

NICHOL-BALLARD DEBATE

— ON —

INFANT BAPTISM

C. L. BALLARD, Methodist

C. R. NICHOL, Christian

— o —

PROPOSITION:

The Scriptures Authorize Infant Baptism

C. L. BALLARD, AFF.

C. R. NICHOL, NEG.

PAGES 89 - 166

PUBLISHED BY

Nichol Publishing Co.

CLIFTON, TEXAS

1954

Ballard's First Speech

If infant baptism is Scriptural, all who believe the Word of God should practice it. If it is not, it should be abandoned. I presume no one will deny these statements. Then let us notice the very beginning of God's Church, its developments, and the sacred relation children have ever sustained to this holy institution. In its embryonic state, the Church, with all its expanding possibilities, began with the first family on earth. When God said to the first pair, "Multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it, it was not merely to conquer the beast, till the soil, and extract a living from it, but it was also, to subdue all nature, and to bring back this sin-cursed world unto the God it had left, until the knowledge of the Lord should cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. But what part were the children to play in this drama, and what share of its privileges and immunities were they to hold? We suppose that one will dispute the right of the commander-in-chief to say who, when, and how his soldiers shall be enlisted, and what badge shall be a token of their enlistment. Now a thing is not true because it is in the Bible, but is in the Bible because it is true. Then if God has in any way connected the children with His church, it is right, and no one has authority to sever their relationship to His holy institution. What is their relationship to God and His Church? They are the creatures of His handiwork, and He has a right to place them where He chooses in His army to bring back this rebellious world to its justly offended God. We will say, then, they are His reserve force, from which He fills the depleted ranks of His dying army. Now if, as some say, the children have no relation to the Church, then God has no right to call upon them to enter His army, for obligation without participation is as unjust as taxation without representation. But does God put children under obligation to Himself and to His Church? That He does is shown by one indisputable fact—that is, that He, in all His laws, commands, covenants and promises, whether temporal, political or spiritual, always includes the children, and they, with their parents, suffered the penalties for the violation of these obligations, or shared in the blessings bestowed for the keeping of the laws and covenants; there is not one exception to this rule in all the Word of God. Not only this, but they, in every instance, received

the sign or token of these promises, covenants and laws. Not an exception to this rule, either. In the very first covenant that God made with Eve, He promised that her seed should bruise the serpent's head. Here is the promise, that the unborn offspring of the woman should bruise or crush the head of the leader of the army of sin. See Gen. 3:15. The next covenant that God made with man was with Noah and his unborn descendants, even down until this day, and will last until the end of time. Gen. 9:8-13. His bow in the heavens was to Noah and his children, is to us and our children yet to be born upon the earth, a token of God's eternal covenant, that He would no more destroy this world with a flood. Were his and our infant children embraced in this covenant, and does God give the sign, His bow, to our children as well as to us, who are grown? None will deny that He does.

The next covenant to which we desire the reader's attention is that one which God made with Abraham. In this covenant God's Church passes out of its embryonic state in the family into its national form in the Jewish race. Now let us see if this Church, passing from the embryonic to its national form, carried the children with it. We will read Gen. 17:3, "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Here God lifts the Church, so to speak, with its children, out of the family, or embryonic state, into a national form with its children. The covenant is here enlarged from that of a family Church into a national covenant or Church, with its children sharing in all its obligations, penalties or immunities. The covenant being enlarged, the sign must be correspondingly enlarged, and so it was; that it might bind in one common brotherhood all the families composing this national institution. Read Gen. 17:1-4, where the covenant of chapter 12 is repeated and enlarged upon. Hear it: "As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations," Verses 11-12: "And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed." Thus we see while the Church

lengthens her cords and strengthens her stakes, she still carries her children with her, and gives unto them the seal of the righteousness of her faith. Rom. 4:11.

We now go forward to the great general expansion of Zion in her onward march to perfection, and of the conquering of this earth for her Lord and Master, to-wit: Its exit out of Egypt, across the Red Sea, and into the land of Canaan. Let us follow it in its developments through this period. In their great distress they cried unto God because of their cruel task-masters. He heard their cry, and sent the saintly Moses, who chose the reproaches of Christ rather than the treasures of Egypt, to deliver them. Ex. 3:7-8, "And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry, by reason of their task-master," etc. Vs. 10, "Come, now, therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt." Here they are called God's people, God hearing their prayer, and sending a deliverer, to bring them out of bondage. But whom was He to lead and to deliver? Read Ex. 10:10: "And Moses said, we will go, with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go, for we must hold a feast unto the Lord." Thus the fathers, mothers and children, all together, under the guiding hand of God, are leaving Egypt to go hold a religious feast unto God in the wilderness. But before leaving this land of cruel bondage, they must have some token, some memorial of their suffering, also a sign of their true deliverer, of which Moses was a representative. So the paschal lamb, bitter herbs and unleaven bread was introduced as a token of their former sufferings and coming *deliverer*. But who were to partake of this great paschal feast? See Ex. 12:3-14. Vs. 3: "A lamb for a house, and if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next his house take it according to the number of souls," etc. Vs. 11: "And this day shall be unto you for a memorial, and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." A memorial, an ordinance, and a feast unto the Lord. All a religious, a Church service. Ritualism and ordinance, all combined in a holy feast. But who are the participants in this feast. Plainly all who went out of Egypt, and Moses says, "our young and our old,

