to "effect". its cleansing does not prove that sprinkling is baptism.

In answer to my questions on religion you ignore the *main* one and express sorrow for me. Since you refuse to consider the Bible definition of religion and confuse it with salvation, regeneration, and the gift of the Spirit, I am constrained to say, "Weep not for me, but for yourself" and those who follow such teaching. James says: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is *this [this what? "Regeneration, " "salvation, " "Spirit of God dwells in me?" No; hut it is THIS], TO VISIT THE FATHERLESS and WIDOWS in THEIR affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.* " (James 1: 27. ) Do you not know that it is both unscriptural and absurd to talk of "GETTING" and "HAVING," "visiting the fatherless and widows in their

affliction, etc.? "The Bible promises the gift of the Spirit to those who obey God. (Acts 2: 38. ) I have obeyed him, and hence claim the promise; but It displays a lack of Bible information to confuse this with religion—A THING THE SAVED SOUL SHOULD PRACTICE.

You contend that Christ had "all power" before his resurrection, because all things were made by him In his preexisting state. What does he mean when, prior to his resurrection, he says, " I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, *but the will of him that tent me*" (John 6: 38); but after he was raised he says, "ALL POWER IS GIVEN UNTO ME in heaven and in earth" (Matt, 28: 18)? Did he have "all power" all the time? The physical world was made by Christ as the Word, but he was not given the authority to name the terms of admission into the new covenant until he was raised from the tomb. It does not matter when the words of the new covenant were put In book form, or whether the apostles ever saw a "Morocco-bound" New Testament or not; since we are to hear Christ (Heb. 1: 1, 2), and the new covenant was not effective till Christ died (Heb. 9: 15-17), we certainly ought to come this side of his death to learn the terms of entrance. Your remark about cutting out Pentecost because Peter referred to the Old Testament is both amusing and absurd. Peter quoted from the prophets, to be sure; but when he told those persons what to do, he gave them the words of the Spirit, by which he was inspired. You seem to think that the apostles had to depend upon the Bible for information just as we do; but as "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1: 21), you are mistaken. "The simple truth is, " the Spirit gave us the New Testament through inspired men, and It does not matter when the " writings were adopted by the church, " It contains the teaching of Christ and the apostles, to which we must submit. The gospel was preached unto Abraham in promise, "saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed" (Gal. 3; 8); but the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ—the facts of the gospel (1 Cor. 15: 1-4)—were not proclaimed until Christ was raised from the dead. Abraham had to believe on the coming Christ and obey the commandments of God, but to contend that we are required to express our faith in the same overt acts that he did is out of the question. On the other hand, we must believe that "Jesus Christ IS COME IN THE FLESH" (1 John 4: 2), and that he HAS ACTUALLY BEEN raised from the dead (1 Cor. 15: 17); but Abraham could not believe these things, as they were not true in his day. So it is about baptism. Jesus had not said, " He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, " in the lime of Abraham; but in the Christian dispensation every responsible person is commanded to be baptized.

The passage which says Christ stood as the " Lamb slain from the foundation of the world " (Rev. 13: 8) does not contradict the scriptures which declare that he was actually slain (Matt. 27: 35) about A. D. 33; but it simply teaches that he stood slain in type and prophecy.

Peter says: "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was *foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you.*" (1 Pet. 1:19, 20.)

You make light of *my* statement that "there are only two recorded accounts of the baptism in the Holy Spirit." The manifestation of the Spirit mentioned in Acts 2 and 10 is called a "baptism;" but since you cannot find another demonstration of the Spirit called a "baptism," you are to be pitied in your search. I believe every scripture you quoted on this point, but not one of them says one word about baptism in the Spirit. Do you not know the difference between the baptismal measure and the gift of the Spirit? But the measure of the Spirit here mentioned is not promised to the man who believes ONLY, but to those that obey God. (Acts 6: 32.) The Spirit is not given to make us sons; but "because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts." (Gal. 4: 6.) You cap the climax with these statements: "The fourth thing that God has set in the church is miracles. Will you give me your authority for setting them out?" The first thing God set in the church was "apostles," "then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." (1 Cor. 12:28.) Will you give me your authority for setting them out? Do you still have apostles in the church of which you are a member? Can you speak in unknown tongues and heal the sick? If no, why do you contend that miracles are still performed? If yes, why do you not join the Mormons?

You and Paul do not agree on Eph. 4:5. Paul declares that there is ONE baptism; while you contend that persons are baptized in the

Holy Spirit, and that the sprinkling of water upon a proper subject is *baptism—not just a symbol, but the thing itself.* The symbol and the thing symbolized are TWO THINGS; and if you ever agree with Paul, you will have to either give up your proposition that "sprinkling is baptism" or cease teaching that every person who is saved is miraculously baptized in the Holy Spirit, unless perchance you can prove that. Paul meant TWO when he said ONE! As to baptism being spiritual. I agree with you; but there is a wonderful difference between that and baptism in *the Spirit as the element.* When we speak of Christian baptism, no one imagines that Christ is the *element* in which the baptism is performed; but all know that it simply means that Christ authorized it, and that it is performed in his name. So when Paul says, "By one Spirit are we all baptized" (1 Cor. 12: 13), he does not mean that the Spirit is the *element*, but that the Spirit directs the matter and that it is done in the name of the Spirit; hence it is spiritual. But you have surrendered the whole contention when you say: "The Spirit is the agent by which we get into Christ." If the Spirit is the agent, he cannot be the *element*; hence your theory of baptism is the Spirit is exploded. Since the Spirit is the *agent*, will you please tell us what



the *element* is? In my last article I showed that when the Spirit through Peter told the Pentecostians to be baptized, and \when they obeyed him, they were baptized by the Spirit. Of course the Spirit OOPS not baptize *personally*; but just as Christ "baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but bin disciples)" (John 1:1, 2). so "by one Spirit we are all baptized." Christ never baptized a person with his own hands, but every person who is scripturally baptized is baptized by him. Can you POP how Christ can baptize people through the instrumentality of men? Then why can you not see that a person may be baptized by the Spirit an the agent, and still see that man has a part in the matter? If you ever get your "seeing department" adjusted, you will be ashamed of this statement: "You nay man, the Bible says Spirit!" Your position of the baptism of the Spirit is unique. In one breath you Bay the Spirit is the *agent*. In the next you say: "Your proposition is immersion; *that* is Spirit *poured*." *Pour the agent!* What will you say next?

I have completely exploded your objection on the "one mediator" (1 Tim. 2:6), and do not have the time to discuss it further; but if . you will find in the Bible where & person received the forgiveness of sins and the third person was not present or easily accessible, I will consider it further.

"I answered every question you asked me." I wonder! I am going to take the time and space to show Just how many you answered and how you answered them.

1. "Can a man be saved who willfully refuses to be baptized?" Your answer: "If he refuses to be immersed, yes." In my reply I showed that you had missed the point, and repeated the question, following it with this statement: "Do not hide behind 'Immersion.' but put your own construction on the word ' baptize.'" "But he strokes his chin and remains painfully silent," and still he has the temerity to say I answered your questions'. I think you must have "smelt a mice." If you say a man can be saved who willfully refuses to obey Hie command to be baptized (Acts 10:48). I will let John answer you: "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2:4). If you say such a character will be lost, then away goes your "scare crows" about the man to do the baptizing and the pious unbaptized. So silence was golden. I insist that you answer it in your last.

2. " Is baptism a Christian duty? "

3. " Do not all Christian duties recur?" You say "Yes" to both of these. I then asked you: "Should baptism be repeated weekly, monthly, or yearly?" And silence was golden again; and remember, too, that he answered my questions! You are in a dilemma on this, from which escape is difficult, it not impossible. The only way out is to give up that old erroneous and unscriptural doctrine that baptism is a Christian duty. I challenge you here and now to find where Christ —

ever commanded a Christian to be baptized. Will you try it? The Lord's Supper, visiting the sick, and all other Christian duties recur; and if baptism is one, you should be able to give us an example and toll us how often it should be repeated. The fact is, baptism, preceded by faith and repentance, is the act by which God "hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son" (Col. 1:13), because we are baptized *into* Christ (Gal. 3:27).

4. "Does the word 'baptism' in Gal. 3:27 mean water baptism?" You say, "No." As I have abundantly shown that it is, "I will pass on.

5. "Is baptism an act of faith?" You answer: "No, it is the sign and seal of faith." What do you mean by "the sign and seal of faith?" Please give chapter and verse for such a statement. If baptism is not an act of faith, every person who is baptized displeases God, for it is impossible to please him without faith. (Heb. 11:6.) The truth is, baptism is an act of faith, because believers are the only ones that are commanded to be baptized. Will you please give us the passage that authorizes you to baptize persons without faith?

6. "Is baptism a work of men?" You say: "Water baptism is." I denied that and demanded the proof, but you are "painfully silent" again. Some preachers quote "not of works" and apply it to baptism; but when asked to show that baptism is a work, the demand is ignored. Brother Bagby, if your life depended upon it, you could not find a passage that even intimates that baptism is a work of man. Then why did you make the statement? You may say man submits to it. That is true; man believes also. But the Bible says faith is the work of God. (John 6: 29.) Faith, repentance, and baptism are all acts of the individual; but since God commands them, they are righteous acts of God to which man submits. (See Rom. 10:1-4.)

7. "Are men Justified by faith or by faith only?" You answer (?): "By faith," "without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3: 28.) In my second affirmative I showed that you had evaded the question, and begged you to answer it in your reply; but again we have more "painful silence!" Bagby, I believe men are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law; but I do not believe that they are Justified "BY FAITH ONLY." Do you? Will you please answer this in your next? All the scriptures that you quote that mention faith do not militate against baptism any more than they do repentance; but as they were examined in my last, I will pass on.

You claim that Paul was not commissioned to baptize, because he said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 1:17); and still we read that he did baptize some. One of two things is certain: Paul was either laboring under the great commission, which imposed baptism upon every intelligent creature (Mark 16:15, 16), or he was in open rebellion to it, and sinned when he taught it and baptized a few. Now, to show that you do not understand the

above passage, I will show the absurdity of your contention and then explain the passage. Paul was "not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel;" therefore baptism is nonessential to salvation. Let us try that logic on a similar passage. Jesus says: "I CAME NOT TO SEND PEACE, BUT A SWORD." (Matt. 10:34.) And, according to your logic, peace is very unnecessary, if not sinful! What is the meaning? Simply that he did not bring peace only, but a sword also. So it was in the other case. Paul's mission was not simply to baptize, but to preach the gospel also. He elves his reason for mentioning this at this time in the following words: "Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." (1 Cor. 1:16.) Then you are wrong from another consideration. You conclude that Paul did not teach baptism, and that it is non-essential, because he only baptized a few with his own hands. Christ never baptized a single person with his own hands, and still the Bible abounds with his teaching on the question. So your objection is indeed weak.

I shall now restate my arguments and close the debate on this question.

1. My first argument was based upon the commission as given by Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Son of God connects faith and baptism by the coordinate conjunction "and;" hence they both look to the same end. (a) Faith is a condition of salvation. (b) Baptism is for the same purpose. (c) Therefore baptism is a condition of salvation. You agree with the construction of the sentence, but say this is baptism in the Holy Spirit. I then showed that you were mistaken, because (1) Jesus administered Holy Spirit baptism, and the baptism of the commission was administered by man in the name of the Spirit (Matt. 28:19); (2) the measure of the Spirit called a "baptism" was a promise to be enjoyed, while the baptism of the commission was a command to be obeyed (Mark 16:15, 16). Hence this argument stands unrefuted.

2. My second argument was based upon Acts 2: 36-38. I showed that repentance and baptism are connected by the coordinate conjunction "and," and that "for" cannot have two meanings in the same place at the same time; hence whatever one is "for" the other is also. (a) Repentance is in order to remission of sins, (b) Baptism is for the same purpose. (c) Therefore baptism is in order to remission of sins. Your only effort to refute it was: "They were Jews, church members." Cannot a Jew be a "penitent believer?" Nicodemus was a ruler in the Jewish church, but he had to be born of water and the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom of God. (John 3:1-5.) But as I have already shown that Peter was under the great commission that included "all nations." it is useless to consider it further. Your effort on this is decidedly the weakest I ever saw. The argument stands untouched.

3. I next showed that Jesus said to Saul: "Go into the city, and it

shall be told thee what thou *must* do." (Acts 9:6.) Ananias said unto him: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22:16.) Therefore to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins was what he *must do*. The only attempt my opponent has made in reply has been to complain at the translations and tell us what the Greek "implies." The James translation, as well as the English and American Revisions, give no such rendering as you mention. The literal translation follows; "Having arisen, be thou dipped and wash thyself from the sins of thee, having invoked the name of him." Any one can see that all your talk about bad translations is worthless, and that the argument stands untouched.

4. My fourth argument, was based upon the truth that forgiveness of sins is in Christ (Col, 1:14); baptism puts a person *into* Christ (Gal. 3:27); therefore baptism is a condition of the forgiveness of sins. The only thing you said about this was that it was baptism in the Spirit; but as I have explained this already, the argument stands.

This ends my work on this issue. The four specific arguments stand unrelated; and as my opponent has had the opportunity to test them in his former replies, and as the rules of debate do not allow him to introduce new arguments in his final negative, they will remain unanswered.

I pray that the honest reader may see the truth.

## BAGBY'S LAST REPLY.

---

I am sorry that my worthy opponent is so slow of apprehension. As he takes my unappeased desire for his producing some arguments to prove the terms of his proposition for aversion to the "issue." Nothing could be farther from the truth. I am not "averse" to this issue, but would like for you to stick to the proposition, which is that immersion is baptism; and all the way through the discussion you have failed to bring forth any proof in support of your proposition. Then you were to show that immersion is a condition to pardon, and you have made a noble effort to prove that part of the proposition; but as "a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, kindreds, and people, and tongues" were in heaven, "clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands," even when John "was in the isle that is called Patmos," about eighteen hundred years before this watery theory was ever taught, it follows that your theory is contrary to the word of God; and anything that is contrary to the plain word of God cannot be proved. In regard to your tormenting me "before the time." I will say that if you do no better in replying than you have in affirming, it will be an exceedingly mild punishment.

You say, "We are not debating the action, but the design;" but that the reader may know the terms of the proposition, I refer him to the definition of the terms as given by you; and there he will find that you are to affirm that immersion is essential to salvation, and he may look all through your argument and never find where you have made any such affirmation. No, indeed, I am not "averse" to the "issue;" but I have made a vain attempt to get you to affirm your proposition.

You are wrong again when you say that I have made an "argument" on your "side of the question," when I said the people were "cleansed" and "sanctified" by sprinkling. I said they were ritualistically "sanctified" by sprinkling—that is, the water was symbolic of purity. Pure first, then water symbolizes that purity. Not only BO. but this is what the Bible says about it; and "he therefore that despiseth" what I have said about it "despiseth not man, but God." Therefore my position is not in contradiction to, as you seem to think, but in harmony with, the apostle Peter in 1 Pet. 3:21, where he says: "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer for symbol] of a good conscience (one already good]." The word "conscience" stands for the inward moral and spiritual life of man. (See Tit. 1:15; Heb. 9:14.) .We are now able to see clearly what Peter means. He means that

baptism is not in order to cleanse the man! and spiritual life from sin, but to symbolize the fact that the moral and spiritual nature has already been purged from sin, through faith in Christ, "to serve the living God." Many thanks to you, Brother Trice, for suggesting this strong proof that baptism is not a condition of pardon; for here Peter adds his testimony in most positive terms that baptism is not to purge or cleanse from sin. So by your own suggestion baptism is not a condition of pardon.

No, I do not "confuse" as you say, religion and salvation. As a man that to have salvation before he is a child of God, and as the "Spirit of God dwells" in his children (Rom. 8:9), I say a man out of harmony with God, a man without regeneration, has no religion; and he cannot "keep himself unspotted from the world," for he is of the world, worldly, and is in the bondage of sin. As a man has to have a dollar before he can spend it, so a man has to have religion before he can live it. So I am in perfect agreement with James 1:27, and it is both scriptural and wise to speak of having religion, for it is the gift of God; and when anything is given to you, you have it. Therefore, Brother Trice, I am indeed sorry for you, because you cannot say you have God's Spirit dwelling in you. I had rather "display a lack of Bible information," as you say I do, and know that I am "filled with the Holy Ghost," than to know the Bible by heart and not know that I was "filled with the Spirit." Brother Trice, if you have not received the Holy Ghost, you have not yet entered into the real Christian life, do not know the "peace which passeth understanding" (Phil 4:7), have in no sense "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27), and you are still "in the flesh," in your natural and carnal state. If you have not the Spirit dwelling in you, certainly you need some one to weep for you.

You failed to refute my position that Christ had just as much power in his "preexisting" state as after his resurrection. So my position is true. You asked me to tell what John 6:38 means by saying Christ came to do God's will. It means that he had laid aside his glory, not his power, to give his life a ransom for the race. It being the will of God that none should perish; and he made known this fact by the coming of Christ to suffer, not to obtain power to save, but that his saving power could be revealed to all nations when he sealed the new covenant with his own blood. So we, like Timothy, may know the Old Testament from our youth; and it, as well as the New Testament, is "able to make thee [us] wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 8:16); for the Old is not contrary to the New. In the Old, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, just as it is in the New. Both the Old and New Testaments offer salvation by faith in Christ, as I have plainly shown. Therefore we do not have to come this side of the death of Christ to learn how to be saved; and no man in all the history of Christendom ever preached such a

doctrine until the year 1811, or about eighteen hundred yearn too late for the spiritual good of all who were converted in apostolic times, if it were so. But it being false, it does not matter, only it misleads some who are not able to reach biblical conclusions.