our sons and our daughters," Then the children partook, and went out with their parents; this can not be denied. All the family ate of it, for the lamb was taken according to the number of souls in that family. And it was the Lord's passover, not a national feast; but the Lord's passover, a religious service, a Church institution, if you please, in which the children shared with their parents.

Let us follow them another step. They cross the Red Sea, but not till they all—men, women and children, were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. A. Campbell, in *Christian Baptism*, p. 286; Paul, I Cor. 10:1-2; Moses, Ex. 10:9. So we find the children, who were to leave Egypt, Ex. 10:9, at the passover, and were with their parents baptized unto Moses as they crossed the sea.

The next enlargement of this Church, now in its national form, was at Mt. Sinai, when from its smoking brow God out of the flames delivered to Moses, for all generations, the moral law, that was forever to regulate their, and our lives towards God and our fellow man. But were the children embraced in these laws? Read Ex. 9:14: "And Moses went down from the mount unto the people, and sanctified the people; and they washed their clothes." Now were the children left unsanctified and in their dirt to appear before the Lord on the third day? We shall see. Read Ex. 20:18-20: "And all the people"—does this include the children? "And all the people saw the thunders, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking; and when the people saw it they removed and stood afar off. And they said unto Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let God speak with us, lest we die. And Moses said unto the people, Fear not; for God is come to prove you, that His fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not." Was this a religious service in God's Church? That it was, it is plainly stated in the holy Scriptures. See Acts 7:34: "I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people which is in Egypt, and I have heard their groanings, and am come down to deliver them. And now come, I will send thee into Egypt." Vs. 37-38: "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he"—that is, this is Moses—"that was in the Church in the wilderness with the angel which spake unto him in Mount Sinai, and with our forefathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Here

we see the church being sanctified, to receive its laws and regulations from the hand of the great Head of the Church. But was this a baptized Church? Paul says they were; hear him: "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." I Cor. 10:2. A. Campbell says: "But not until they all—men, women and children—were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Christian Baptism, p. 386. Here are his own words: "It was a Church of this world, a great community, called out of Egypt; and under Moses in the wilderness God made a covenant with them, after they had all—men, women and children—been baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The facts were too manifest for Mr. Campbell, as much as he opposed infant baptism, to deny that the children of Israel were then a Church, with ordinances and ritualisms, in which the children bore a great part and held as large a share as the grown people; and that God did make a covenant with this baptized Church, with its children taking part therein. He could not deny it. Who can? But to be sure that God embraced the children in these laws, let us read Ex. 20:5, 6. Speaking of false gods, He says, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." Here God plainly teaches, that not only the children present were embraced in the commandments, but the unborn children should be blessed, if those commandments were kept, and cursed if those commandments were broken. That the children were embraced in these laws is beyond dispute. God says they were.

This being settled, let us see if the children were embraced in the Church ritual, as directed by God to Moses for His Church, of which Moses and all Israel, with their children, were members at Sinai. After Moses had made the tabernacle as God showed him on the mount and placed its curtains, altars and vessels in their places, God covered the tabernacle with a cloud of His glory, and talked to Moses out of the cloud, and gave him the ritual that should control all the services of His holy sanctuary. See Lev. 1:1: "And the Lord called unto Moses, and spoke to him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying, etc. Then follows, to

the most minute detail, every rule and regulation of the Church, and all who should take part therein or be included in the scope of its services. That the adults were members, and took part therein, there is no dispute; but were the children included in it and did they take part in its obligations and privileges? What was the custom of this national Church? We have seen, in Gen. 17:7, that God blessed the children who entered into His holy covenant by circumcision, and cursed the child who broke this covenant, Gen. 17:14. We further find, in following the development of this Church, that in Egypt, with their fathers and mothers, the children, even their infants, were slaves, and with them suffered, with them ate the passover, with them went out of Egypt, with them were baptized unto Moses, and with them received the law at Sinai's trembling base; now, were they included in these ritualistic services, as they came direct from God's mouth to Moses and the people, or is there a clause, a word or an intimation that the children were to be excluded from any of these rites, ceremonies or services? If so, where? But to the law and to the testimony. Ex. 19:1: "In the third month when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they unto the wilderness of Sinai." Vs. 3: "And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel." Vs. 5: "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine." Vs. 6: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." Are children embraced in the house of Jacob, and are they included in "holy nation?" If not, where are they? Are our children in the terms "our nations," "our households?" If not, where are they? If they are, who will exclude the children from "the house of Jacob," the "holy nation," or the "kingdom of priests," as mentioned in verse 8, as above quoted? The priesthood and holy nation, being God's kingdom, God's Church, the children were in some way connected thereto, for if they kept God's covenants they were blessed for so doing, but if they broke them they were cursed therefor, even though they be but eight days of age. See Gen. 17:7-8: "And he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do. and

be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it upon the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Were the children included under this sprinkling? They surely were a part of the people which were sprinkled; and they were surely included in the covenants, or God could not bless them, if they kept his laws and covenants, nor curse them if they broke them in which they were not included. This is self-evident, that if a law or covenant does not reach a party, that party has no responsibility in the success or failure of said covenant.

Nichol's First Reply

Mr. Ballard should have defined his proposition. He says, "If infant baptism is scriptural, all who believe the Word of God should practice it. If it is not, it should be abandoned." Admitted, but is "infant baptism" scriptural?

It is not necessary for a thing to be *forbidden* in the Scriptures for it to be *unscriptural*. Lack of scriptural warrant renders it *unscriptural*. It is for Mr. Ballard to show that infant baptism is scriptural, and *not* for me to show that it is *forbidden*. To be scriptural, it must have scriptural warrant. If he fails to show scriptural warrant, he says it should be "abandoned."

Question: Can a thing be warranted by the Scriptures without being mentioned in some way? Is infant baptism warranted by being mentioned in the Scriptures? If yes, where?

Name an apostle of Christ that baptized an infant. When? Where?

Is there an unmistakable case of infant baptism mentioned in the New Testament? Where?

Were infants baptized in the days of Adam, Abraham or Moses? Name the case. If not, why go there seeking proof? When you answer, the falsity of your contention will be apparent.

Hear him: "Then let us notice the very beginning of God's Church, * * * and the sacred relation children have ever sustained to this holy institution." His beginning for the Church antedates any I have ever heard. He says: "In its embryonic state the church * * * began with the first family on earth. When God said to the first pair, 'Multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it,' it was not merely to conquer the beast, * * * but it was also to subdue all nature, and to bring back this sin-cursed world unto the God it had left." My, my. When God said, "Multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it," Ballard says that was a command to "bring back this sin-cursed world unto the God it had left." What is the matter with you, Ballard? This command was given in the garden of Eden, before the fall of man; before one person had left God. Gen. 1:26-28. Of course, there is not one bit of authority in that for infant baptism, but it is as good proof as he will find in the Bible. Should I grant that the church began with Adam, there is not an infant in it, for there were no infants

till after the expulsion, and then, if they were in the Church when born, they were there without baptism. In his embryonic Church, according to his showing, there was not an infant. Do you mean that the unborn infant is a member of your "embryonic Church?"

He inquires: "What part were the children to play in this drama?" He then says that the "commander-in-chief" has the right to say—that God "has a right to place them where He chooses in His army to bring back this rebellious world." God's right, admitted. Imagine my surprise at the next statement, viz: "We will say, then, they are His reserve force, from which he fills the depleted ranks of His dying army." Ballard, are you the "commander-in-chief?" If not, to whom do you refer when you say, "We will say, then?" This is all the proof you offer to show the relationship to God and His army. Who are "we?" What authority is there in what "we" say?

You think God has no right to call on children to join his army if they are not members of His Church. Tell us, what right has God to call on lost, sinful men to obey Him? You say that He calls them from sin to become members of His Church. So when the child comes to the age of accountability God calls on them to enter His Church. Till they reach that age they are safe.

The next assertion: "Does God put children under obligation to Himself and to His Church? That He does is shown by one indisputable fact; that is, that He, in all His laws, commands, covenants and promises, whether temporal, political or spiritual, always includes the children, and they, with their parents, suffered the penalties for the violation of these obligations, or shared in the blessings bestowed for the keeping of these laws and covenants; there is not one exception to this rule in all the Word of God." Were you right in this, would it prove infant baptism? Infant baptism is not mentioned in any of God's laws, commands, covenants or promises. Where God placed children, they are mentioned. Since infants are not one time mentioned as having been baptized, we conclude that they were not. Now for the exception, where Mr. Ballard says there is *not one*. In Numbers 16 we have the rebellion of Korah and others. Vs. 27, their wives, sons and little daughters stood in the door of the tent. Vs. 32: "All the men that appertained to Korah, and all their goods," went down into the pit. Num. 26:10, 11 says: "The children of Korah died

not." This shows that the children did not suffer the penalty for the violation of the law, and is an exception to the "rule" of Mr. Ballard, and he said there was *not one*. Again, Mr. Ballard, will you show one unmistakable case of a child, under twenty years of age, that crossed the Red Sea, that died before they reached the land of promise? Show a case where a child "died of the plague" in the wilderness.