What I said about Pentecost is neither "amusing" nor "absurd," but plain, simple troth. Every conversion recorded in the Bible was before there was a New Testament, and the apostles and Christ preached out of the only Bible that was in existence, and that was the Old Testament.

I believe with all my heart that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21); for if they had not, there would have been neither an Old nor a New Testament. Whenever and wherever they spoke, it was the word of truth and in keeping with recorded truth. This alone gives harmony to the Scriptures, and finally led to the writings of the evangelists and apostles being adopted as a part of the holy Scriptures, and is in keeping with my argument that the Old Testament offers salvation by faith in Christ and knocks every prop from under your theory, and down it comes! Your saying that "Abraham had to believe on the coming Christ," and that we must believe that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," is only a distinction without a difference, since it is Christ in each instant that did the saving and on the same condition—faith in him.

1 Pet, 1:19, 20 does not help you, but me; and I cannot see why you gave it, since it is expressly against you. for it teaches that the manifested Christ saves just like the promised Christ saved Abraham.

Certainty I made light of your statement that there "are only two recorded accounts of the baptism of the Holy Spirit," because it is a plain contradiction of God's word, its I already showed by Acts 19:6; 4:31; Eph. 6:18; and many other passages. But you try to make a difference between "baptismal measure and the gift of the Spirit." If there be any difference at all. it is in degree, and not kind; and those that obey God (Acts 6:32) receive the Spirit; and having obeyed film, becoming sons in the obedience of faith, God sends bin testifying Spirit into the heart (Gal. 4:6). This is in perfect agreement with my position, hut contrary to yours. Besides, in Eph 5:18 we are. in plain words, commanded to "be filled with the Spirit."

Whatever is meant by "baptismal measure or the gift of the Spirit." or being "filled with the Holy Ghost," it is laid upon us as our duty, or, as Trice would put it, "a command to be obeyed." Have you obeyed it?

You did not answer my question about miracles. I will answer yours by saying that I have set nothing out of the church that God set in. I have left, and do leave, things just as he left them; and as he said all were not apostles and that ail did not have the gifts of healing, I take it for granted that God will take care of those things, and I am making no great claims, knowing that God set every member in the

church as it has pleased him, and I leave it like it is; but you say the clays of miracles are over, and thereby presume to put out what God put in. I do not join the Mormons because I prefer the church of Christ, which he has cleansed with his own blood.

Brother Trice, you are mistaken again about Paul's not agreeing with me. We do agree on Eph. 4:5. He says one *baptism*, and so do I: and that is Holy Spirit baptism, and water is but a symbol, as Peter says (1 Pet. 3:21), of the one *spiritual baptism* that gives a good conscience toward God. Therefore, I am free from any obligation of proving "that Paul meant two when he said *one*;" for he meant *one*. and that one is the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit—the baptism one receives in the act of believing, when he is saved from all past sins. So I shall continue *teaching* the one *baptism* that Paul, Peter, and all the inspired writers taught, and symbolize that with water.

No one ever thought that Paul meant element when he said, "By one Spirit are we all baptized" (1 Cor. 12:13), and I am just as far from believing that he meant man; but he did mean that the Spirit is the agent by whom it is done; and the effect is, the soul is "quickened" into a new life and "born of the Spirit." By comparing spiritual things with spiritual, which to the uninitiated is foolishness. it is easy to see that the Spirit can be the agent, and as such "shed forth" his quickening power by direct contact with our souls and cleanse us from our sins. The Bible says: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. 6:11.) Here the Spirit is the agent by whom the "washing, sanctifying, and justifying" were done. That is just what I say. So my theory of baptism by the Spirit is not "exploded," as you said it was, but is sustained by the Bible, which says again: "He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly." (Tit. 3:5, 6.) Trice says the Spirit directs the matter, and that it is done in the name of the Spirit. The Bible says it is done by the Spirit. I like the Bible better, for I know that the Bible is true.

No. Brother Trice, I do not have to get my "seeing department" adjusted. I see things just as they are written in the Book and take the Book just as it is. and I can already see that dipping the body in water cannot cleanse the soul, but it must be done by the Spirit working in us. "It is God which worketh in you." (Phil. 2:13.) So says the Bible. "God is a Spirit." (John 4:24.) That is what the Bible says, and that is what I say. Thus you are the one to be ashamed *of your statement*. You say that my "position of the baptism of the Spirit is unique." Yes, it has the peculiarity of God's word. I neither add to nor take from the precious Book. That is why I can refute your watery proposition so easily.

I hasten to confess that your having "completely exploded" my



"objection on the one mediator" produced the least effect of any explosion of which I have ever read. But, dear reader, turn to my objection and you will find that it is his portion, and not my objection, that is "completely exploded."

In regard to the bombast you got off about obeying the command to be baptized (Acts 10:48), I will say that they were not baptized in order to be saved, but were baptized with water because they had been baptized with the Holy Ghost and were already saved. (See verses 44. 45.)

The words in 1 John 2:4 agree with my position. I say that a man gets into God by faith; then he is saved and knows God; and to keep saved he must keep God's commandments; and if he does not do this, he is a liar in saying that he is saved and knows God. One of the

plain commandments of God is. "Be filled with the Spirit" (Eph. 5:18), and John says he who does not keep this commandment is a liar. So Peter, Paul, John, and I have agreed, as we always do, for I teach only what the apostles taught; and I have answered you, as you requested.

Most of your argument about whether or not I have answered your questions respecting Christian duties has been previously answered. That part of it that has not, I take pleasure in answering it. You say that every person who is baptized with water displeases God, if baptism is not an act of faith. No, you are mistaken about that. Paul circumcised Timothy, and he had no faith in circumcision, but did it "because of the Jews" (Acts 16:3), and there is no record that it displeased God. I believe Heb. 11:6 in the sense that it is used, and that is. faith brings us into a state of spiritual life that pleases God. and without this faith it is impossible to please him. But no inspired writer ever said: "Without immersion it is impossible to please God." So immersion is not necessary to please, but faith is; and the one who exercises this faith has everlasting life (John 3:36), is born of God (John 5:1). is justified from all things (Acts 13:38. 39), as I have proved before. Therefore. Trice's proposition goes down before the plain word of God. Yes, Brother Trice, I believe that men are justified by faith, as I have shown above.

1 Cor. 1:17 says Paul was not sent to baptize. I only gave the Scriptures on it; so your fight is not against me, but Paul. And Matt 10:34 does not render Paul's statement false, but confirms it. The trouble is. your explanation is false. He did not mean "peace only, but a sword." If he had, he would have said it; for I think the Christ .was capable of saying what he means. This does not mean that he never used symbolic expressions, for he did; but when he did use such expressions, somewhere near by he had used the true relation of words in their common significance. Such is not the case here. But the plain meaning of his words in Matt. 10:34 is: "There shall be separation in the closest earthly ties (verses 35. 36); but my claims are

paramount (verses 37, 38), and on your relation to them depends everything hereafter (verse 39)."Hence the plain meaning of Paul's words is: "Baptism is not essential to salvation, but the gospel of grace is, for grace is the source and faith the condition of pardon. Therefore I am come or sent to preach the gospel of salvation." Down goes your watery proposition again!

I come now to your restating your arguments, and, to show that I have more than refuted them, I shall sum up my rebuttals. I have proved (1) that if you were right in your contention about Heb. 9:15-18, thru Christ made his last will and testament and gave it validity by his death, that his resurrection three days later rendered it null and void; and so we have no New Testament, if you were right. Therefore you are wrong. See my argument for true meaning. (2) I proved that baptism in Mark 10:16 means spiritual baptism, because it is an inward thing that believes, sins, and needs conversion, and it takes Spirit to produce spiritual effect; that we get into Christ by Spirit baptism, and not by a middleman or carnal priest; that God, and not man, sets all the members in the true church of God, or body of Christ. Therefore it is Spirit baptism, and not water baptism. So his first argument is "completely exploded." Header, look at my first reply for my complete argument and learn the "truth as it is in Jesus." (3) I showed that Trice's theory is against the plain word of God (I Tim. 2:5), because he makes it impossible for the sinner to be saved without water and a man to immerse; and the Bible says there is one mediator, and that does not mean three. Therefore, immersion is not in order to pardon. (4) I proved that his second argument was false, because Peter's sermon could not have been addressed to any other congregation than that to which it was addressed; that these Jews had rejected Christ, had "crucified and slain" him and would have nothing to do with him and would not accept him as Christ. So Peter commands them to make atonement for their crime as far as they could. So he says, "Repent"—that is, • alter at once the thing you *have been*; and though you cannot alter the thing you *have done* in crucifying the Christ, yet you can show that you are willing to make atonement as far as possible. Therefore you must accept him as your Savior by being ' baptized every one of you' in the name of the one whom you rejected and crucified, and thereby acknowledge that you are bounden to him for the remission of sins." As the sermon was addressed to those who had killed Christ, and to them alone, Trice's position is false. See my full argument for the mode. (5) I proved his third argument false, because Paul's sins were washed away in prayer, and not in baptism, as six translations of the English Bible show. But Trice says that the literal is, "Having arisen, be thou dipped and wash thyself from the sins of thee, having invoked the name of him," nil of which is not so. Paul was in "the house of Judas;" Ananias "entered into the house;" Paul received his sight, and "standing up

was baptized." Header, do you not think that was a funny dip? Did you ever before hear of a fellow standing in a dwelling place, where people live, and being dipped in the house? Such an Idea is absurd. Down goes this argument also! (6) I proved that his fourth argument is false, because it is Spirit baptism that puts one in Christ (1 Cor. 12:13) and the Spirit is received by faith (Gal. 3:2. 3), which shows that when a person breaks off from sin and by faith surrenders his soul to God and believing, he is at once received into the kingdom of God and filled with the Spirit; and since the Spirit is received when one exercises living faith, it follows that one gets into Christ by Spirit baptism, and not by water. Therefore, Trice's fourth argument is "completely exploded."

I have refuted every argument that he made, my dear reader. I ask you to carefully read the discussion and see the facts as presented. I appeal to you to accept the argument that is sustained with the greatest evidence of fact.

Now, Brother Trice, we have found by a close study of the word that Abraham was saved by faith. "He believed God. and it was counted to him for righteousness;" and we are saved in the same way, for faith is the fundamental principle of salvation. It is Christ that saves in the two dispensations, both in the old and the new; for it cannot be otherwise, since we believers "are blessed with (not apart from) faithful Abraham." (Gal. 3:9.) Paul shows how Abraham had the heirship, the sonship, the kingdom, the glory, on the ground of the promise; and, of course, he did not receive the promise only for his children; for if we were to take the promise of the Spirit from Abraham, we would also take it from ourselves. We cannot exclude the father of the family and admit only the children. So the way of salvation is the same in both dispensations, as I have proved. The Old Testament saints were saved exactly like New Testament saints—by faith in "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Since we are all saved by faith in Christ, we conclude that baptism is not in order to be saved, but a beautiful symbol of a heart cleansed from sin by the Holy Spirit.

All of your effort to prove that immersion is in order to pardon has been in vain. You could have done it if it could have been done, for in this part of the country your dogma has no more venerable name than W. Halliday Trice; but even Trice, a debater of enviable fame, cannot prove a doctrine that is contrary to the word of God.

Now I have done. This is my first experience in real debating; but since I have the word of Almighty God on my side, I am not afraid of the most learned teacher in the school and learning of the doctrine that Brother Trice proclaims. I do not do the work, but the plain word of God—it does the work.

May the reading of this discussion prove a blessing to the reader and lead him into the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

Page 38 - blank

# BAGBY-TRICE DEBATE.

---

PROPOSITIONS —"The Bible teaches that the sprinkling of water upon a proper subject is baptism." J. T. Bagby affirms: W. H. Trice denies.

## BAGBY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.

I discuss this proposition with no view at all of defending any denomination, creed, or ism, but with the purpose of showing just what "is noted in the Scripture of truth" concerning it

We want in this age, above all wants, information—information that will rouse individuals to seek the truth as it is in "the oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2), and become devout, zealous, joyful believers, "filled with the Spirit," thereby becoming members of the one true church—the church outside of which there is no salvation and in which all the members have the same marks, for in the one true church all the members are born of the Spirit, possess "repentance towards God, faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ," and holiness of life and conversation.

It is not, therefore, in a spirit of controversy, but in a spirit of love, bent on presenting the truth of the Bible in such a way that prejudices, even the strongest, may melt away, thereby giving every one an opportunity of studying the proposition with an unbiased mind

I will now give the terms of the proposition: "The Bible"—the book created by the breath of God; the authoritative, final court of last appeal; the very utterance and voice of God; the Old and New Testament "Teaches"—to enlighten by express statements or necessary inference. "Sprinkling or pouring of water is baptism." Proper subjects—one who makes a credible profession of repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, and infants, who are also the subjects of redeeming grace

My conception and estimate of the Old Testament must be no lower and no less than were the high conceptions and estimate of our Lord and his apostles for that inestimable book What my Lord and his apostles regarded as the "breath of God" I must so regard in opposition to every breath of man that dares to breathe against the most sacred, age-established, and time honored book of the world Jesus and the apostles always recognized the Old Testament as the court of last appeal for mankind, and Jesus said concerning it, "Ye do err, not

knowing the scriptures;" and Paul said, "It is able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Thus we find that the Old Testament in a book of which Christ is the key. and beginning at any point we may preach Jesus. So the ordinances of the Christian church, or the church of Cod, were brought into use under the covenant of promise, and no new thing has ever been added to the church under the new covenant. Circumcision was taken away and due notice given of it, and the killing of the lamb in the passover was taken away; but the cup and the bread were retained in .the Lord's Supper, and baptism by direct command is retained; but nothing new has been added. It was necessary for a clear understanding of the proposition to call your attention to these things, for they are the fundamentals of a clear testimony to the truth. Since the Bible is the criterion by which we are to determine the controversy, I shall now call your attention "to the law and to the testimony" (Isa. 8:20), and make the Bible the supreme authority in defining its own terms.

Now, God and his Son and the inspired Bible writers have defined V baptized;" and, for me, I prefer their definition to that of any great scholar of a later day. Isa. 44:3, speaking for God, said: "I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." Joel 2:28 said: "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." Jesus calls this pouring out of the Spirit "baptism," for he says: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." (Acts 1:5.) Here Jesus uses "baptize" to represent the action of water and Spirit in baptism, and Peter said that this pouring out of the Holy Ghost reminded him that Jesus had said: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." (Acts 10:44, 45.)

Thus we find that Christ and the inspired writers define "baptize" to pour when used in reference to Holy Ghost baptism; and if "baptize" has any other meaning in the New Testament than that of affusion, the Bible has not seen fit to give that meaning; but the express terms used in the Bible to show how Holy Spirit baptism was administered are "come upon," "fell on." "pour out," and "shed forth." (Acts 1:8; 10:44; 2:17; 2:33.)

1 John 5:8 says: "There are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one." \Ve know how the Spirit and the blood were applied. It was by pouring, (See Acts 1:8; 2:17; John 1:32.) Hence it follows that as the water has to agree in action with the Spirit and the blood, it, too, has to be poured out. It cannot be gainsaid that the New Testament says "baptize" means to pour. Will my opponent find where the New Testament says that "baptize" means immerse?

I call your attention to the fact that water, in the Bible, is a symbol of innocence and purity, the one implying the other. "I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord"

(Ps. 26:6); "I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency" (Ps. 73:13). In these scriptures the water symbolized innocency and purity before God, and anticipates the inward cleansing. All through the Bible water and Spirit are named or implied together— one, inward; the other, outward. Of course all inward purity can only be had through "the blood of sprinkling" applied by the Spirit, as these passages abundantly show: (a) "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 1:2.) (b) "The blood of Christ . . . shall purge your conscience . . . to serve the living God." (Heb. 9:14.) And *these scriptures* associate water with the purity that comes only through the merit of the blood of Christ. (1) "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." (Heb. 10:22.) (2) "That soul shall be cut off from among the congregation [church], because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord: the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him." (Num. 19:20.) And the water is a symbol of the Spirit by which we are actually cleansed, as these passages show: (a) "Wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved." (Jer. 4:14.) (b) "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty: . . . I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." (Isa. 44:3.) (c) "Thou becamest mine. Then washed I thee with water." (Ezek. 16:8. 9.) (d) "He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Tit. 3:5.) («) "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts 10:47.) The water being associated with the work of the Spirit in all these passages, as well as innumerable other ones, shows conclusively that water is symbolic of the purity effected by the Spirit's application of the blood of Christ. This enables us to see that baptism is symbolic of the Spirit's work. Heb. 9:13. "Sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh," agrees with what I have said before, and here the water indicates the typical cleansing and is declarative of its work. All these washings were done with the sprinkling of water or of blood. (Num. 8:7; Heb. 9:17-22.)

Paul calls those sprinklings of Moses "divers baptisms," and uses the same word that Christ used in the great commission. Thus we have Paul saying that "baptize" means sprinkle or pour; and those "divers baptisms," as we have shown, were typical of purity. The person had to wash after he was purified to declare and symbolize the fact. So the Bible teaches that baptism is done by sprinkling and that it denotes cleansing. Will Brother Trice please show me inside the lids of any respectable translation of the Bible on the face of the earth where "baptize" is rendered "immerse? "

Again, the Bible says that God should raise up a prophet among the

Jews like Moses. (Deut. 18:15. 18.) This, of course, means that thin new prophet would preach the law and administer the ordinances of the church after the manner of Moses. John was under the same covenant as Moses and preached the same law of inward purity, and symbolized that fact by baptizing with water, as is shown by these words: "There arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." (John 3:25, 26.) Notice that John's baptism and that which Christ was having administered are here called "purifying," because it is still symbolical of inward purity; and if its significance was ever changed, Brother Trice will please give us the scripture that says so.

Now, when John came, he did so much like Moses the Jews thought that he must be "that prophet;" so they sent "priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?" (John 1:19.) "Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No." (Verse 21.) "And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizeth thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" (Verse 25.) Any intelligent person knows from this scripture that the point of similarity between John's work and the work of Moses was his baptism, because the priests and Levites were so deeply impressed with the point of similarity that they asked why he baptized. Since John baptized like Moses, we do not have to guess how John baptized; for that has been settled for us by the Bible. Paul tells us plainly how Moses baptized. Heb. 9:19 says: "For 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." Therefore. John's baptism "with water" was sprinkling, according to the word of the Lord; and as the baptism that Christ had his disciples to administer was like John's, a "purifying," and as Christ was really the one that was to come, administering the ordinances of the church like Moses, his, too, is by sprinkling. If not, those who teach otherwise must give a "thus saith the Lord" for the contrary.

Now, I want to take up a few cases of baptism and show that they are in keeping with what I have said and proved by the Bible, that the mode of baptism has always been sprinkling or pouring. I will now take the first recorded case of the baptism of men, women, and children. This baptism took place nearly sixteen hundred years before John came preaching repentance, and God himself did this baptizing, and Paul says that he would not have us ignorant about this first baptism. In Ex. 14:22. 29 we read: "But the children of Israel walked upon *dry* land in the midst of the sea." 1 Cor. 10:1. 2 says: "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." Ps. 68:9



says: "Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary." Notice what we have given here: (1) They were in the sea; (2) they were under the cloud; (3) they were on dry ground; (4) God sent a plentiful rain; (5) they were baptized. In speaking of this baptism administered by "a plentiful rain" from the cloud, Paul uses the identical word that Christ uses in the commission; and if this pouring of rain from a cloud was baptism, as Paul says it was. when God himself did the baptising, then it follows that in our day sprinkling is baptism. Now we are prepared to make these statements:

1. In all cases in the Bible where the mode of baptizing (Spirit) is given it is pouring.
2. In all cases where the mode in the allusions to baptism is given it is affusion.
3. In all cases where such words as "cleanse" and "sanctify" are used, referring to water, where all agree it points to baptism, as Eph. 5:26, it is affusion.
4. Immersion as an ordinance of the Christian church is a stranger and foreigner to the whole Bible; and if these statements are not so, let Trice bring forth proof to the contrary.

Since immersionists claim that Christ was immersed, I deem it best to consider his baptism more closely. We have already shown that John baptized under the Mosaic dispensation; that his baptism was a "purifying;" that cleansing or purifying was done by sprinkling. (Num. 8:7; Ezek. 36:25.) ALL these things are proof that Jesus was sprinkled. Besides all this, Matt. 3:13 says: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him." It was "at" the Jordan, not "in" or "into" it. Mark 1:9 has it "eis," which immersionists translate "into." I could cite vast numbers of places where "eis" means "to," "at," or "by," as in these cases: At Carmel (1 Kings 18:19), at Jordan (1 Kings 2:6), to Jordan (2 Kings 2:6). But Matthew says that it was at ("epi") Jordan; and the Greek Testament (Mark 1:10) says "he came immediately from ["apo"] the water." Since he was baptized "at" the Jordan under a dispensation of sprinkling, and came immediately from the water, we know that he was not immersed. Besides, we are not told that Jesus went into the water, and we are only informed that he came from the water. All that supports the idea of immersion is the fact that he was baptized at Jordan. So you see that it is a very slender thread that supports the idea of immersion; but as there are many strong reasons why he was sprinkled, one of which is that he came not "to destroy, but to fulfill" a law (Matt. 6:17) that demanded sprinkling for cleansing, and his own baptism was called a "purifying." therefore he was not immersed. I want my opponent to tell why Jesus was baptized. In whose name was he baptized, and upon what profession of faith?

Seeing that our position is fortified thus far by the Bible, we will now examine briefly the baptism on the day of Pentecost. How did the apostles baptize on the day of Pentecost? This is a very important question, because this was the first case of baptism performed under the new covenant. If the rite of baptism was now changed from the sprinklings of the Mosaic law to immersion, now is the time for Peter to tell us; but he does not give us one word of information about it. If three thousand persons went marching out to the pool of Bethesda, or Siloam, or any other place, in order to be baptized, accompanied by thousands of others who would naturally follow out of curiosity, it was certainly a spectacle worthy of notice; but Luke does not give us an expression that will allow us to think such a thing possible. Peter was reading from the prophets, explaining and expounding as he went, telling them that Pentecost was a direct fulfillment of prophecy. The people were "pricked in their heart," and said: "What shall we do?" Peter answered: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you," etc. "For the promise is unto you, and to your children." (Acts 2:39.) Therefore the children of believing parents are to be baptized also; and in Paul's writings it is plainly stated that even if one of the parents be a heathen, the children of a believing parent are not to be left out. (1 Cor. 7:14.) This clearly shows that infants—those that suck the breasts" (Joel 2:15-17)—are a part of the New Testament church, the same as they were of the Old. As the blood of Christ covers their condition, and as they are innocent and in a saved condition—the same condition to which conversion brings sinners (Watt. 18:1-5; Eph. 2:13-19)—they of all the human family are most properly entitled to baptism:

But let us see what prophecy told of Pentecost and the events that transpired. Let us take the items as given by prophecy and compare them with what happened on the ever-memorable day of Pentecost:

PROPHECY.—Ezek. 36:24 says: "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land."

FULFILLMENT.—Acts 2:5 says: "And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven."

Here is an accurate and literal fulfillment of the prophecy. Let us take the next item and see how it turns out.

Ezek. 30:25: "Then [at that time] will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you."

Acts 2:11: "Then [at that time] they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls."

Here is another accurate and literal fulfillment of the prediction, unless the apostles wrested the "scriptures unto their own destruc-

tion" and substituted immersion for baptism. Let us take the next item:

Ezek. 36:26: "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your Dealt, and I will give you a heart of flesh."

Acts 2:46: "And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."

Another fulfillment, and a genuine conversion set forth.

Ezek. 36:27: "And I will put my spirit within you. and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them."

Acts 2:4: "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Here is another accurate and literal fulfillment, making four successive items of prophecy recorded in the same chapter, verse after verse—all fulfilled to the letter, on one single day, and set down in one single chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Unless they departed from the plain word of God and invented immersion for baptism; and the very last item of the prophecy makes that substitution impossible, for it says: "I will put my spirit within you. and cause you to walk in my statutes"—the "forever statutes" that Moses walked in, that John the Baptist walked in; and one of those "forever statutes" of God is that baptism is to be performed by sprinkling. This mode has never changed, and never will. Let me state the four things necessary to fulfill Ezekiel's prophecy: (1) The gathering of the Jews. They were gathered and present on Pentecost. (2) Sprinkling clean water upon them. Three thousand were baptized. (3) The renewing of the heart. They received that. (4) Receiving God's Spirit within. They were all filled. If ever there was a prophecy fulfilled, this prophecy of Ezekiel was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and the apostles baptized the first converts by sprinkling. This is where Peter used one of the keys of "the kingdom of heaven" and admitted the Jews to the new covenant. Now we will go with him to the house of Cornelius, where he uses the other key and admits Gentiles to the church of God. As he preached, the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them. This reminded him of Pentecost and of baptism. So he said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts 10:47.) Or, to put the language in modern form: "Will some one bring water that these may be baptized?" "And I when the water was brought! he commanded them to be baptized," and the Gentiles were admitted to the church by God's "forever statute" of sprinkling.

Let us next consider the eunuch's baptism, which is the clearest case of baptism by sprinkling that is to be found anywhere in "the New Testament. He was in a desert, riding along the road, reading Isaiah, where it tells about the coming of Christ and the establishing

of his kingdom. Philip began at that place and preached unto him Christ, and explained the prophecy to the eunuch, telling him that Christ was the one that purified the heart by pouring out his Spirit, and as a sign of that fact he would "sprinkle" the nations. That expression occurs just seven verses from where the eunuch was reading, and the Bible was not divided into chapters and verses then, but in subjects; and when Philip came to that, he told the eunuch that "sprinkling" was baptism. So when they came to a little spring, as the eunuch's words imply, he seems surprised to find water, and says: "Behold, water!" Not "much water," not deep water; but "ti hudor." some water, as it were, in a manner, enough water to notice, and here Philip baptized him. Of course they had to go down from the chariot to the water; then they had to come back up into the chariot. But we know that Philip preached baptism by sprinkling, for the Bible tells us that he was reading where it is so stated; and, besides this, the Gentiles had not been admitted to the church, and the law of Moses was strictly kept for years after this, and this law required running water. That the law of Moses was kept for years after this, see Acts 15:1-20; all of 21; and Gal. 3. This is further proof that he was sprinkled, for the law that Philip kept required such.

The baptism of Paul, of Lydia's household, and of the jailer's household are such clear, undeniable proofs of baptism by sprinkling that I will not examine them now.

Now, I will ask Brother Trice this question: If the word "sprinkle" in all of these passages that I have considered, and the many others that I could have considered, a word that occurs forty-seven times in the Old Testament and seven times in the New, and in almost every case is connected with the Idea of baptism—I say, if this word had been translated "immerse," would not you have regarded that as final authority in settling the mode of baptism?

Now, I have given a historic basis, a record of facts, in historic order, of baptism, showing that the mode is sprinkling. These are the plain facts, not assumed facts. The fact that in no instance did the apostles in the whole history of Christian baptism, during sixty-seven years, go in search of water, so far as the record goes or hints—and I propose to stay with the record—Is all positive proof that immersion, as an ordinance of the church of God, is a stranger and foreigner to the word of God. .

I now challenge my opponent to subject my arguments to a careful examination; and if they are false, let him refute them with a "thus saith the Lord," and not "darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge" by advancing that bigoted, dogmatic, bombastic statement: "'Baptize' means immerse, and nothing but immerse, because a lexicon says so." We are not consulting anything but the Bible in this discussion.

## TRICE'S FIRST REPLY.

I heartily concur with my opponent in the view that we should have more information concerning the teaching of the Bible and a greater desire to obey the Lord when we learn his will. I am sure that a lack of biblical knowledge is one of the towering sins of the age, and the disposition to set aside God's order with the flippant remark, "Something else will do as well," is one of the greatest curses the world ever knew. Too many people rely upon what their leaders say, and fall to study the Bible for themselves. Each person should fully realize that Christianity is preeminently an individual matter, and that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

In denying this proposition, I occupy a position that is unquestionably safe. The scholars of all churches agree that immersion is baptism, and a great portion of the religious world reject sprinkling and pouring as spurious. Some think that affusion will suffice, but no real scholar denies the validity of immersion. My opponent accepts it. In fact, he himself was immersed, and I doubt if he has ever been sprinkled or poured. The Methodist "Discipline" (the creed to which he subscribes) says: "Or, if he shall desire it, shall immerse him in water." So if the scholarship of the world can be relied upon in this matter, and if the creed of my opponent teaches the truth on the subject, I am on a *firm* foundation. On the other hand, if that part of the religious world which rejects affusion is correct, and if I disprove my opponent's contention, the man who fails to be immersed is unbaptized; and as he has failed to obey this solemn commandment, he is in great danger. I insist that it is best to take the stand that is admitted to be safe.

I have some objections to your definition of terms: In discussing the design of baptism, you contended that the *one baptism* "is Holy Spirit baptism, and water is but a symbol;" but in this you affirm that "the sprinkling or pouring water upon a proper subject *is baptism*." To be consistent you should affirm that sprinkling or pouring *is not* baptism, but "*water* is but a symbol." Since the thing symbolized and the symbol are two things, you are in a tangle from which release is difficult, if not impossible. I also object to the statement that infants are proper subjects of baptism, for the following reasons: (1) Proper subjects of baptism must be taught. (John 6:44, 45; Heb. 8:11.) Infants cannot be taught; therefore they are not proper subjects. (2) Proper subjects must have "faith toward our Lord." (Mark 16:16.) Infants cannot exercise faith; therefore they are not fit subjects. (3)

Proper subjects must make "a credible profession of repentance toward God." (Acts 2:38.) Infants cannot repent; therefore they are not lit subjects. (4) Baptism is a condition of the forgiveness of sins. (Acts 22:16.) Infants have no sins to remit (Mark 10:14); therefore they are not proper subjects of baptism.

With all my heart I believe the Old Testament, and I esteem and respect Us sacred message; but I most heartily dissent from your unsupported and absurd statement that there is "no new thing" in the "new covenant!" I read, "One new man" (Eph. 2:15); "A new and living way" (Heb. 10:20); "A new commandment I write unto you" (1 John 2:8). Rut my opponent very gravely tells us that "no *new* thing" in the "*new* covenant" is a "fundamental" truth! A *new* covenant that contains "no *new* thing!" What will you say next? I most emphatically deny your groundless assumption that the Lord's Supper, which commemorates the death of Christ, and baptism in his name, were commanded by the old covenant, and I demand the proof for your ridiculous opinion. Please do not forget it.

In your first attempt to prove your proposition you contend that the word "baptize" means "pour," because the Spirit was poured. Do you mean that the Spirit, one of the members- of the Godhead, was actually and literally poured out, as you would pour water upon a candidate? When we were discussing the design of baptism, you admitted that the Spirit was the agent, and not the element; but now you claim he is the element; and if your contention is worth anything, he is literally poured out! "The world do move!" The simple truth is, the statement is figurative, and the reason Jesus spoke of it as a baptism is because the spirits of the apostles were overwhelmed by the power of the Holy Spirit. It was not merely a sprinkling, but an immersion. The pouring was not the baptism, but the wonderful effects of the Spirit upon the apostles was.

Your effort on 1 John 5:8 is indeed weak. You contend that since Spirit and blood were applied by pouring, that "water has to agree in action." You had as well contend that "the Father and the Holy Spirit" ' cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers" (Matt. 21:12), as Jesus, the Word, did that; and since "the three that bear witness in earth" must agree in "*action*," of course the three that bear record in heaven must do likewise! This passage does not propose to tell how the water, blood, and Spirit were *applied*, as you imagine; but it teaches that the three bear witness to the fact that Jesus is the Son of God, and has no reference to the way the blood and water were applied. When the word "baptize" occurs, the word "immerse" is there; for when "baptizo" is translated, it is "immerse," as I will show later.

Your contention that water is a symbol of purity does not prove that sprinkling is baptism, so I will not take the space to consider that. I believe all the scriptures you quote; but as they do not inti-

mate that sprinkling is baptism, they do not touch the issue. I could grant your claim, and still you have not proved anything.

You say Paul calls the sprinklings of Moses "divers baptisms." I deny it and demand the proof. You are a great logician when you can assume the very point to be proven. The washings, or baptisms, mentioned in Heb. 9:10 and the sprinklings of Moses are different things altogether. The following question was asked Dr. Kleeberg, the Jewish rabbi, of Louisville, Ky.: "Were the Jewish ablutions immersions?" He replied: "Before eating and prayer, and after rising in the morning, they washed; when they have become unclean, they must immerse." (Louisville Debate, page 652.) It is true that the water of purification was sprinkled upon certain persons at the proper time, but this is not the washings to which Paul alludes.

You next ask, with an air of triumph: "Please show me inside the lid of any respectable translation of the Bible on the face of the earth where 'baptize' is rendered 'immerse.'" Do you mean to say that "baptize" is a translated word? Surely not. You know that every version that *translates* it at all translates it "immerse" or its equivalent. Do you know the difference between "Anglicize" and "translate?" You translated some in our correspondence; so I want you to try your hand on the following expressions, and we will see how "respectable" your translation is. First Anglicize and then translate these: (1) "Cheo se." (2) "Raino se." (3) "Baptizo se." When you are done, please tell us which one of these words occur in the great commission. Then give us the Greek for the following expressions: (1) "I pour thee." (2) "I sprinkle thee." (3) "I baptize thee." *Please do not fail to Anglicize and translate these expressions.*

Your statement that Christ's being like Moses means "of course", that he was to administer the ordinances of the church as Moses did is indeed amusing. Christ was not a priest after the order of Aaron (Heb. 7:11-14), and he did not administer the ordinances of the Jewish church; but he was like Moses in that they were both leaders and lawgivers, and your "of course" does not prove anything.

If the similarity between John's work and that of Moses was that of baptism, why did the people wonder at what John was doing? Did not the priest sprinkle the people? The very fact that they wondered at his baptism is proof positive that his baptism was unlike the Jewish sprinklings.

I will call attention to some of your assumptions in your effort to prove that John sprinkled. (1) You assume that the sprinkling mentioned in Heb. 9:19 is baptism. I have already shown that the washing in verse 10 does not refer to the sprinkling of the people and the book with the blood of calves and water. (2) You next assume that John was purifying the people by baptizing them, as Moses "purged" the book and people by sprinkling the "clean water" upon them. Then you conclude (?) that sprinkling is baptism! I have shown that

both of your promises are untrue, and "of course," your conclusion is false. But you quote: "There arose, a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying." And because it is stated in the same connection that Jesus baptized, you conclude that purifying and baptizing are the same. Some more assumptions. What does baptism purify—the soul or the flesh? If you say it "ritualistically" cleanses the soul, I demand the proof; if you say the flesh. Peter says baptism does not put away "the filth of the flesh" (1 Pet. 3:21); hence the "sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the *purifying of the flesh*" (Heb. 9:13) is not baptism.