Should I admit all that he has said in this speech, it would not prove his proposition, for there is not one word about infant baptism in it.

Mr. Ballard says God put the infant in all the covenants and promises, and gave them the "sign or token." Mr. Ballard, if "circumcision" was the "token" in the old covenant, what is the "token" in the "new covenant?" In the old, God said "circumcise;" told who to circumcise. In the New, baptism is commanded, and it tells who to baptize. I will show the same authority for circumcising the heathen that you will for baptizing the infant, and for the same reason. God named circumcision, and the one that should be circumcised. Dare you circumcise another? Baptism is named; dare you baptize those not named?

Again, he says: The infant, "in every instance, received the sign, or token, of these promises, covenants and laws." Not an exception to this rule, either. You say the first promise was made to Eve; tell us what token was given there? Echo answers, what? But he finds a "token" given to Noah, the "bow," and asks: "Were his and our infant children embraced in this?" The "bow" was a "token" to those that could understand why it was given, and only to them. The covenant embraced, not only children, but "every living creature," and the "earth," too. Not a word about infant baptism in it, though.

The covenant with Abraham is next referred to, and Mr. Ballard asserts that the Church here passed from the embryonic to the national form. It would be amusing to hear him try to prove that there was a Church there. The first Church that I remember being mentioned was in the wilderness. He affirms there was a Church before Abraham. Proof, please. Your silence is to tacitly admit that you have it not. Prove that there was a Church before they were called out of Egyptian bondage. Your assertions are not proof.

After *asserting* that the Church passed from the embryonic to the national form, without showing that there was a Church to pass, he deposes: "Let us see if this Church, * * * carried the children with it." Should I grant this, would it prove infant baptism? Certainly not, for infants were not baptized in either "state." Commenting on the promise of God to Abraham (Gen. 12:2, 3), he says: "Here God lifts the Church from one form to another. You forgot to give the proof, or did you fail, because there is none? But suppose the Church was there and so changed, does it prove infant baptism? Baptism is not mentioned.

He says: "Read Gen: 17:1-4, where the covenant of chapter 12 is repeated and enlarged upon. Hear it: 'As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations'." Before replying to this, I would like for Mr. Ballard to tell in what part of Gen. 12 is the covenant he refers to. I deny that there is anything in the shape, form or fashion of a covenant in Gen. 12 that is repeated in Gen. 17. There are two promises in Gen. 12. Mr. Ballard, point out the covenant. A promise is the foundation for a covenant. The first covenant that I have any record of that God made with Abraham is in Gen. 15:18, and it expressly says that it was made "in the same day," i. e., the day mentioned in that chapter. There are two promises in Gen. 12. First, Vs. 3, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed;" the second, in Vs. 7, "Unto thy seed will I give this land." One promise was to bless all families; the other was to give Abraham's seed the land of Canaan. These are only promises at that time. In Gen. 15:18 God made the covenant of the land (Gen. 12:7), but does not mention the promise of Gen. 12:3. Hear the covenant of Gen. 15:18: "In the same day God made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." This is the promise of Gen. 12:7, and not the promise of Gen. 12:3, blessings to all nations. In Gen. 17:1-14 we have this covenant repeated, telling the conditions, and in Vs. 8 God says: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." The promise of Gen. 12:3 is nowhere mentioned in Gen. 15 or 17. Of the covenant mentioned in Gen. 17 it is said: "My covenant shall be in your flesh," Vs. 13. Not a spiritual covenant, but it is one "in the flesh."

The promise of Gen. 12:3 is repeated in Gen. 22-15-18, and confirmed with an oath. This promise of Gen. 12:1-3, confirmed with an oath (Gen. 22:15-18), is the promise on which the covenant of Christ, the new covenant, is based, and it was not a covenant till after the "covenant of circumcision," and the law was "added," and both had been taken away by the cross of Christ. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ." Heb. 10:9-10.

Mr. Ballard says again: "The Church still "carries her children with her, and gives unto them the seal of the righteousness of her faith. Rom. 4:11." Not true. Circumcision was to Abraham the sign and seal of the faith which he had before he was circumcised, but it never was before, nor since, a seal of faith to another.

He next takes up the Exodus, and says here is the Church. I admit there was a Church in the wilderness, but you cannot prove infant baptism from it. He says they all ate the paschal lamb. If this is an example of infant Church membership, why do you not allow infants in the Methodist Church, and give them the Lord's Supper? Will you show how this proves infant baptism, and excludes them from the fellowship in the Methodist Church?