In giving your first case of baptism you wrest the scriptures in a remarkable way. I shall quote your five statements and show where they fail you: "(1) They were in the sea." Yes, they were in the sea; "and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left." (Ex. 14:29.) "(2) They were under the cloud." You are correct again. "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. 10:1, 2.) But was "the cloud" a "rain cloud that poured out a "plentiful rain?" Most certainly not. "The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar *of fire*." (Ex. 13:21.) They crossed the sea in the night. "The Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind *that night*." (Ex. 14:21.) Hence if the "cloud of fire" poured out water, it was rather warm, don't you guess? "(3) They were on dry ground." True again. "The children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground." (Ex. 14:22.) "Will you please tell us in your next how they kept the ground "dry" while that "cloud of fire" "poured out" that "plentiful rain?" I await your reply with great interest and concern. "(4) God sent a plentiful rain." Indeed! He has sent many "plentiful" rains; but where did you learn that he sent one while the children of Israel were in the Red Sea? God sends rain. "on the just and the unjust;" and, according to your logic, they are all baptized, and the Lord is the administrator! I will now quote Ps. 68:7-9, in connection with some other passages, and show that the "plentiful rain" came at least two months after they crossed the Red Sea: "O God, when thou wentest forth before the people, when thou didst march through the wilderness; Selah: the earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary." This shows that the "plentiful rain" came when they were at Sinai, and not at the Red Sea. Why did you not read the connection? "In the *third month*, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the *same day* came they into the wilderness of Sinai. . . . And there Israel camped before the mount." (Ex. 10:1, 2.) This shows that they did not get to Sinai



for about two months after they crossed the sea, and absolutely demolishes your theory that the "plentiful rain" came upon them while crossing the sea. "(5) They were baptized." Paul says: "All these things happened unto them for ensamples [margin, "*types*".]" (1 Cor. 10:11.) Hence the baptism was a type. Type of what? Sprinkling? No; but immersion. The ground was under them, the walls of the sea were on each side, the cloud or pillar of fire was above them; therefore they were baptized—immersed, or completely buried, Your theory is demolished.

Your contention on the baptism of Christ is certainly rich in assumptions. Without one iota of proof, you declare that this baptism was a "purifying," and that this was accomplished by sprinkling. Unless you can prove that baptism was required by the law of Moses, your reference to the expression, he came not "to destroy, but to fulfill," the law, does not touch the issue, Are you willing to state in this, debate that Christian baptism was commanded by the law of Moses? We will see. It makes my heart sad to see a man who poses as a minister of Christ mutilate the word of God as you have in this instance. You do not even give our readers the account as given in the Bible. Let us read it: "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in not "at" as you guess, because "at" is found in the Old Testament, but "eis"—"into"] the Jordan. And straightway coming up *out of the water* (how could he come "*up out of the water*" if he were only at or out on the bank?), he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him." (Mark 1:9, 10, R. V.) Just how any sincere soul can read this and conclude that our Lord had a little water sprinkled upon him, I am at a loss to know. Why should he walk sixty or seventy miles to get to the Jordan to be sprinkled? Why should he be baptized "in" or "into" Jordan and come "up out of the water" if he were only sprinkled? To these and other questions there is no answer. He was immersed; and all scholars, as well as all unbiased minds, so think. But in order to put my opponent to the test, I am going to ask him to translate **ebaptisqh**. If your learning will allow you to translate it "sprinkle" or "pour," we will consider it further; but if you translate it as all scholars do. then I beg you never to again say that my Lord was sprinkled or poured. In answer to your questions I will say: (1) "To fulfill all righteousness." (Matt. 3:15.) (2) By the authority or in the name of his Father. God sent John to do the work. (John 1: C.) Christ did not have to confess his sins or "profess" his forgiveness, but it was a part of all righteousness for him to be baptized.

Your effort on the baptism of the Pentecostians is both amusing and absurd. In this you "wrest the scriptures" to your own theological destruction. You think because the Lord did not give us a detailed account of this baptism and toll us the number of "curiosity" seekers

that were in the crowd, that these persons must have been sprinkled! We had as well conclude that Jesus was not baptized at all, since we are not told of the happenings on his trip from Nazareth to Jordan or the excitement occasioned by the Journey.

As we do not have space to discuss infant sprinkling, and as I have already given some reasons to show they are not fit subjects of baptism, I will only say a few words in answer to what you say about the promise "to your children." You assume that "children" in this passage are infants. We are children of our parents long after we are capable of heeding the gospel "call." The promise is conditioned on repentance and baptism, and until a child is old enough to hear and obey the "call" he is not fit for baptism. Your reason for baptizing infants is strangely out of joint with Mr. Wesley, the founder of Methodism, and the Methodist "Discipline." You say they are "innocent and in a saved condition," and, therefore, should be baptized. Mr. Wesley says: "If infants are *guilty* of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way *they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism*. It has been already proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man, and thereby they are children of wrath and *liable to eternal damnation*." ("Treatise on Baptism" in "Doctrinal Tracts," page 251.) The "Discipline" says: "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and, born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' I beseech you to call upon God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to this child, now to be baptized with water, that which by nature he *cannot have*" Do you subscribe to Mr. Wesley's views and the "Discipline?" *Do not fail to answer.*

I shall now take up your "prophecy" and "fulfillment" and show how utterly you fail to make fail a case of sprinkling for baptism. The reader will please turn to his contention under this head and study these objections: (1) If your contention is true, it everlastingly ruins your theory on the design of baptism. These, people were not made "clean" until the water was sprinkled upon them. You contend that the sprinkling is baptism. Therefore, per your theory, baptism is essential to forgiveness. Verily, "the legs of the lame are unequal." (2) Peter does not refer one time to the prophecy of Ezekiel, but mentions Joel and David. (Acts 2:16, 25.) (3) Not *one word in* either prophecy refers to "water" baptism in any way whatever. Joel deals with the figurative baptism of the Holy Spirit, which we have shown was an overwhelming of the apostles' spirits by the Holy Spirit; while David spoke of the Sonship of Christ. (4) At the time Ezekiel's prophecy was fulfilled the Israelites, as a nation, were "gathered from among the heathen" into their "own land;" while on the day of Pentecost they assembled in Jerusalem of their own accord to keep a Jewish feast, and thousands of them were still living among "the na-

tions." "And besides all this." at this time they would not have been in their "own land." as Ezekiel declared, for their land had been taken away from them and wait in possession of the Roman empire. (5) Only the apostles were filled with the Spirit on Pentecost, while Ezekiel indicates that all would receive the Spirit. (6) *There is not one vestige of analogy between the prophecy of Ezekiel and the events on Pentecost.* (7) So far as disproving my opponent's contention, I could let the case rest here; but in order to teach die truth and to show the straits to which men are driven to make out a case of sprinkling, I am going to show when Ezekiel's prophecy was fulfilled. In 608 B. C. Nebuchadnezzar carried the Jews into captivity (Dan. 1:1), and the Lord said: "After seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you. and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to *return* to this place." (Jer. 29:10.) In 537 B.C., nineteen years later. Ezekiel uttered his prophecy; and in 536, fifty-seven years after Ezekiel's prophecy, Zerubbabel, with about fifty thousand Jews, returned to Jerusalem and rebuilt the walls of the ancient city. Nineteen and fifty-one equal seventy—the exact time to be "accomplished at Babylon." Hence the prophecy was fulfilled five hundred and thirty-six years *before* Christ came, and my opponent would have you believe it all happened on the day of Pentecost, thirty-three years *after* he came! They were to have "clean water sprinkled upon them" when they came to possess their "own land." (Ezek. 36:24, 25.) They were brought into their own land 536 B.C. Therefore they were sprinkled live hundred and thirty-six years before Christ came.

As I have answered him so fully on the pouring of the Spirit, I pass his reference to the baptism of Cornelius, with the request that he translate *baptisqhai*. That was what was done to Cornelius; and if it means he was poured, let him say so.

It provokes a smile to hear you say the eunuch's baptism "is the clearest case of baptism by sprinkling" in the New Testament; but I must say it is as clear as any you have thus far presented, and I am sure no unbiased mind would ever imagine that he was sprinkled from reading the account. You assume that he was in a desert. There were two Gazas—one a flourishing village, the other a deserted or depopulated town. They were on their way to the latter. But granting it was a "desert way." they found water enough to go *into* and perform the action of baptism. The word "sprinkle" in Isa. 52:15 is rendered "startle" in the margin of the American Revision, and the context shows that to be the meaning. But let us read the account, and I am sure all will agree that he was "baptized by baptism:" "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture (what? "So shall he sprinkle many nations?" No; but, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter"), and preached unto him Jesus. "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water (not a little spring, but a "certain water"]": and the eunuch said, See, here is

water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? [ebaptiden is the word; please translate.] . . . 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.*" If he was sprinkled, why did "they both" go down "*into*" and "*come up out of the water?*" The truth is, that person, like all others who are baptized, was immersed; and all the ingenuity of the affusionists cannot show to the contrary.

When you make an argument on the cases of conversion mentioned, they will be duly considered.

I have answered all your address, and shall now offer a few objections to your affirmation.

(1) Christ commanded men to be baptized. The word "baptize" docs not mean sprinkle or pour. Proof: "Baptizo: 1—to dip in or under water." (Liddell and Scott.) "Baptize: 1 (1) prop., to dip repeatedly, to immerse, submerge." (Thayer.) I challenge my opponent to name a standard Greek-English lexicon that *defines "baptizo"* to sprinkle or pour. If you cannot, my second premise stands, and the objection disproves your affirmative. But I am reminded that my opponent is averse to lexicons and warns me not to use them. Strange indeed! In a correspondence we had in my little paper he . tried in vain to prove by lexicons that "baptize" did mean sprinkle or pour. I have heard that "a burnt child is afraid of the fire." I am not surprised that he wants to get away from them; but since this controversy depends largely on the meaning of the word, and as the lexicons are our best authority, we will not leave them yet.

(2) The Bible does not teach that unmixed water was ever sprinkled or poured on any person for any religious purpose. You pour unmixed water upon persons; therefore your position is wrong.

(3) Baptism is called a "burial." "Buried with him in baptism." (Col. 2:12.) Sprinkling or pouring is not a burial; therefore sprinkling or pouring water upon a proper subject is not baptism.

#### SOME QUESTIONS.

1. Were you ever sprinkled?
2. Is immersion baptism?
3. Do you immerse people?
4. If no. do you obey the "Discipline?"
5. If yes, do you perform an unscriptural act by the authority of Christ?

## BAGBY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

---

I am very much gratified that Brother Trice agrees with me that we should know more about the Bible and obey our Lord in all things; . for in viewing hie reply I find that his prelusory remarks are about nil that is true in what he has said, and in everything else he is very much at sea. If a wholesale deliverance of dogmatic, vociferous assertions could settle a question, his reply certainly would do it; for this is the method with which he has attempted to meet my arguments. But after the noise has died away and I weigh his arguments in the light of the plain teaching of the Bible, I find that every argument I made in my affirmative stands, as I said, and I have scored in every contention; but for the sake of the reader I will carefully examine the grave mistakes that he has made.

He makes his boast that he occupies "a position that in unquestionably safe in denying this proposition," because the scholars are all agreed that immersion is baptism. For the same reason his position that baptism is a condition of pardon is "unquestionably" wrong, for only one-sixtieth of the Protestant world, to say nothing of scholarship, teaches as he does; and; besides, the one *thing* on which the great number of scholars (in fact, all but one-fortieth) are agreed is that *sprinkling* or *pouring* is the Bible mode of baptism; but as "baptism" is a word of *denomination*, and not of mode, they say (all but one-fortieth) that immersion will suffice; and as thirty-nine-fortieth of the scholars of the world take this position, it is certainly safe for me to take a position that is backed up by such a "cloud of witnesses."

Yes, I was immersed, for I was brought up in the same church of which Brother Trice is a member; and so fully did I believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism that I compassed "sea and land" in search of all the information possible. I began "to search the Scriptures daily" to see if my position was true, and, to my utter astonishment, I found that immersion is not found in the word of God in connection with baptism, and that the doctrine that immersion is a condition to pardon in papistic in fact, and is supported by the same passages of scripture that Rome quotes, with the same construction put upon them. When I saw the error of my way, I repented and turned to the simple Bible as the man of my counsel, and allowed it to be its own interpreter, and no longer blindly follow the creed of one man, which falsely claims that it defines the whole limits of the church of God.

Any intelligent man knows that when I affirm that sprinkling or

pouring is water baptism. I do not say one word that militates against my contention that "the one baptism." the real baptism that puts us into Christ, "is Holy Spirit baptism," and that water baptism "is but a symbol." It is certainly straining the sentence out of all reason to argue, as you have, that by so doing I am "in a tangle from which release is difficult, if not impossible." Christ gets in the same "tangle," for he says in reference to the bread of the Supper: "This is my body which is given for you." (Luke 22:19.) Let me use your words: "Since the thing symbolized and the symbol are two things," Christ is "in a tangle from which release is difficult, if not impossible." Now, if your objection is not the height of nonsense, I am at a loss to know what would be called such. As Christ meant that the bread represented his body, even so do I mean that water baptism represents spiritual .baptism. Your objections to infant baptism could all have been made in reference to circumcision; yet God commanded infants to be circumcised, thereby becoming debtors to "do the whole law" (Gal. 5:3), and, of course, infants could not "do the whole law," any more than infants in our day can obey the gospel; but the parents assumed the obligations of the law for the child, and so we receive the obligation of the gospel for the infant and baptize him. Besides, the Abrahamic covenant is in force to-day; for David said it was an everlasting covenant for a thousand generations (Ps. 105:8-10). and Matthew (1:17) tells us that all the generations from Abraham unto Christ are forty-two generations; and, according to this count, and it is God's own count, we have just passed forty-two generations since the coming of Christ, making us have nine hundred and sixteen generations yet to come in this covenant that God put children in. and I demand a "thus saith the Lord" for taking them out. So your objections are not valid, and babies are proper subjects of baptism. The apostles practiced infant baptism, for they baptized families, and infants are members of families; and in the family of Lydia she was the only one that *believed* and the only one that *attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul*; and as her family was baptized, it stands to reason that her baby was not old enough to believe; for even Brother Trice would not baptize a person that did not exercise faith. So here is a clear case of infant baptism in the New Testament. (See Acts 16:14, 15.) The Bible nowhere says that water baptism "is a condition of the forgiveness of sins." That idea is found in the "Christian System," page 194—a little book written by Mr. Campbell for the government of that denomination claiming to be "the Christian church;" but such an Idea is not found in the word of Cod, and Acts 22:1(5 does not teach any such thing. If baptism is immersion, as Mr. Campbell says, and immersion is conversion, it was the most important part of Ananias' commission, and yet he says nothing about it in speaking of his commission; but in Acts 9:17, going in unto Saul and putting his hands on him, he said: "Brother Saul,

the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou earnest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Verse 18 gives the fulfillment of this commission: "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." If Ananias' mission was fulfilled as he defined it. Paul received sight and was "filled with the Holy Ghost." Having received the one true baptism, he was baptized with water, standing in the house of Judas, to symbolize that fact. When you cite this case to prove that water baptism is a condition of pardon, you make assumptions that are without proof. You presume that "wash away thy sins" is to be performed by immersion as a condition of pardon, when any one knows that water baptism cannot actually wash away sins, but is only a figure of that which can wash away sins, even the baptism of the Holy Spirit. With this Paul himself agrees. He (1 Cor. 6:11) says: "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by *the* Spirit of our God." And 1 Cor. 12:13: "For by *one* Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." Again, you assume that it is water baptism here spoken of. The word "baptize" (Acts 22:16) in this place is in the middle voice and has the reflexive force, and a good literal translation would be: "Arise, baptize thyself, and be washed from thy sins while thou callest his name."

It is clear, therefore, that Paul's real baptism was a baptism that he secured or called upon himself by prayer, and not by water baptism. So what Ananias did with water was but a figure of what God did with the Holy Spirit; and as Ananias did his in a dwelling house, it was with water, and not in water; and so Paul was baptized by affusion, and the affirmative has scored another point. But if it could be proven that it is water baptism spoken of, the language does not make the baptism "wash away sins." Mr. Campbell has given the key to the proper interpretation of the passage, saying: "Cleanse the house, sweeping it." So we have "wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Thus Paul was a devout Christian before Ananias baptized him.

I still say that no new thing was added to the new covenant, and the new things you cite were not added as a part of the conditions or church life, and it is nowhere stated; and your attempt to refute what I said is simply puerile. The passover, which commemorated an event in the old covenant, is replaced by the Lord's Supper in the new, which also commemorates an event; and baptism, which denoted cleansing, has been retained in the new, and still denotes cleansing, and is done in the name of Christ; and thus I have given you proof of my "ridiculous opinion." as you are pleased to call it. and it is in keeping with the Bible. (See Luke 22:11, 16; and also verse 19; John 3:25, 26.)

You ask me what I mean by the Spirit being poured. I mean just what the Bible means when it says that the Spirit was poured. If your argument holds good that the Spirit could not literally be poured on us. It is much stronger against the idea of being immersed in the Spirit. How could they be immersed into that in which already they were enveloped? So your position is both unreasonable and absurd, and you cannot find where the Bible says "immersed in my Spirit," but I can find where it says the Spirit was poured out, and that "pouring out of the Spirit" is called "baptism." It is not figurative, but a literal baptism performed by pouring; and if pouring is baptism, then baptism is pouring; and hereby we find that the Bible says that pouring is baptism. That is what I set out to prove, and the Bible says in so many words that pouring is baptism. So I have proved my proposition.

Your attempt to refute my position on 1 John 5:8 is an absurdity in the superlative degree, and my affirmative stands. I did not say that water, being a symbol of purity, proved that sprinkling is baptism; but I did say that as it symbolized the purity wrought by the Holy Ghost, and as the baptism of the Holy Ghost was by pouring, *that water baptism*, the symbol, should be administered in the same way as the thing *symbolized*, and that is by sprinkling or pouring, and the water is brought. (Acts 10:47.) My affirmative stands. Yes, I say that the sprinklings of Moses were called by Paul "*divers baptisms*," and take pleasure in giving the proof. Heb. 9:10 says, "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings," or "divers baptisms," for that is the Greek; and verse 13 gives one of these divers baptisms thus. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth," etc., which shows conclusively that sprinkling is one of these divers "baptisms." and that makes Paul say that sprinkling is baptism; and so I have scored again. So Paul says the sprinkling of Moses is one of the baptisms spoken of. Trice says it is not. I prefer Paul. He quotes Kleeberg, but I prefer Mark 7:3, 4; Luke 11:38, which show that the Jew baptized himself several times a day. But to offset his rabbi, I quote Josephus, who lived in the apostolic age, and who, in speaking of the laver baptisms, said: "The sea to be for the washing of the hands and the feet of the priest." "Whence the priest might wash their hands and sprinkle their feet." ("Antiquities," Volume 8, Chapter 8, Sections 5, 6.) So this is certainly the washing to which Paul alludes. When you answer my question about the translation that I demanded, or show what I asked, then it will be time to try me on my scholarship in translating, and not before; and what you ask me to translate is not germane to the subject. The Bible says "baptize" means pour or sprinkle, and that is good enough for me.

Nobody said Christ was a priest after the order of Aaron; but he came to fulfill the law and the prophets, and when he came to John,



he "forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee." Jesus said: "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." This appeal to the law was enough for John, and he soon thought of the teaching of Moses and the prophets, that Christ was to be a priest; that the Aaron priesthood pointed to him; that it was to culminate in him and be abolished by him. Therefore it was necessary for him to be consecrated to that office by a regular priest; or, if not, he could not abolish it. John was a priest in the regular line according to the law, being the only son of Zacharias, the officiating priest at the time, and his mother of the daughters of Aaron. John had prepared the way for his coming. Now he is come, and at once John recognizes it as his duty to consecrate him to his office and make him known to Israel. He was just thirty years old—the exact age at which they were consecrated—and the law to which Christ appealed, and concerning which he said "not one jot or tittle" should ever pass, tells us how a priest was consecrated: "Thus shall thou do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." (Num. 8:7.) This is the law to which he appealed and which was fulfilled at his baptism. So he walked "sixty or seventy miles" not to get to the Jordan, but to get to John, the priest, to be consecrated; and if he was immersed, he was a lawbreaker; and will you have the daring to say that the Christ of God was a lawbreaker? That the law of Moses required baptism is proved already by what Paul said and the passage above quoted. So it is forever settled that Christ was sprinkled, and the scholars that think he was immersed make him a lawbreaker; and, as for me, I had rather be ignorant on God's side than scholarly against the plain word of God.

In regard to the baptism at the Red Sea, I will say that the rain they had at Sinai does not interfere with the rain at the Red Sea, and Ps. 68:7-9 does not say it rained at Sinai, but when they were "weary" or disturbed, which was at the Red Sea. and not at Sinai, where they were encamped; and your sarcasm no more proves that I think that every rain is a baptism than your saying that they were immersed is proof that you believe that everything enveloped is baptized. The pillar of fire was not over them, as you think, but it was "behind them" (Ex. 14:19); and it, therefore, was not the cloud that poured out water, but a rain cloud (that is wont to pour out water. But this we absolutely know: There was no immersion, no dipping in, and no taking out; and you immersionists will take no other kind of immersion except putting in and taking out; so it was not immersion, but they were baptized.

In answer to your question. I will say that it was infinitely more easy to keep the ground dry while it rained a "plentiful rain" for the purpose than it is to immerse on dry ground, and the dry means not water to immerse. So your great "Interest and concern" may now subside, and your immersion theory is "demolished." As you

claim that this was a type of baptism, it follows that baptism is not a putting in and a taking out of an element; and since immersion is not the mode used, and as they were baptized with a cloud, they were sprinkled. So I am again right.

I deny that I have mutilated the word of God in what I said about Christ's baptism. I say that it is not in the Bible where Christ went into the river; and as the Greek shows that he only came to the river and went from the river, we know that he was not immersed, for he did not get in; but I have already proved that he could not have been the Christ and have been immersed. So every contention of mine is sustained by the Bible.

In answer to your question about Mr. Wesley and the "Discipline," I will say that Mr. Wesley was able to take care of himself while living, and I subscribe to whatever he taught that is in keeping with the Bible, and from anything that is not taught I dissent. Yes, I subscribe to our "Discipline," and it nowhere says what you quoted. We revise our "Discipline" every four years, and anything that is not in the revised edition is not law. Get you a "Discipline" of 1910, and you will find no such language as you have quoted.

Of all the absurd and ridiculous things, your attempt to refute my prophecy and fulfillment argument beats them all. You say, after some assertions, that the prophecy was fulfilled when the Jews under Zerubbabel, at the command of Cyrus, king of Persia, returned to Jerusalem, their home, to rebuild the walls. In Ezekiel's time the Israelites had not been scattered among all countries, and, therefore, could not be gathered from all countries, although, in an outburst of holy insight, like Isaiah (9: C), speaking of Christ as already come, he speaks of Israel's dispersion as having already happened; but as Babylon was only one country, it could not mean the return from that country. "Ye shall dwell in the land." As the Jews who returned from Babylon did not permanently dwell in the land, but were again ejected, it is certain that the prophecy does not refer to what you say it did, but to a time when God would gather, cleanse, and renew them. Of course this is moral and spiritual purity described, and came to them when they were converted to Christianity. They were converted to Christianity on the day of Pentecost, and the promise received its highest fulfillment when they became God's people and he became their God. (See Chapter 11:20; Jer. 7:23.) So the plucky and tenacious editor of *Truth and Freedom* assails my argument and finds it an impregnable fortress, and my argument stands, and the Pentecostians were sprinkled; I do not mean "startled," on the authority of the Bible. How is this for scholarship: "Thus shalt thou do unto them: Startle [Trice says the word in Isa. 52:15 means "startle" that is translated "sprinkle;" and if it does there, it does here] water of purifying upon them;" or, "Then will I startle [sprinkle] clean water upon you?" (Ezek. 36:25.) Such scholarship is too great for me. But Trice says

that if the Pentecostians were "sprinkled," and the Bible says that is the way that is was done. it "everlastingly ruins" my theory "on the design of baptism," for "those people were not made clean until" they were baptized. You know this is Acts 2:38. and that is the strong hold of my opponent's theory that immersion is a condition of pardon. This is his argument: "Repentance and baptism are joined by the (coordinate conjunction 'and,' and 'for' cannot have two meanings in the same place and at the same time; hence whatever repentance is for, baptism is also." There is plausibleness in this, and as the Bible plainly says that faith is the only condition of the sinner's justification, as you can easily see by reading from the Revised Version (Gal. 2:16): "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law. save [marginal, "but only"] through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law." Again (Eph. 2:8-10): "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. . . . For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." And as truth is always consistent, and as the Bible plainly says that faith alone is the one thing that a sinner has to perform as his personal act to secure pardon or justification, I maintain that Brother Trice's interpretation of this text is entirely wrong when he connects "baptism" and "repentance" with the remission of sins by the preposition "eis," or "for." I take the position that the "name of Jesus Christ" and "the remission of sins" are connected by "for," and the purpose of the apostle was to show these Jews who had crucified Christ that remission of sins is in the name of Christ alone. When "they heard this," they confessed their sins and obtained remission of sins by heart faith in Christ, or upon him.

It is necessary to keep in mind that "epi to onomati" does not mean the same as "eis to onoma" in Matt. 28:19. The first is "upon the name," and the second is "into the name." The primary meaning of "epi" is "on" or "upon." Then "upon the name of Christ" is "believing upon his name." There are quite a number of passages that prove this. Luke 24:17, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in ["epi"] his name," which, of course, means remission of sins upon faith in his name, or believing on his name. Acts 3:16, "And his name through ["epi"] faith in his name hath made this man strong." or "believing on his name hath," etc. Peter, in telling about the conversion of Cornelius, presents it as an exact parallel of the Pentecostal occasion, as recorded in Acts 11:17: "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on ["epi"] the Lord Jesus Christ." If anything could give more reason for reading "epi to onomati" in Acts 2:38, "believing on the name of Jesus Christ." I do not know what it could be. So now we are ready to properly translate the passage, making it consistent with Gal. 2:16 and Eph. 2:8-10, thus: "Repent [or, rather,

"turn"], and be baptized every one of you [believing] on the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." So water baptism is not for the remission of sine; the Bible nowhere says so; and my theory on the design of baptism stands, and the Pentecostians had "clean water"—that is, unmixed water—"sprinkled upon them" as a symbol that they by the Holy Ghost coming upon them had been cleansed from sin. In regard to the eunuch's baptism, I will say that I made no assumption at all. The Bible says that he was in a "desert way," and the Greek says they came to a "little water," and decency and good will demanded that both go to the water while one had to go, and the law of Moses, which was strictly kept (Acts 15:1-20; Gal. 3). demanded running water (Num. 19:17); and as Philip preached baptism by sprinkling (Isa. 52:15) to him, it follows .that he was baptized by sprinkling, and the affirmative stands. Of course they found enough water to sprinkle, or baptize ("baptisthenai" is the word in the text), him.

I come now to your objections:

1. Yes, Christ commanded men to be baptized. The Bible says "baptize" means "pour out," "come upon," "shed forth." Therefore immersion is not the Bible mode of baptism; and as I was to prove that the Bible says that sprinkling or pouring is baptism, and it does (Acts 1:5; 1:8; 10:44; 2:17; 2:33), my affirmative stands. You may use every lexicon in the world if you like, but I shall stick to my proposition.

2. The Bible does teach that the Pentecostians, as I have shown, were baptized with unmixed water. So you are wrong again.

3. But the burial to which you refer is not an immersion, because it was done "without hands" (Col. 2:11), and an immersion is performed with hands. And in Rom. 6:4 the subject is not the kind that you immerse. You immerse a living man, but the man in Rom. 6:4 is a dead man. Verse 2: "How shall *we, that are dead* to sin, live any longer therein?" Therefore this burial is not immersion, for they do not have the same subjects. Again, you immerse into water, and no death; but this baptism was "into Jesus Christ" and into "his death," so no likeness at all to your immersion. Another difference between your immersion is that immersion buries a live man into the water, while this burial buries a dead man into death, and is done by baptism, and not by a carnal priest. Again, it is "buried with" Christ, while in immersion one is not buried with Christ, but by himself or with sonic other person. Again, the raising is not the same. In immersion the subject is raised from the water, and not from death, and not by the glory of the Father, but by the power of the preacher; while in this burial it is a raising from the dead and is done "by the glory [power] of the Father."

So your immersion theory is "demolished" by this scripture, and

Paul in speaking of our complete deliverance from sin. Through the death and resurrection of Christ, by believing on his name, we become-dead to sin and buried to sin by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which kills to sin and makes alive to God and raises us up to "walk in the newness of life." We are baptized "into Jesus Christ" by "one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13), and we are baptized in the name of Christ by a preacher, and the Bible nowhere confounds the two. The first is an inward work of grace, and the second is an outward symbol of the inward work of grace. So Brother Trice is in error when he confounds the work of the Spirit with the work of man. Let it ever be remembered that the Spirit baptism alone puts us into Christ, and water baptism that symbolizes this is not done by the authority of the Spirit, as Brother Trice teaches, but by the command of Christ. (Matt. 28:19.) So there is no doubt but that Spirit baptism is meant in Rom. 6, and as Paul was one of those included, and as he was baptized with water, standing in a dwelling house, it follows that he was baptized by affusion, which is the proper way to symbolize the baptism that put him into Christ.

So the Bible nowhere teaches that baptism in the name of Christ is a burial, and for fifteen hundred years no one ever pretended that it represented a burial; but, as I have proved in my first article. it was symbolic of innocence and purity, and the Bible clearly tells us how the water as the symbol of cleansing was applied. Heb. 9:13, 19 and Num. 8:7 tells us it was done by sprinkling. So baptism is only a symbol and is done by sprinkling, and has no necessary connection with regeneration; for in the Bible all were regenerated before baptism, as in the case of Cornelius (Acts 10:44, 46). of Lydia (Acts 16:14), and of the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:31). John speaks many times of regeneration in his First Epistle, but he never connects baptism with it, declaring that those who are "born of God" do righteousness and overcome the world. All this shows that baptism is not necessary to pardon, but is only a sign or seal of remission of sins already accomplished.

The apostle Peter further shows us this same meaning of baptism when he says. "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." which could be easily done by the external application of water, "but the answer of a good conscience toward God." showing that this answer, or symbol, representing the reality and sincerity of our faith. is no part of the putting away of sin, but an outward sign of the inward cleansing.

Now we have found that the law required sprinkling as a symbol of purity, that John's and Christ's baptisms are called a "purifying" under the old dispensation; and this is no guess, as Brother Trice said it was, but a plain declared fact (John 3:25. 26); and as Christ in the commission leaves baptism just like it was in the old dispensation as to mode and design, which was sprinkling or pouring, and as

there is not a hint in a single literal text in the Bible of a change in mode or design, it follows that baptism is still by sprinkling or pouring and is symbolic of the work of the Spirit. So I have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, by every baptism I have cited, that sprinkling or pouring is taught by the Bible, and no apostle ever moved a step from where he preached to baptize any one in all the apostolic history of sixty-seven years, and Acts 10:46, 47 shows that the water was brought for the baptismal use. So my affirmative, as a whole, stands.

#### QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY NUMBERS.

1. Yes, indeed.
2. Clearly and fully answered in my negatives.
3. Yes, if they prefer it to the Bible mode.
4. Answered in the third.

G. No, I perform a scriptural command by doing it in the name of the Deity, but the mode is unscriptural.

## TRICE'S SECOND REPLY.

---

My opponent very kindly tells us that my reply was "a wholesale deliverance of dogmatic. vociferous assertions," and that "every argument" of his "stands," and that he "scored in every contention." It is well that he gives us this information (?), as some of us might not have found it out by reading the debate. He was so afraid that the reader would not find out that he had proved (?) his position "beyond the shadow of a doubt," and that my efforts against his "impregnable fortress" (?) were all in vain, that at regular and irregular intervals he emitted the following: "Every argument stands," "I have scored again," "I am right again," "My theory stands," "I have scored in every contention," etc. etc. By actual count I find that he used *fifteen* such expressions in his second address! Poor fellow! He is painfully conscious that he and his denominational craft are sinking beneath the waves of gospel truth; and in order to keep up appearances and to console some of his brethren, he gets his head above the water occasionally and shouts: "I have scored again," "My theory stands!" But do not judge him too harshly. He is a man of ability, and has many good traits, but he has engaged to prove a proposition that cannot be sustained; hence his desperate struggles.

The infallibility of my position on these two issues gives my opponent much concern. He is forced to admit that it is safe to be immersed; so he runs back to the first proposition and says I am unsafe on it. Let us look at both issues. Without a dissenting voice, all informed affusionists say that immersion is valid. My opponent admits that it is. All scholars and lexicons, without exception, say that "baptize" means immerse. I cannot induce my opponent to translate "baptizo" to "sprinkle" or "pour," and we all know he would gladly do it if his learning would allow. So my "cloud of witnesses" is decidedly larger than yours and *includes you*. On the other hand, there are thousands of conscientious men who declare that sprinkling is not baptism. There is not a scholar or lexicon on earth that defines "*baptizo*" to "sprinkle" or "pour." Even my worthy opponent, who can and does translate Greek, dare not render "baptizo" to "sprinkle" or "pour;" hence he balks and will not translate at all. I will leave the candid reader to say whose position is safe.

But he says my position on the design is unsafe, because the scholars are against me. Against me on what? I know that many scholars deny that baptism is a condition of pardon, but I challenge you to name one sincere scholar that says it is unsafe for a penitent believer to be baptized. Brother Bagby, do you believe that God will damn the

genuine believer because he submits to the command to be baptized? I can find thousands of people who believe that it is dangerous not to be baptized; and, of course, this "cloud of witnesses" question your position. From these considerations I conclude that my positions are not only unquestionably safe, but yours are manifestly dangerous. Reader, where do you stand?