He says: "They cross the Red Sea, *but not* until they all—men, women and children—were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. A. Campbell, in *Christian Baptism*, p. 386; Paul, I Cor. 10:1, 2; Moses, Ex. 10:9. So we find the children, who were to leave Egypt, Ex. 10:9, ate the passover, and were with their parents baptized unto Moses as they crossed the sea." Paul said no such thing. Hear him: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ?" Does that say "they all—men, women and children—were baptized?" Unless you can "twist" the words "fathers" into infants, it does not. The word "fathers" includes only those that had reached mature years when they crossed the sea, for the ones baptized "did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the

same spiritual drink." None were included in the "all" save those that could eat, and this does not include an infant. The mere act of passing through the sea would not constitute a baptism.

He says the Church was again enlarged at Mt. Sinai, and that the children were embraced in the laws. Should I admit it, there is not one thing about infant baptism in it, the thing you are trying to prove. But were the children embraced in the laws, and to what extent, and when? Deut. 31, 12-13, God commands that the children shall be taught. Deut. 21:18-21, the children that would not obey were stoned to death. The children were not and could not be amenable till they were able to be taught.

He next goes to the Church in the wilderness, and says it was here "sanctified, to receive its laws and regulations from the hand of the great Head of the Church. But was this a baptized Church?" We have learned that infants were not included in the number baptized. "Our fathers" were baptized—those old enough to eat and drink of Christ, and this did not include an infant. He says it was a "baptized Church;" but there was not an infant in it, unless he gets them in without baptism, and then it is not a "baptized Church." Certainly the infants were in that old covenant made with Abraham, in which he was promised the land of Canaan; they were there by natural birth, and were then circumcised (the males) at the age of eight days, and afterwards taught to "know the Lord." Deut. 31:12, 13. In that covenant they were members and then taught to "know the Lord." This is one of the differences between that covenant and the new one. In the new it is said: "They shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." Heb. 8:7-11, Jer. 31:31-34. So Jesus says, "Teach all nations, baptizing them." Matt. 28:19. In the new covenant, they are first taught to "know the Lord," and then enter the covenant. Should I grant that the infants were under the laws, and had to keep them, it does not prove infant baptism. The very passage you read shows that infants, as such, are not included in it; but that when at the age of responsibility should keep the law. He then wants to know if the infant was embraced in the ritual? Only as the child grew to the age of reason was he required to conform to the law. The fact that the infant was a member of the covenant by natural birth does not signify that it

was baptized, nor that it was responsible, till taught. Deut. 31:12, 13.

Mr. Ballard seems to think that the child that was not circumcised was "cursed." Tell us plainly if this is what you mean, and do you intend that the reader shall understand that the infant that is not baptized will be cursed? Tell us why you baptize infants, anyway? Is there a blessing that the baptized infant receives, that does not come to the unbaptized infant? Do you baptize the infant for the same reason that the infant was circumcised, under Moses?

He contends: "In Egypt, with their fathers and mothers, the children, even their infants, were slaves, * * * with them ate the passover." Are you serious in your statement that the infant at the age of eight days "ate the passover?" Should I admit that they did, would it prove infant baptism?

He finds a statement in Ex. 19:1, where the "house of Jacob" is mentioned, and Israel is called "holy nation." He inquires: "Are children embraced in the house of Jacob, and are they included in the words "holy nation?" I answer, Vs. 6, same chapter: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests." Are infants embraced in "kingdom of priests?" Mr. Ballard well knows that infants as such, could not be priests. The Levites could not serve about holy things till they were thirty years of age. Num. 4:3. If children, infants, were not included in "kingdom of priests"—and Mr. Ballard knows they were not—then why will he try to include them in the expression, "holy nation," which has reference to the same parties. Infants, as such, are not included in either expression. When we say the United States did thus and so, we do not include the infants. He says: "The priesthood, and holy nation, being God's Kingdom, God's Church, the children were in some way connected thereto." If the "priesthood be God's Kingdom, God's Church," since none could then minister about holy things till thirty years of age, how do you get the infant in?

Next, Moses at Horeb: "And he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said we will do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it upon the people." The people said, "We will be obedient." No infants in that number.

Let me impress one thought on your minds: Mr. Ballard says the covenant with Abraham is the Church; that the *covenant* and the *Church* are the same.

Ballard's Second Speech

Mr. Nichol complains that I did not define my proposition. It is so plain, so simple, I did not deem it necessary, but to satisfy Mr. Nichol's desire, I will say that by the word "Scriptures" I mean the Old and New Testaments, as received by all evangelical people. By the word "infants," I mean children in their non-age; unconscious babies, if you choose, Mr. Nichol. "Proper subjects," fit, suitable. "Baptism," the application of water to the candidate for a sacramental purpose. I trust this is explicit enough.