You relate some of your experiences, and say that "the doctrine that immersion is a condition of pardon is papistic." I am perfectly satisfied with my efforts on the design of baptism; but I take great pleasure in showing that sprinkling and pouring for baptism is not only "papistic." but that the Roman Church does not claim that it is scriptural. "The usual mode of performing the ceremony was by immersion. In the case of sick persons (clinic) the minister was allowed to baptize by pouring water upon the head or by sprinkling. *In the early church 'clinical' baptism, as it was called, was only permitted in cases of necessity; but the practice of baptism by sprinkling gradually came in, in spite of the opposition of councils and hostile decrees. The Council of Ravenna, in 1311, was the first council of the church (Catholic Church, of course—W. H. T.) which legalized baptism by sprinkling by leaving it to the choice of the officiating ministers*" (Encyclopedia Britannica. Article "Baptism," Volume III., page 351.) This will convince the candid reader that sprinkling came not from the Bible, but from "*the church.*"

In order to show that the Catholic Church does not rely on the Bible for her authority in this matter I relate the following: I was sprinkled in infancy by the Catholics, and my father died a member of the Church of Home. On December 6, 1911, I wrote Mr. P. J. Gleason, of Nashville. Tenn., the priest who sprinkled me, and asked him the following questions: "Does the word from which we get 'baptize,' as found in either the Catholic or Protestant Bible, mean 'sprinkle' or 'pour,' or does this authority come from the Catholic Church?" In reply he said: "The word 'baptize' in Greek means 'to immerse, or dip, or wash, or cleanse.' This gives the root meaning of the word. Baptism by immersion as well as by pouring was practiced by the church in time past." Later I wrote him again and asked him this question: "Does not the sprinkling of water upon *any* individual *as baptism* come from 'the divine tradition of the Catholic Church' rather than from the word 'baptize' in the Greek, which means "to immerse, or dip, or wash, or cleanse?" To this he replied, under date of November 18, 1912: "You ask: 'Does not the sprinkling of water upon any individual as baptism come from the "divine tradition of the Catholic Church" rather than from the word "baptize" in Greek?' I answer, in brief, *yes*. But in this the custom of or tradition of the Catholic Church is *Consistent*. Protestants who observe the same., means of observing baptism are *inconsistent*. How so? Because they . claim to follow the Bible in everything. Now, the meaning of 'bap-



tize in the Bible is simply to wash, or immerse; and when Protestants baptize otherwise, they depart from the literal meaning of the Bible terms." Dear reader, what do you think of that? Have you been baptized, or do you rely upon this Romish relic? It is passingly strange that Protestants will attempt to sustain such a practice *by the Bible*, when the Catholics, *with whom it originated*, say: "When Protestants *baptize otherwise*, they depart *from the literal meaning of the Bible terms*." But such is the influence of Rome! The priest knows that "baptize" does not mean "sprinkle" or "pour," but he thinks the church is infallible and had the right to change the ordinance.

You are still trying to disentangle yourself on the "one baptism," but you have failed again. You say Jesus is in the same kind of a 'tangle.'" No, indeed! If you had read the entire verse, your fallacy would have been apparent. "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying. This is my body which is given for you: This do in remembrance *of me*" (Luke 22:19.) The casual reader can readily see that Christ meant to teach that the bread *represents* his body, and that it is to be broken in "remembrance" of him; but where is the passage that intimates or says: "He took water and sprinkled it upon them, saying. This is the one baptism which is given to you: *this do in remembrance of the Holy Spirit baptism?*" Will you affirm that the bread used in the Supper is *the body of Christ*? If you will, I will turn you over to the Catholics. If you win not. then the cases are not parallel. If you will affirm that sprinkling is not baptism, but *only represents it*, I will consider your proposition; but as long as you affirm that "sprinkling or pouring is baptism." I propose to show that you are in a tangle. If this is "nonsense," make the most of it.

You say my objections against infant baptism could have been made against circumcision. You are badly mistaken. God commanded circumcision, but he did not command infant sprinkling. Do you see the difference? But you say the Abrahamic covenant is still in force. Let us read the passage you cite: "And confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant: saying, Unto thee will I give the land *of Cannon*, the lot of your inheritance." (Ps. 105:10, 11.) This covenant was broken. "The earth also is denied under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting covenant." (Isa. 24:5.) But in the new and better covenant (Heb. 8:6) all know the Lord. "from the least to the greatest" (Heb. 8:11). Infants cannot know him; therefore they are not eligible to membership. You say: "God put children in, and I demand a 'thus saith the Lord' for taking them out" Will you please explain why Nicodemus, the Pentecostians. Saul. -and all other Jewish converts had to be baptized in coming into; the new covenant, seeing they had all been circumcised? "Who took them "out?" Remember, there is "nothing new" in the new covenant!

You assume that the apostles baptized babies because they baptized households. This does not follow. (1) "Household" does not always include "little ones." "And for them of your households, and for food for your little ones." (Gen. 47:24.) (2) Those who were baptized were capable of being "comforted" (Acts 16:40) and of believing in God (Acts 16:34). (3) I can prove just as conclusively that Lydia's "baby" was thirty-five years old, and that she was a good church member, as you can that she was eight days old and was sprinkled by Paul. Neither assumption is worth anything; but as you are contending for a case of infant sprinkling, you should, present some proof. Lydia was two or three hundred miles away from home on business, and it does not "stand to reason" that she would have carried her eight-day-old baby with her, even if she had one.

You go next to the first proposition. In fact, you spend a good deal of your time on that issue in your second speech. When we were on the design, you wanted to discuss the action; and now you want to debate the subject and design. It is difficult to keep you on the subject. You say that water baptism is not a condition of pardon, because it does not actually wash away sins. The very same argument can be made against faith and repentance. Should the Governor of the State say to the convict, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be pardoned," would you tell the prisoners that faith and baptism were not conditions of pardon, because the Governor "actually" pardons? God forgives sinners; but faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of salvation. Paul said certain persons were "washed by the Spirit"— *not in Spirit*. He also said some were "washed" "by the word." (Eph. 5:26.) Do you think they actually had the Spirit and word applied to them, or were they washed by the direction of the Spirit through the word? You have said much about certain versions that say Saul "washed away his sins in calling on the name of the Lord." but I observe that you have never quoted from them or told us what translations they were.

You think because Saul "arose and was baptized" that it must have been done in the house. Should your wife say to you, "Arise and eat breakfast," would you stand in the middle of the bed and eat, or would you dress and go to the table? "When Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah saw that her son was dead, she *arose and destroyed* all the seed royal." (2 Chron. 22:10.) Do you think she killed them without leaving the house? I can see my opponent waxing eloquent and exclaiming: "Sure! She arose and did it; hence it must have been done in a dwelling house!" I insist if there is anything in the expression on the *action* of baptism, it is manifestly against sprinkling and in favor of immersion; for if Saul were either lying or sitting down, he could not have been immersed without arising; but he could have been poured or sprinkled lying or sitting just as well as standing." But

since he tells he was "buried in baptism" (Col. 2:32). I know he was not sprinkled.

Because the passover commemorates an event in the old covenant and the Lord's Supper commemorates one in the new, you conclude that they are one and the same, and that there is "no new thing" in the new covenant! You again assert, without one iota of proof, that the sprinkling of the Old Testament and the baptism of the New are one and the same, and declare that you have given proof for your groundless opinion. What and where is the proof?

I will number and name some of your mistakes on the baptism of the Spirit. (1) When we were on the design of baptism, you said: "The Spirit is the agent, and not the element." But in this you contend that he is the element, and that it is a "literal baptism performed by pouring." David said: "I am poured out like water." (Ps. 22:14.) Was he literally poured out? The Holy Spirit is not a mere influence, but he is a person, and it is absurd to talk of his being "literally" poured out. Do you know the difference between a metaphor and a literal statement? (2) But here is another tangle: You say the expression, "buried in baptism," is Holy Spirit baptism; hence the baptism in the Spirit is a burial. But in the next breath you say pouring is the only mode of Spirit baptism! "The way of the transgressor is hard." The spirits of the apostles were overwhelmed by the power of the Holy Spirit; and since the word "baptize" means to submerge or overwhelm, it is called a "baptism."

You still contend that the "divers washings" or baptisms in Heb. 9:10 refers to the sprinkling of verse 13. I will expose you on this once more. "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.*" (Verse 13.) (1) This sprinkling purified "the flesh." (2) Baptism is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." (1 Pet. 3:21.) -(3) Therefore the sprinkling is not baptism.

Your failure to translate the words given is a confession that you are wrong. I told you that *every version that translates it at all translates it "immerse,"* and asked you if you knew the difference between "Anglicize" and "translate;" but you neither answer nor translate. You are between two fires. If you save your scholarship, you ruin your theology; and if you save your theology, you ruin your scholarship. Hence the only thing you can do is *do nothing!* Now, I am going to give you one more trial; and if you do not "Anglicize" and "translate" these expressions. I am going to in my next, and then your theology and your scholarship will both be ruined. Your statement that this is not "germane" is absurd. The whole contention hinges on the meaning of the word, and yet it is not "germane!" Please "Anglicize" and "translate" the following: (1) "Cheo se." (2) "Raino se." (3) "Baptizo se." Then give the Greek for these expressions: (1) "I pour thee." (2) "I sprinkle thee." (3) "I baptize thee."

When you are through, you can shout: "I have scored again!" I challenge you to find any kind of a translation, respectable or otherwise, that translates "baptizo" to "sprinkle" or "pour."

In regard to Christ's being made a priest by John, I will let the Bible refute the assertion: "For *if he were on earth, he should not be a priest*" (Heb. 8:4.) Christ was not a priest on earth at all if the Bible be true. So your beautiful (?) theory is exploded. Christ "was baptized [ebaptisqh] of John in Jordan." (Mark 1:9.) Translate the word. If it means "sprinkle," say so; if not, please do not approach blasphemy again by asserting: "If he were immersed, he was a lawbreaker."

Your effort on the Red Sea baptism is amusing. You say the rain at Sinai does not interfere with a rain at the Red Sea. Indeed! I showed that the "plentiful rain" you spoke of came at Sinai, and not at the Red Sea; and yet that does not make any difference!! Since you surrender this passage, will you please give another that tells of the rain falling upon them? You say: "The pillar of cloud was not over them," but "behind them," In your first you say: "They were under the cloud." What will you say next? I can see how the cloud could be over them and behind them, too. Can't you? Paul says they were "under the. cloud" and were baptized "in the cloud and in the tea." and I believe it; but I do not believe "the cloud" poured out water. Instead of answering my question, you ask me one and suppose my interest will subside. No, not till you explain how "the cloud of fire" "poured out a plentiful rain" upon the people in the Red Sea and the ground remained "dry." I told you that this was not a literal baptism, but that it was typical, and explained how it was; but you could not answer the question and had to hide behind something. You ignore Paul's statement that it is a type, and make a literal *pouring*. Will you slate in this debate that this is a literal *baptism*? We will see.

I do not have the 1910 edition of your "Discipline," hut I will accept your statement that is needed revising, and am glad to know that it has been improved. The one I quoted from was published in 1906; ami, of course, the Methodist doctrine could change much in four years.

You make a great ado over my reply to your "prophecy" and "fulfillment" argument, but you take special pains not to refer to *five* of my objections to it. You attack my explanation of the fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy, and actually deny the plain word of God in your effort. You say: "In Ezekiel's time the Israelites had not *been scattered among* all countries." The Bible says: "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather *you out of all countries*." (Ezek. 36:24.) How could he gather them "out of all countries" when they were not "scattered among all countries?" You should apologize for that statement. As this is your only attempt to offset my objections, and as they are before the readers, I will pass on.

You say: "Trice says the word in Isa. 52:15 means 'startle' that is translated 'sprinkle.'" I deny it. and demand the proof. Here is what I said: "The word 'sprinkle' in Isa. 52:15 is rendered 'startle' in the margin of the American Revision, and the context shows that to tic the meaning." Why do you say, "Trice says?" Do you deny the statement? You should apologize again. If the Revision says "startle" in the margin of Ezek. 86:25, we will consider it; but it not, you should not use them interchangeably just to ape some one else.

You overlook the point on Ezek. 36:25. and run back and try to patch up your efforts to meet my second affirmative argument on the design of baptism. Here is the thought: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, *and ye shall be clean.*" The sprinkling was to make them clean. You say the sprinkling is baptism. Therefore, as per your theory, baptism is a condition of remission or cleansing.

Then you tell us that the He vised Version in Gal. 2:16 says we are Justified by "faith only." What revision? I have four versions before me. including the. American Revision, but none of them give the marginal rendering you mention. You will please designate in your next the version and the edition, of else recant the statement. I have shown throughout this discussion that men are justified by faith, but for the following reason I do not believe in salvation by "faith only:" "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and *not by faith only.*" (James 2:- 24.) The Methodist "Discipline" says (unless it has undergone some much-needed revision) that we are Justified by "faith only," but I never read it in the Bible. Are you sure you do not have the two mixed? Do you mean by "faith only" that prayer, repentance, and grace are excluded, or does it include *everything but baptism?* To be sure, persons must believe on the name of Christ in order to be saved; but that docs not prove that repentance and baptism are not conditions of salvation. So your far-fetched argument does not prove salvation by "faith only." Do you think a man can be saved by faith without repentance? Your contention militates Just as much against reptance as it docs baptism.

You say you "made no assumption at all" in the case of the eunuch.

I will just name some of them: (1) "He was in a desert way." The Bible says he went down "from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert."

It does not say that either the way or the country was desert, but the Gaza to which he went was. Why should he tell us that a road or way did not have any water in it? You seem to think that "desert" means "no water," and yet the very passage says they both came "up *out of the water,*" You have never yet mentioned this point, but you did not assume "at all!" "When Jesus heard of it, he departed thence by ship into a desert place apart." (Matt. 14:13.) Was that a place "without water," or was it a deserted place "apart?" (2) "Philip preached baptism by sprinkling." Remember, you ore not assuming "at all!" He was baptized, and came "up *out of the water.*" "Baptisthenai'

is the word in the text." you say. Will you please translate it? Do not say it is not "germane;" but if it means "sprinkle," say so. and then shout. "The affirmative stands!" You can correct roe on "the word in the text" rendered "ti hudor," "little water." "some water," "as it were, lit a manner;" but you dare not translate "baptize!" If you will read the passage carefully, you will find baptisqhnaï and ebaptisan bath in this connection, but I will give you your choice. in translating: but please do not fall to render one of them. I am so anxious to see how "respectable" you can translate.

I will now consider your reply to my objections:

1. You agree that Christ commanded men to be baptized, but say "baptize" means "pour" or "sprinkle." That is what you are to prove, and I have already shown that the "pouring of the Spirit" is not baptism. So you are only assuming. It is not leaving the proposition to learn the meaning of "baptize" from the lexicons, any more than it is leaving the course of study to consult the dictionary for the meaning of a word; and I am surprised that you would intimate such a thing. I shall now give some reasons for believing that "baptize" means "immerse:" (a) Liddell and Scott and Thayer, two of the best lexicons extant, say that is its meaning. All others say the same. (b) There is not a standard Greek-English lexicon extant that defines "baptizo" to "sprinkle" or "pour." The scholars on my opponent's side freely admit this, as the following will show:

The University of Texas says:

AUSTIN, TEXAS, March 5, 1908.

*Mr. T. B. Thompson, Paducah, Ky.*

DEAR SIR: The president of the university has referred to me your letter of the 1st instant. I know of no standard Greek lexicon "that defines *baptizo* to mean sprinkle or pour."

Very truly yours, W. J. BATTLE.

The Methodist Publishing House says:

NASHVILLE, TENN., March 5, 1908.

*Mr. T. B. Thompson, Paducah, Ky.*

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 1st instant is received, and in answer to your inquiry we desire to say that we do not know of any standard Greek lexicon that defines "baptizo" to sprinkle or pour.

Very truly yours,

SMITH & LAMAR, Agents.

(c) The Eastern or Greek Catholic Church repudiates sprinkling and practices immersion; and since they are familiar with the Greek, they certainly would not so act if the word meant "sprinkle" or "pour." Dean Stanley, a distinguished minister of the Church of England, says: "There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries any other form was either unknown or, regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost monstrous case. To this form the Eastern church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable, portion

of it, that of the Byzantine empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid." ("History of Eastern Church," page 117.)

2. I have shown that Ezekiel's prophecy was not fulfilled on Pentecost; and, besides, the "clean water" did not mean "unmixed water." So you have failed to show where unmixed water was ever sprinkled upon any one for any religious purpose.

3. Because the circumcision of the heart was done without hands you guess that baptism is circumcision; and it is done without hands! You will have that to prove before it will "stand." I do not immerse "a living man," but one that is dead to the love and practice of sin. The Bible says, "Buried with him in baptism," meaning that as Christ was buried in the tomb, so we are buried in baptism. All scholars and commentators so hold. Adam Clarke, a Methodist and a great scholar, says: "it is *probable* that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water, which seemed to say the man is *drowned*, is *dead*; and, when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life; *the man* is risen again; *he is alive*." ("Commentary" on Rom. 6. 4.) John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, says: "We are buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." ("Notes on New Testament," Rom. 6:4.) Dr. Philip Schaff, a great church historian, says: "All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse, especially in *sunciaphenen* and *cgerthe*, the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied." The Edinburgh Reviewers, who are affusionists, express my sentiments in the following: "We have rarely met, for example, a more weak and fanciful piece of reasoning than that by which Mr. Ewing would persuade us that there is no allusion to the mode by immersion in the expression, 'buried with him in baptism.' This point ought to be frankly admitted, and, indeed, cannot be denied with any show of reason."

But I suppose my opponent will say he does not care what the scholars say, he knows he has "scored again."