I shall now proceed to answer Mr. Nichol's interrogations that are germane to the proposition. I will not say answer his arguments, for these he did not adduce; but seems pleased to turn himself into interrogation points. A tyro can ask questions. He admits that if infant baptism is scriptural, all who believe the Bible should practice it. Enough.

Again, he asks can a thing be scriptural "without being mentioned in some way?" Yes, many things are imperfect harmony with the Scriptures, and yet are not mentioned in them. For instance, women taking the Lord's Supper. Not one time is this mentioned in the Word of God. Many others might be given, but one instance is enough.

Again, he asks were infants baptized in the days of Adam, Abraham or Moses? Not in the days of Adam or Abraham, for baptism was not yet given. In the days of Moses? Yes. Paul says they "were all baptized unto Moses," etc. A. Campbell says: "They all—men, women and children—were baptized unto Moses," etc. Again, Mr. Nichol says my beginning the Church in its embryonic state in the family of Adam "antedates any I have ever heard." Mr. Nichol forgets. In our debate at Lometa, Texas, Nov. 28, 1907, Mr. Nichol said: "I believe that the Kingdom, or Church of Christ, has existed in some form, even from the days of Adam, in embryonic form in the family. Nor is this all. In "Gospel Guide," of which Mr. Nichol is one of the editors, December number, page 14, are these words: "The young child is life in the bud; life unfolding; life with all its wonderful possibilities." My position exactly, stated by Mr. Nichol himself, and published in the periodical of which he is one of the editors. Thank you, Mr. Nichol. But he seems surprised that I should say the command to subdue this

world, though given before man fell, meant to bring back this sinned world to the God it had left. I wonder that he is not surprised that John said, in Rev. 13:8, "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Yes, Jesus was as a lamb offered, even before the world began, in order to provide for the restoration of the Church of which He was, and is, the Head.

Mr. Nichol again inquires: "What right has God to call on sinful men to obey Him?" God first demands of men to quit their sinful ways, leave the devil's kingdom, and then to become as little *children* before they can enter His Kingdom. See Matt. 18:3. The little child is God's ideal Church member.

Mr. Nichol's admission that "where God has placed children they are mentioned," is fatal to his cause, for in Mark 10:13-16 and Luke 18:15-17, Jesus says of such, "infants" (*brephos*), "children," is His Kingdom or Church, and Mr. Nichol admits that Kingdom and Church mean the same thing in the Bible. Thank you, Mr. Nichol, for by your own statement the children are in some way in the Church or Kingdom of Christ.

But Mr. Nichol thinks he has found an exception to my statement that the children share in the blessings or suffer in the curses pronounced upon the parents. He refers to the case of Korah's children not perishing in the company of Dathan and Abiram. There is no exception here, but proof positive of my position. If Mr. Nichol had read verse 27, chapter 16, of Numbers, he could have seen that only the families of Dathan and Abiram remained defiant, standing in their tents with their wives and little ones, and that they—the men, their wives, and their little ones—went down into the pit. No exception, Mr. Nichol; no exception there, but proof positive of my statement. Now it is my time to say, "My, my!" Right on the heels of this awful statement, where it says, "And the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up," that is, Dathan, Abiram and their little one, Mr. Nichol asks me to show one case, one "unmistakable case of a child under twenty years of age that crossed the Red Sea, that died before they reached the land of promise." I do wonder if all those little fellows of Dathan and Abiram are still alive under the ground, or did they scratch out and leave their parents down there, and go on with the Is-

raelites into the land of promise? Please tell us, Mr. Nichol, in your next reply.

But Mr. Nichol wants to know what sign or token was given the first covenant God made with Eve? Just read your Bible, Mr. Nichol, Gen. 3:14-16. Not one sign or token, but two, if you please, Mr. Nichol. The serpent was to crawl and eat dust; the woman in sorrow was to conceive and bear children. Are those signs in force today? He admits the covenant given to Noah was for the children, even our children of today, though it was made four thousand years ago. He is getting good now. Thank you.

On the Abrahamic covenant being an enlargement of the Church from its embryonic state in the family to its national form in the Abrahamic family and his descendants, he says: "It would be amusing to hear him try to prove that there was a Church there." Well, I like to amuse people, so I will not only try, but prove it also. Mr. Nichol will admit that all the faithful belong to the Church of Christ. I presume he will not deny this. Christ is the Head of the Church. The Church is His body. Eph. 1:22-23. "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all." Christ, the head, the Church His body; then all who belong to Christ belong to His body, the Church. But did Abraham belong unto Christ, or to His body, the Church? Read John 8:56-58. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." In Gal. 3:8, "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Here we have Christ, the gospel, and blessings for all nations in the Abrahamic Church or family. Now read Gen. 12:3, "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Here all families, down to the remotest duration of time, are embraced in this national Church charter, which was more largely developed in Gen. 17:4, where God says: "As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." Thus God incorporates in this covenant, or Church constitution, not only the

posterity of Abraham, but all families, all nations of the earth, are in the future to be blessed in this organic institution, called the body of Christ. But when? We now read Gal. 3:13-15: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; that the blessings of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto." Thus we see Paul plainly states that in the full development of the Abrahamic covenant, in which the eight-day-old child received the sign or token. Gen. 17:11-12: "And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a *token* of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations," etc. Into this ancient covenant with its eight-day-old children, the Gentile, which means every nation of earth except the Jew, was to come, when the ultimate development of God's Church began in the Abrahamic family, should be consummated in Christ. So Paul thought, and wrote further, in Gal. 3:24-29: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are not longer under a schoolmaster. 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 or free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." That is, both Jew and Gentile share alike in Christ; "And if ye be Christ's," that is if ye belong to Christ, one of His body, the Church, "then are ye Abraham's seed, not Jews in the flesh, "and heirs according to the promise." Heirs of what, and according to what promise? Heirs of the great blessings that God promised to Abraham, that in blessing He would bless Abraham and his *seed*, and that in his seed, Christ, both Jew and Gentile should be blessed, and thus we become heirs with, and children of the same covenant, as Peter in Acts 3:25, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."

In the foregoing quotations we have the children of eight days

of age put in the covenant with Abraham. In the New Testament we find Peter addressing the converted Jews after Pentecost, who had accepted Christ, who belong to his body, the Church, as children of the Abrahamic covenant. Paul, in addressing the Galatian letter, used the following language: "Paul, an apostle, * * * and all the brethren with me, unto all the Churches of Galatia." Gal. 1:1-2. Thus showing that those who accepted Christ were in His Church, and in chapter 3:29 he says, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Thus showing that the Galatian brethren were in the Abrahamic Church, which had its eight-day-old children in it. Now, Mr. Nichol, here is amusement for you for several days.

Mr. Nichol admits there was a Church in the wilderness. This is good in him, I am sure; though he could not help it, for the Bible plainly says so. "Acts 7:38, "This is he, that was in the Church in the wilderness, with the angel that spake to him (Moses in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Yes, "The Church." Not the old Church done away with, but *the Church* which received the lively oracles, and transferred them to us, who live after Pentecost, in the same Church that was at Sinai, with its babies freshly baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Oh, yes, they were there; Moses says so, and Paul says they were baptized.

Mr. Nichol states that the covenant in Gen. 17 was only a fleshly covenant, "not a spiritual covenant, but it is one in the flesh." Mr. Nichol so differs from Moses and Paul. Moses says in Gen. 12:3, "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Chapter 17:5, "For a father of many nations have I made thee." Acts 3:25, "And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Paul, Rom. 4:11, "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also." Here we have God's blessings on Abraham and his posterity, "all nations," "all families," the father of all that believe; and circumcision the "seal of the righteousness of the faith," though Mr. Nichol says it was only a fleshly covenant in the flesh. Mr. Nichol states the truth when he says it was repeated in Gen. 22, but is wholly mistaken when he says that

Gen. 17:1-14 is a different covenant, and of the flesh only. Read Rom. 2:28-29. Paul says, "Neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." Here Paul emphatically says circumcision is not in the flesh. Mr. Nichol to the contrary. Which will you believe? Mr. Nichol says that God took away the covenant of circumcision and not of the law, but confirmed the promise of Gen. 12:3, and Gen. 22, which promise then became a covenant, upon which the covenant of Christ, the new covenant, is based. How much does this help Mr. Nichol, or his cause? If his contention be true, this covenant was made with Abraham who was circumcised, and if it was the basis of the Christ covenant, it came through the circumcised family or nation. No help for him here.

Mr. Nichol's dissertation on the word "fathers," in 1 Cor. 10:1, amuses me. He says: "The word 'fathers' includes only those that had reached maturer years when they crossed the sea." I wonder where he got that? And if "*fathers*" can be twisted to mean those of maturer years, whether male or female, why not give it another twist and take in the babies, too? But let us see how the word "fathers" is used in the Bible, and see if it does not include the children, too. The Hebrews for ancestor is "aboth," Ex. 3:13. "The God of your fathers hath sent me." Does this include the God of their children? Or do children have a God? Deut. 1:21, "As the Lord God of thy fathers had said." Does this mean only those of maturer years? 2 King 21:22, "And he forsook the Lord God of his fathers." Does this mean the God of those who are of maturer years only? Jno. 6:31, "Our fathers (Greek: 'paters') did eat manna in the desert." Does this mean that little fellows who were not of mature years starved, just to make "fathers" fit Mr. Nichol's emergency. Poor fellow, Mr. A. Campbell says, they were all-men-women-and-children baptized unto Moses. Moses says they went out with their young, old, sons and daughters, and Paul says they were baptized. Who is right?