You say a great host were regenerated before baptism. I challenge you to find the word "regenerate" in any of the cases you cite. If you mean they were saved before baptism, I deny it, and demand the proof. You say Peter shows the meaning of baptism in 1 Pet 3:21. Let us explain the passage: "Wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water [saved from sin? No; they were already righteous; but saved from the old world]. The like figure [or in the antetype] whereunto even *baptism doth also now save us*." What saved Noah and his family? "Water." How? He prepared an ark and went into it; but he was not saved from the antediluvian world until the "water" lifted the ark up and placed it in the new world. So after

a true likeness "*baptism saves us.*" How? We believe the gospel and repent of our sins; but baptism translates us from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God; and this being the final step, it is said baptism saves.



## BAGBY'S LAST AFFIRMATIVE.

---

Any one who reads the clear, scriptural arguments that I have made and carefully examines the mighty eloquence and limping logic with which Brother Trice has tried to sweep away the affirmative, and has not found out that the affirmative has "scored in every contention," is certainly dull of comprehension.

My opponent claims that I was dogmatic in saying that I had scored in every contention; but if the reader will turn to my second affirmative, he will find that I use the expression only after absolutely annihilating his false positions, and the expression was but the clarion note of victory, and the conclusion was the same that any one would have reached if he had carefully examined the material with which my opponent sought to discredit my statements. He says that he cannot get me to translate *baptizo* to "sprinkle" or "pour." Why should I translate the word when the Bible has already said that "baptize" means to "pour?" He says that no scholar gives "sprinkle" or "pour" as the meaning of "baptize;" but many scholars define "baptize" to "sprinkle" and "pour," among whom are Passow, Scheider, Gazes, and Stokius; and, above all, the Bible says that it means "pour" or "sprinkle," and it never means "immerse" in the New Testament anywhere where the rite of baptism occurs, and I am sticking to the Bible and to the proposition; and as he could not with his lame and puerile attempts overthrow my plain, scriptural statements, he has sought to sidetrack me by introducing some lessons in Creek composition and the testimony of uninspired men. But as the Bible was made and its usages clearly prescribed and set forth long before human lexicons and Catholic priests were known in the world, I prefer going to the plain word of God to find the meaning of its own terms.

Nobody ever said that "It is unsafe for a penitent believer to be baptized," but a cloud of witnesses "decidedly larger than yours" say that it is not a condition of pardon. And remember this: The fight is not on baptism, but on the construction that you put on baptism; and when any ordinance of the Christian church is emphasized to the utter neglect of the more important ones, that perversion is dangerous.

I do not have to go to the Britannica nor to the priest who baptized you to find out that your position is papistic; I can read it from the holy Bible; but when you try to refute my arguments and discredit my position, you have to call in an uninspired man. Reader, which side had you rather be on—mine, that is sustained by the word of God;

or his, that is supported only by man's opinion? I deny that he has proven that sprinkling or pouring is papistic, for it was practiced for hundreds of years before there was a pope. It is the baptism of the Old and New Testament, as I have shown already. You take precisely the same position on Luke 22:19 that I took, and do it to try to disentangle yourself; but you have still left your objection where I left it at first—"the height of nonsense." The question you asked me, in the light of what I said on the subject, is nonsense personified; and as you saw the fallacy of your position, you did it for effect and nothing more. I said the bread represents his body. Why did you ask that question?

Brother Trice produced no "thus saith the Lord" to show that infants have been taken out of the "everlasting covenant;" so we will still leave them in. Paul and the others were baptized because baptism took the place of circumcision in the gospel dispensation, as the following will show: "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." (Gen. 17:10.) This is the covenant that God made with Abraham, with the seal affixed. Rom. 4:11 says: "And he | Abraham I received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Here we learn that circumcision was the *sign* and *seal* under the old covenant. Again, in Gal. 3:26-29 we read: "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. 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." Now the facts are before us. Under the old covenant, circumcision was the *sign* and *seal*; under the new covenant, baptism is the *sign* and the *seal*. The old covenant had respect to Abraham and his *natural seed*; the new has respect to all the children of Abraham and their seed—not his natural seed alone, but all those who are "by faith" his seed. In the old covenant the seal was a partial one, being delivered only to the male children of Abraham; in the new the seal is given to all alike, for "there is neither male nor female," but "all are one in Christ Jesus." The "putting on of Christ," or the initiation, under the new is done by being "baptized into Christ." We are baptized "into Jesus Christ" by "one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13), and symbolize this spiritual baptism with water administered in the name of Christ, and not by the authority of the Spirit, as Brother Trice has said in this debate (Matt. 28:10.)

Baptism is, then, the *sign* and *seal* of the new covenant; and as all who are in Christ are Abraham's seed "according to the promise," and as babies are in Christ, they are also Abraham's seed and entitled to baptism "according to the word of the Lord." Besides this, in the

commission we are commanded to baptize "nations" and babies are a part of "nations," and, as such, are entitled to baptism, for they are not rebels, but they are saved. So if Brother Trice wants to obey "from the heart" the command that Christ "delivered unto" him, he will baptize babies. The apostles did this, because they baptized families; and any man who baptizes families will baptize babies, because babies are members of families.

The Bible says of Lydia: "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 16:14, 15.) Here are the facts: Lydia's "heart was opened;" "she attended unto the things Paul said;" "she was baptized with her household;" "she besought." saying, "me to be faithful;" "come into my house;" "she constrained us." Now, if we are. to believe the plain word of God. there was either a baby in her family too young to believe, or Paul baptized impenitent sinners. The record shows that one believed and at least two were baptized. Please make as good argument as I have that Lydia's baby "was thirty-five years old." That Lydia was, as you say, "two or three hundred miles away from home." is positively contradicted by the Bible, which says: "She besought us, saying. . . . Come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." That is, we went in and abode. I am "of the city" of Decaturville; I was born there; but I have a house in Obion. So with Lydia; and if words mean anything, she was' baptized with her baby in her arms; and Brother Trice cannot explain the baby away.

I have just this to say in regard to your saying that I try to get sway from each proposition: I begged you to make one argument in support of your proposition that immersion is baptism and is a condition to pardon, and you excused your shortcomings by saying that you then was discussing mode. I made many then and have made many this time that prove my position.

I referred to the first proposition at this place because I aim for my articles to serve as a shield against all heretical perversions of the plain doctrines of the Bible, and any one who will read what I have said about Acts 2:38 will be convinced that I have forever destroyed your watery theory of salvation.

Your argument about Paul's baptism is indeed lame. I *know* that the Bible says Paul was in the house; that Ananias entered the house, put his hands on Paul, and immediately Paul was baptized. I know "immediately" does not mean after a fellow has gone .to Obion River, but instantly, without the delay of going to the river. So Paul..as far as the record goes (and I propose to be governed by the Bible), was baptized in the house; and I baptize people where they were converted, and by doing so I am following the example of the apostles.

for there is no record of any apostle going to a river to baptize in all the sixty-seven years of apostolic history, although they baptized thousands. (Acts 2:41; 6:14; 16:16, 22; 10:43-47.) This is strong proof that the apostles did not immerse, and Brother Trice says we have to come "this side of the cross" to find the terms of admittance" to the new covenant, and he claims that baptism is one of the terms; and if his claim is true, the Christian dispensation is without immersion, for the apostles did not baptize in rivers.

Should my wife, as you ask. say to me, "Arise and eat breakfast," I certainly would not expect to go down to the Obion River to find my breakfast, but would expect to find it in the house; and in the case of Paul, the Book says that he was in the house, and was baptized immediately, and I take what the Book says; and so he was not immersed, but baptized by the Bible mode of sprinkling.

In the case of Athaliah (2 Chron. 22:10), if the Book had said that she did it immediately. I would have thought that she did it at once.

I am satisfied with my position on Spirit baptism. Pouring is the mode of the true baptism, which is Spirit baptism, and the Spirit thus acting baptizes (Joel 2:28; Acts 11:15. 16; Tit. 3: & 6); and the effect of this mode is death to sin, or a burial to sin. and a raising to a new life by faith in the energy of God; and as water, which is administered by the command of Christ and in his name, is a sign of this work of the Spirit, it, too, is by pouring or sprinkling.

If language is capable of conveying intelligent thought, Paul says that one of the "divers baptisms" in Heb. 9:10 is the sprinkling of verse 13; and no one has ever disputed it, except those that had a little theory to defend, whether it was in keeping with truth or not.

My "failure to translate the words" you gave me is not a confession, as you say, that I am wrong, and it neither affects my scholar-ship nor ray theology; and neither of these affects the proposition, which is, not whether Bagby can Anglicize and translate "Cheo se" ("to pour upon thee"), "Raino se" ("to sprinkle upon thee"), and "baptizo se" ("to wash, wet, cleanse thee with water"); but "the Bible teaches that the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject is baptism." Anybody can see that your short course in Greek composition has nothing to do with the proposition.

Of course the whole contention hinges on the meaning of the word "baptize" as given by the Bible, but not on what any uninspired man has said about it; and the Bible says that "baptize," where the mode of baptizing is given, means "pour." I [John] indeed baptize you with water: ... he [Christ] shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; John 1:31, 32.) John baptized with water. Water was the instrument used with which people were baptized. Christ baptizes with the Holy Ghost—that is, the Holy Ghost is the agent used, and the operation of this agent on man's moral nature is baptism, and the mode is pouring; for "on the Gentiles also

was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 10:45.) Here, dear reader, the Bible says in so many words that "baptize" means "pour." It does not matter what Trice, John Wesley, W. J. Battle, or any other man says about it. The Bible says "baptize" means "pour," and I believe that the Bible knows more about the meaning of my own words than any uninspired man, however learned he may be. Now, if we are to take the Bible, sprinkling or pouring is the mode of baptism, and is the way that Christ did it; and, as for me, I want to baptize like my Lord showed me; for if I do like he did, I certainly cannot be wrong.

In regard to my approaching blasphemy in regard to the baptism of Christ, I will say that my Lord was a Jew, a worshiper in the temple and in the synagogue, and he said: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: ... but to fulfill." (Matt. 6:17.) If he fulfilled the prescribed baptisms of the law and the prophets (Hum. 19:9-22; Isa. 1:6; etc.), we know that he was not immersed; and he could not be immersed and fulfill any ceremonial law of either the law or the prophets, for they were done by sprinkling. So I told the truth when I said that those who say that he was immersed make him a lawbreaker, and the *truth is* not blasphemy, and it is both coarse and vulgar to make such an accusation. Heb. 8:4, that you cite, only shows that Christ's priesthood was not "lineally" derived, but does not affect the fact that he abolished the Levitical priesthood and was ceremonially consecrated to that office by John's sprinkling "water of purifying upon him" (Num. 8:7); so that when he was asked "by what authority" (Matt. 21:23) he performed his official acts, he could refer them to the fact that "John, the regular priest, had consecrated him in the regular way by sprinkling water upon him," "that he might be a faithful high priest" (Heb. 2:17). This is enough to convince any unbiased mind that Christ was not immersed.

You say in so many words that "the context shows that [what "that?" That the word in Isa. 52:15 translated "sprinkle" means "startle "] to be the meaning." I demand that you apologize for denying what you said.

In regard to aping "some one else," though I make no claim to originality (all I have said has been said before), I will say that you accused me of being "strangely out of Joint with Mr. Wesley" in my position; but I must say that you tread exactly in the footsteps of Mr. Campbell, making the same kind of arguments that your great leader made before you.

The Revised Version of 1885, in Gal. 2:16, says what I said of it, and I am not responsible for his not having it. So the Bible says we are Justified by faith only. This is the only thing that a penitent sinner has to do on his part as the conditional cause of his pardon. The question is not what Christ, the Father, and the Spirit have done or

must do, but what must the sinner do as the conditional cause of his justification; and the Bible says "faith only" is the conditional cause.

It will not help Brother Trice any to say, as Mr. Campbell does, that "faith only" means faith without repentance, grace, Christ, etc.; for faith only affects none of these things, but means that faith is the one thing without which a sinner cannot be pardoned—that it is the conditional cause of his justification.

Let us take Abraham and see how my theory works. Gen. 15:6: "He [Abraham] believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." Now, forty years after this, Abraham, in the sense of approval, was justified by works, when he offered up Isaac (James 2:21); but he had been a righteous man for forty years when this happened. So please do not mix this again, for baptism is not a condition of pardon. Thus we find that a sinner exercises faith, and, in the act of believing, is born again and becomes a child of God. (John 3:6.)

This leads me to say that the water in John 3:5 does not mean Christian baptism, for the commission was not yet given; and if it refers to baptism with water at all, it refers to John's baptism; and that was by sprinkling, as we have already shown, for John was a priest, and the priest sprinkled. (Num. 8:7; 19:13, 18.) ... Brother Trice, you take up several pages showing what men say. If you wanted to discuss men and lexicons, why did you not submit a proposition of that nature? You talk like nobody ever saw a lexicon but you. But as the proposition that we are discussing says "Bible," you will have to give a "thus saith the Lord" to satisfy me. I know you would like to get away from the Bible on this issue, for the Bible says that the mode of real baptism is pouring (Acts 10:45), and you cannot stand that. I know how to sympathize with you, however, for I once was in the dark on this subject and taught as you teach; but God opened my eyes, and I determined no longer to blindly follow a theory, but to take the Bible as my only creed, because it contains all that is necessary to salvation, and nothing should be required of any man as a condition of pardon that is not clearly taught in the Book.

Since you are so anxious to see how "respectable" I can translate. I will gratify your anxiety: "' Ebaptisen:' to cleanse or purify with water, to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize."

Here are the things that Brother Trice could not explain away: God at the Red Sea baptized men, women, and children "on dry ground;" and he did not dip them, but sprinkled them, as he is wont to do. (See Ex. 14:22, 29; 1 Cor. 10:1, 2.)

In all cases in the Bible where the mode of baptism (Spirit) is given it is pouring.

In all cases where the mode in the allusions to baptism is given it is affusion.

In all cases where such words as "cleanse" and "sanctify" are

used, referring to water, where all agree it points to baptism, as Eph. 5:26. it is affusion.

"Baptize" never means "immerse" in the New Testament anywhere where the rite occurs; therefore immersion as an ordinance of God's church is a stranger and foreigner to the whole Bible.

John's baptism was "a purifying" (John 3:25, 26), and purifying was done by sprinkling (Num. 8:7; Ezek. 36:26); therefore John sprinkled for baptism.

The Pentecostians were sprinkled in fulfillment of prophecy. Four successive items of prophecy were fulfilled to the letter. See the full statement in my first affirmative, and remember that the only effort he made to refute my argument was that the prophecy was fulfilled five hundred and thirty-six years before Christ, when the Jews returns! from Babylon. I showed that his position was false, because they were to be taken from "all countries," or nations, and in Ezekiel's time they had not been scattered among "all countries" and could not be gathered from all countries, or nations. Those who returned from Babylon did not return from all countries, but from one country; and did not permanently "dwell" in the land, but were again ejected from it, and, therefore, could not refer to that event. So the "gathering" to which Ezekiel refers is an event that did not take place on the return from Babylon, but did take place when the Jews were gathered and experienced a cleansing that freed them from their "unclean-nesses" of the past, and gave them such an inward renovation of heart that in the future they would worship and serve God. This was done when they were admitted to the Christian church; and they were received into the Christian church on the day of Pentecost, and had "clean water," unmixed water, sprinkled upon them, symbolizing the fact that "a new heart" had been given them. So if the Bible is true, the Pentecostians were baptized by having "clean water" sprinkled upon them. As Brother Trice has failed to refute this argument, it stands, and he cannot bring in any new arguments in his last reply. If he brings in any new arguments in his final reply, he will violate every rule of public debating.

Cornelius and his house were also admitted to the church by God's "forever" statute of sprinkling, for Peter said when he saw that Christ had baptized them by pouring out the Spirit upon them, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts 10; 47); or, as we would say, "Will some one bring water, that these may be baptized?" "And [when the water was brought] he commanded them to be baptized." This is another case of sprinkling so clear that Brother Trice refused to notice it, and now he cannot.

The eunuch was baptized by sprinkling, because he was in a, desert riding along the road, rending Isaiah, where it tells about the "coming of Christ. As Philip preached unto him Christ, who shall "sprinkle

many nations." they came to a "little, water"—not "much water," not "deep water:" and here Philip baptized him by sprinkling; and they both went to the water, for they had to have running water (Num. 19:17); and as one had to go, decency and good will demanded that they both go. The law of Moses, which demanded sprinkling, was strictly kept by Philip and the early Christians long after this (Acts 15:1-20; all of Gal. 3); and by this also we know that the eunuch was baptized ("ebaptisen:' to cleanse, wash, baptize with water") by sprinkling, clean water, or running, water, being the instrument used. The only things he says about this is, "they both came 'up out of the water,' "and" why did 'they both' go down 'into' and 'come' up out of the water?" I have shown why they both did it; and "both Philip and the eunuch" could have gone down "into" and "come up out of the water" where it was one inch deep ("a certain water," or "a little water," as the Greek has it), just as well as if it had been three or four feet deep; and "down into" and "up out of" no more prove immersion than my saying "I fished in Obion River" would prove that I caught an elephant. Out when the Bible tells us that the law of Moses was strictly kept for many years after this event; that the eunuch was reading about Christ, who should "sprinkle the nations;" and that they came to "a certain water" or "a little water," we know that, in keeping with the law and the prophets, he was baptized by sprinkling.

After Pentecost, "baptize," in reference to the Spirit, is never used except in connection with its symbol, water baptism. The two go together, just as a man and his shadow, and neither is ever referred to without the other; and as they are joined together just as a man and his shadow, and the mode of the Spirit's baptism is plainly given, and is by pouring (Acts 1:8; 10:45; 2:17; 2:33), it follows that water baptism is performed in the same way.

I have finished my task. I have shown what the Scriptures of truth say on this subject. I have shown that the poor, the weak, and unlearned, who cannot spend ten or twenty years in learning what the lexicons say about "baptizo," can take the Bible, which in the channel to convey the glad tidings of God's salvation, and learn that "faith in Christ" is the one conditional cause of a penitent sinner's pardon; and when he believes, in the act of believing" he will have the Spirit poured upon his soul; and while he is magnifying God for "the gift of the Spirit." he can have water brought and be baptized like Cornelius, who was the first fruits of the Gentile world.

May the reading of these pages lead the reader into the light of divine truth, make him a true follower of Jesus Christ, and cause him to delight in his gospel; and, finally, may we all be gathered into eternal rest on high, where we shall be able to give Christ perfect praise forever. Amen.



## TRICE'S LAST REPLY.

---

My opponent is not quite so boastful in his last affirmative, but he says the person who does not see that he "scored in every contention is certainly dull of comprehension." If your logic is so irresistible and your proposition so manifestly scriptural, why do you spend so much time sounding "the clarion note of victory?" Do you not suppose the reader will find out who presented the arguments and whose theory was "absolutely annihilated?" You remind me of the boy who drew the picture of the horse; but, fearing it would not be recognized, he wrote these words under the picture: "This am a horse."

You say: "Many scholars define 'baptizo' to 'sprinkle' or 'pour.'" Why did you not give their definitions in this debate? Why do you not send their names to the University of Texas and the Methodist Publishing House, at Nashville, Tenn.? They know of no such scholars. In the correspondence we had in my little paper you introduced Home of these scholars, but I showed that they did not *define* "baptizo" to "sprinkle" or "pour;" so in this discussion you leave them severely alone, and actually censure me because I consult the Greek lexicons to get the meaning of a Greek word! We live and learn!

You say: "'Baptizo se:' to wash, wet, cleanse you with water." *But you do not say "baptizo" means 'sprinkle' or 'pour!'* You made a desperate struggle to save your theology and scholarship; but li; trying to occupy a middle ground, you have hopelessly ruined them both, (1) All *real* scholars give "immerse" or "dip" as the *primary* meaning of "baptizo." You mention some secondary meanings, but refuse to give the primary one; hence you are out of harmony with the real scholars, and away goes your scholarship! (2) You have engaged to prove that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject is baptism," but your scholarship will not allow you to translate the word "baptizo" to "sprinkle" or "pour;" therefore you have failed to prove your proposition, and your theology is ruined!

Why are you so averse to Anglicizing those words? Do you hope to keep the readers from knowing that "baptize" is not a *translated*, but an *Anglicized*, word? I shall first Anglicize and then translate these three expressions, that alt may see the truth in the matter and be convinced that there is absolutely nothing in your statement that "no version renders 'baptizo' to 'immerse.'" (1) Cheo = cheize = pour. (2) Raino = rantize = sprinkle. (3) Baptizo = baptize = immerse. If you leave "cheo" and "raino" in their Anglicized form, as you do "baptizo." you have *cheize* and *rantize*, and you could challenge the

world to name a "respectable translation" that renders "rantize" and "cheize" to "sprinkle" and "pour;" but if you *translate* "baptizo," as you do "cheo" and "raino," you will not have "baptize," but it will be "immerse." This may help some to understand why you would not Anglicize and truncate those words, or even admit that "baptize" is not a translated word, but that it is a Greek word with an English ending.

You say: "Nobody ever said it is unsafe for a penitent believer to be baptized." To be sure! I thank you most heartily for thin noble and honest confession. I knew that it was true, and I rather thought you would have the manhood to admit it; but I hardly expected you to be so outspoken in the matter. It matters not how many think baptism is "nonessential" to pardon, so long as they all *agree* that it is safe for the penitent believer to be baptized, my position is unquestionably safe. I do not "emphasize" baptism "to the utter neglect of the more important" duties; and if you know half as much about what I teach as you claim to, you could not truthfully make that statement. And if you had the proper appreciation of the word of God, you would not be talking so glibly about some "ordinances" being "more important" than others. Much mischief has been wrought in the religious world by the presumption of men. Some seem to think that the Lord did not know how to "label" his laws; so they proceed to tell you which commandments are "essential" and which are "non-essential."

I do not understand how you can "read from the holy Bible" that my position is papistic. I am sure you can read my position from the Bible, but why that makes it papistic is the strange part. You can deny the statement of the Britannica if you like, but the truth will remain, and the readers will think the less of you for it. I know my reference to the Catholic priest is painful to you, as it shows clearly that you are trying to sustain a Romish relic by the Bible—a thing Catholics do not attempt; but duty demands that I give the facts in the case. In regard to your statement that sprinkling was practiced "hundreds of years before there was a pope," I will say that assertion without proof is not argument.

You speak of my "tangle" on Luke 22:19. Who told you I was in a tangle? I insist that you should either affirm that the bread used in the Lord's Supper *is the body of Christ*, or else affirm that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject" *only represents baptism and is done in remembrance of Spirit baptism*. I will affirm that the bread used in the Supper is not the literal body of Christ, but only represents it: Will you affirm that water baptism is not real baptism, but only represents it? Your present proposition says it *"is baptism."* and I am determined that our readers see that you are hopelessly tied up. When you took the absurd and unscriptural position that the miraculous baptism in the Holy, Spirit is the "one *baptism*,"

and then affirmed that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject is *baptism*," you put yourself in a hobble from which release is impossible, and your shouting "nonsense personified" will not extricate you.

You say: "Paul and others were baptized, because baptism took the place or circumcision." Wonderful logic! If baptism takes the place of circumcision, why should "Paul and others" be baptized and circumcised both? When you wear a cap "in the place" of a hat, do you wear both of them at once? This one point refutes your contention that baptism is the "sign and seal" of the new covenant as circumcision was of the old. But the scripture you quote does not say or intimate that baptism is the "sign and seal" of anything. Of what is it the "sign," and what does it "seal?" We are all the children of Abraham "by faith." Infants cannot exercise faith; therefore they are excluded. I have already shown that all who are in the new covenant have been taught. (Heb. 8:11.) Infants cannot be taught; hence they cannot be members of the covenant of Christ. When you show they were ever members of the new covenant, or even explain how it is possible for them to ever be, then it will be time to ask me for authority for taking them out.

Christ commands the nations to be baptized. Infants are a part of nations; hence they should be baptized, you contend. Christ commands nations to be baptized. Infidels are a part of nations; hence, per your theory, they should be baptized; and it would be just as reasonable and scriptural to take a rebellious infidel by force and sprinkle water upon him as it is to take a sinless babe and sprinkle it against its will. You again contend that since the apostles baptized families, they baptized infants. You had as well contend that they baptized idiots, as they are "members of families." But as I showed the term "household" or "family" does not always include infants, and as you ignore the argument, I will not spend more time on this point. I will number the things you have to assume to find a case of infant sprinkling in Lydia's house: (1) You assume that she was married. The very fact that she was the head of her house is a good indication that she was an unmarried lady, because in those days where there was a husband he was the head of the house. (2) You assume she had children. The Bible does not mention them, and the term "household" often means servants or assistants. (3) You assume she had an eight-day-old baby with her and by the river side! But you think because it is not stated that "her household" believed, that "there was either a baby in her family too young to believe or Paul baptized impenitent sinners!" You had as well argue that the jailer and his house (Acts 16:30-33) were all "impenitent sinners," because it is not stated that they repented! But since faith and repentance are prerequisite's to baptism, those who have no theory to shield have no trouble in understanding such things. I am "of Union City;" but I have a home at

present in Campbell, Mo., and I have "constrained" some people to visit me while here.

Paul was baptized, but "baptize" does not mean "sprinkle;" hence he was not sprinkled. He was *buried* in baptism. A burial is not a sprinkling; hence he was not sprinkled. Your dodge on the two illustrations I gave is apparent and pitiful, but you have fixed it now by saying "Immediately" means "instantly." So when your wife tells you to "arise and get breakfast," you not only stand in your bed and cat, but you gulp it down "instantly!"

You are still struggling to disentangle yourself on the Holy Spirit baptism. You say "pouring is the mode" of Spirit baptism, "and the *effect of this mode*" is a "burial to sin." You thus admit that the pouring is not the burial, but the "effect" of it is. I have repeatedly shown in this debate that the overwhelming influences of the Spirit constituted the baptism, and not the pouring upon; but in the face of all this you have the temerity to say: "The Bible says in so many words that 'baptize' means to 'pour.'" A man is certainly hard pressed who will make such reckless statements. The Bible says the Spirit was poured, but it does not say that the pouring was the baptism. You continue to stultify yourself by saying "the Holy Ghost is the agent," and that he is *literally poured out*. If the Spirit is the agent, then what is the element? "Verily, the legs of the lame are unequal."

You say Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill, the law. I agree, but that does not prove that he was sprinkled for baptism. In my first reply I asked you this question: "Are you willing to state in thin debate that Christian baptism was commanded by the law of Moses? You refuse to answer the question or attempt to prove that it was. but you have the audacity to assert that if Christ were not sprinkled he was a lawbreaker! You will not translate "ebaptistha" to "sprinkle." for you know it does not mean "sprinkle;" and yet you have the monumental gall to say Christ was sprinkled! I pity the man or cause that grasps at such imaginary straws.

I have shown that Christ did not belong to the priestly tribe (Heb. 7:13, 14), and that he was not fit priest on earth (Heb. 8:4); but my opponent pays no attention to that, as he must be sprinkled by John into the priesthood at all hazards, or his theory goes down.

I did not deny what I said on Isa. 52:15. I repeated it in my last speech; but you said that I said "sprinkle" means "startle," when I simply told you what the Bible says. "Like as many were astonished at thee (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men), so shall he sprinkle I margin, "startle"] many nations; *kings shall shut their mouths at him:* for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard *shall they understand*" (Isa. 62:14, 16. A. R. V.) Does the sprinkling water upon the people cause the kings to shut

their mouths and be astonished? You know it does not. But the advent of Christ into the world did "startle" or "astonish" the nations and cause the kings to shut their mouths. This is why I said the context favored "startle," as the margin suggests.

I have not studied Mr. Campbell's works during this discussion, but I certainly appreciate your saying that I make "the same kind of arguments" that he made. I cannot say that you have followed in the footsteps of Mr. Wesley, but you have certainly clung tenaciously and slavishly to one J. E. Mahaffey. You have not only used the "same *kind* of arguments," but you have used the *same ones*, and clothed them in the same words a good part of the time. I hope that those who have read "The Bible Mode of Baptism" may read the debate, not simply to see how closely you followed Mahaffey, but that they may see how absurd and unscriptural Mahaffey's arguments are.

I do not know what kind of a revision you have, but I have before me the American Standard Edition of 1885, "newly edited by the American Revision Committee" in 1901, and it does not read by "faith only," but it says: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the *works of the law* but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law." (Gal. 2:16.) The passage simply teaches that men are not justified by the law of Moses, but through faith in Christ, and it does not contradict the statement which declares: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and *not by faith only*." (James 2:24.) Would you have the Bible contradict itself in order to save your theory? If faith is the "only conditional cause" of pardon, then you have people saved without repentance, unless "faith only" means repentance, prayer, confession, and everything else except baptism.

Abraham lived and died before Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and, of course, he did not have to be baptized; but he was not justified by "faith only." for the Bible says: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, *Abraham believed God*, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness!" (James 2:21-23.) I do not have the time or the inclination to discuss the meaning of John 3:6, but will state that the Methodist "Discipline" (1912 edition) says "the minister shall" read it when about to baptize or sprinkle a person. Do you obey the "Discipline" and let the people think you indorse it, or do you tell them that the makers of the "Discipline" did not know what they were doing, and that John 3:5 "does not mean Christian baptism?" You try to play to the galleries a little by saying I want to leave the Bible and the proposition, but you are going to stay with the Bible. When you were in school, did your teacher think you had quit

the course of study every time you went to the dictionary for the meaning of a word? When you consult a lexicon for the meaning of a word in the Bible, do you mean to abandon the Bible? I have not left the Bible or the proposition, either, as the readers know; but I simply consulted some scholars on the meaning of a word, and your ado on this point is futile.

You still claim that God sprinkled the people at the Red Sea. I showed that the "cloud of fire" was not a rain cloud, hence it did not pour out water; and that the "plentiful rain" to which you referred came at Sinai about two months after they had crossed the sea; hence you cannot make out a case of sprinkling here. I asked you to tell how the ground remained "dry" while that cloud poured out a "plentiful rain:" but you look wise and say it is easier to do that than to do something else, but leave the question severely alone. I showed that Paul says this was a type, and challenged you to say it was a *literal baptism*; but you refuse to *answer*. You dislike to dispute what Paul says; and if you agree with him, your theory is demolished; so you cannot answer at all. You cannot find the passage that even intimates that water was *literally* poured upon the children of Israel while they were crossing the Red Sea; but the ground was beneath them, the walls of the sea on either side, and the cloud above them; hence they were entirely buried, or immersed; and as that is the literal meaning of the word "baptize," Paul calls it a type of baptism.

After I have shown over and over that the "cleansing of the flesh" is not baptism, and that John did not sprinkle people, you have the audacity to again *assert*: "John's baptism was a purifying, and purifying was done by sprinkling; therefore John sprinkled for baptism."

In your last reference to the fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy you say some things for which you should not only apologize, but of which you should sincerely repent. You say: "The only effort he made to refute my argument was that the prophecy was fulfilled five hundred and thirty-six years before Christ!" The fact is, I did not use that to refute your argument (or Mahaffey's, either); but after stating *six objections* to the groundless assumptions, *five of which you have never mentioned*, I said: "So far as disproving my opponent's contention, I could let the case rest here; but in order to teach the truth and show the straits to which men are driven to make out a case of sprinkling, I am going to show when Ezekiel's prophecy was fulfilled." But in the face of this stubborn fact, the man whom the Lord "led out of error" and filled him with the Holy Spirit says: "The only effort he made" was to show when the prophecy was fulfilled! But hear him again: "In Ezekiel's time they had not been scattered among all countries or nations, and could not be gathered from all countries." I showed in my last reply that you had flatly denied the Bible, and asked you to apologize; but you ignore the request and repeat the statement. I am going to expose you again. Ezek. 36:19, 20 says: "*And I*

*scattered them among the heathen, and they were dispersed through the countries:* according to their way and according to their doings I judged them. And when they *entered* unto the heathen, *whither they went*, they *profaned* my holy name, when they said to them. *These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of his land*" The Bible positively says they went "forth out of his land." and "were dispersed through the countries;" but in order to shield a theory, my opponent denies it most emphatically. I have the profoundest sympathy for both the man and the cause that are driven to such straits.

In regard to the case of Cornelius you say: "This is another case of sprinkling so clear that Brother Trice refused to notice it. and now he cannot." To show that I have mentioned it, and to show that you would not translate "baptisthani" to "pour" or "sprinkle." I am going to state just what I said about it: "As I have answered him so fully on the pouring of the Spirit, I pass his reference to the baptism of Cornelius, with the request that he translate *baptisthani*. That was what was done to Cornelius; and if it means he was poured; let him say so."

#### FINAL SUMMARY.

I shall now restate my objections to his proposition, and close the debate:

1. In commanding baptism, Christ used the Greek word "baptizo." This word does not mean "sprinkle" or "pour." There is not a standard Greek-English lexicon extant that so defines it. My opponent has not given any authority to that effort. He translated the word, *but did not render it "sprinkle" or "pour."* I have quoted from two standard Greek-English lexicons, and they both say "baptizo" means "dip" or "immerse." (a) Christ commanded people to be baptized. (b) Sprinkling or pouring is not baptism, (c) Therefore your contention is false.

2. Unmixed water was never sprinkled upon any one for any religious purpose by divine authority. My opponent sprinkles unmixed water upon people for baptism; therefore he does something for which he has no divine authority.

3. I have shown that sprinkling for baptism began with the Catholics. They say the Bible does not teach it, but the church is infallible and changed the ordinance. Therefore the effort of my opponent to sustain the practice by the Bible is both futile and inconsistent.

4. Where a detailed account of a baptism is given, it is always clear that immersion was the act. Take the case of the Savior: "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came, from Nazareth of Galileo, and was *baptized of John in Jordan*. And straightway *coming up out of the water*, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him." (Mark 1:9, 10.) Take the case of the eunuch: "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.*" (Acts 8:38. 39.) The unbiased reader can readily see that these cases are decidedly against sprinkling and in favor of immersion; but as the objections of my opponent on these cases have been met. I will pass on.

5. We have been "buried with him in baptism." The sprinkling or pouring of a little water upon a person is not a burial; therefore sprinkling or pouring is not baptism.

6. All affusionists admit that immersion is baptism. My opponent, agrees that it is safe to be immersed, and says that he will immerse people. Therefore it is manifestly and unquestionably safe to be immersed. A great many scholarly men say sprinkling or pouring is not baptism. The word "baptize" does not mean "sprinkle" or "pour." Baptism is a burial. Therefore it is exceedingly dangerous to. accept sprinkling for baptism.

Dear reader, have you been baptized, or have you been sprinkled? Do you not see that it is safe to be immersed and dangerous to be sprinkled? You have but one life to live; you pass this way but once. Can you afford to make a mistake about such an important matter?

My work is done. I pray the blessings and benedictions of the Heavenly Father upon the candid reader.