Again, he admits there was a Church at Mt. Sinai, but asks, was it a baptized Church? Yes, Paul in Heb. 9:19, says, "And when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people," and this surely includes the children, "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." Does all the people include the children? It does these days, and did then, for they are specifically named twice as a part of the multitude. But was these sprinklings called baptisms? Yes. Read verse 10 of chapter 9 of Hebrew, where the Greek is "*diaphorois baptismois*," literally translated divers, or many baptisms, which Paul says were performed by sprinkling "all the people." Yes, they were baptized.

Again, Mr. Nichol says, under the covenant of circumcision, the children were to be taught. True. What is more teachable than a child? But says, under the new covenant, they are not to be taught, and tries to make it appear that this does away with the Abrahamic covenant, and establishes a new Church. But read the context, Heb. 8:8, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the *house of Israel* and the *house of Judah*. Not a new Church, but the same old *house of Israel* and *Judah*. Not to abrogate the Abrahamic covenant either, for it does not refer to it one time, but to the covenant he made with them at Mt. Sinai, the covenant of ceremonies. Read verse 9, "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." Showing to the day which covenant he referred to, and Paul says the Abrahamic covenant was made 430 years before this. So, Mr. Nichol has wasted his time and space writing on this covenant.

Mr. Nichol says the infant, "when at the age of responsibility, should keep the law." Let us try this by God's Holy Word, Gen. 17:14, "And the uncircumcised man child * * * shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." Here the eight-day-old, through its parents, is expected to keep the law. In Num. 18:15-16, "Nevertheless the first born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem. And those that are to be redeemed from a month old shalt thou redeem." Thus are the month old children to keep the law through their parents.

Nichol's Second Reply

Mr. Ballard, what do you mean by the word "teach" in your proposition? How do the Scriptures "teach" a thing that is not mentioned in them?

The reason he objects to my questions is apparent. He attempts to answer one: "Can a thing be Scriptural and not mentioned in any way?" He answers, "Yes." Then affirms that women are authorized to eat the Lord's Supper, but says that it is not mentioned. Tell us, sir, where women, as such, are authorized to eat the Supper. Neither men or woman, as such, are authorized to so do. Christians, as such, have the right. Men, women nor children, as such, are commanded to be baptized; but believers are. Will you show otherwise?

I also inquired: "Is infant baptism warranted by being mentioned in the Scriptures? If yes, where?"

"Name an apostle of Christ that baptized an infant. When? Where?"

"Is there an unmistakable case of infant baptism mentioned in the New Testament? Where?" I insist that you speak.

He repeats that infants were baptized in the days of Moses. Paul said "our fathers," not our "infants." Know you not the difference between "our fathers" and "our infants?" Paul says: "Our fathers * * * were all baptized * * * all did eat * * * all did drink the same spiritual drink * * * that Rock was Christ."

Can an infant, as such, eat and drink, spiritually? Answer? Not an infant, as such, is contemplated by the expression of Paul. Your proposition says, "the Scriptures teach." Mr. Campbell, though a scholar, is not authority in divine matters.

The kingdom was promised before it was established. Of this I spoke at Lometa. You declare that it has existed from the days of Adam in some form.

Does your quotation from the *Guide* prove infant baptism? Because the possibilities of life are in the child, does that prove there was a Church in the days of Adam, with infants in it? Are you certain that you quoted me in the *Guide*?

Because I am astonished at his blunder in saying that Adam was to "bring back this sin cursed world to the God it had left," when it had not sinned nor left God, he wants to know if I am

astonished at Rev. 13:8. No. What world is reference made to in the passage? Is it the present order of things? Will you take the position of the Primitive Baptist?

He says: "Mr. Nichol again inquires, 'what right has God to call on sinful man to obey Him?'" Ballard answers: "God first demands of men to quit their sinful ways * * * and then become as little children before they can enter His kingdom." That is my question. "What right has God to demand this of them?" You seemed to think God had no right to call children to join His army if they were not members of His Church. If He has the right to demand it of sinners, why not of children, when they reach the age of reason?

You make a false impression on Mk. 10:13-16. You say: "Jesus says of such, 'infants' ('brephos') 'children' is His kingdom." Where did Christ say such? It is in neither passage you gave. It reads: "Suffer the little children ('paidia') to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God." The word "brephos" in verse 13 does you no good, for it is "paidia" in verse 14, and this is one able to "Come unto Me." When a "paidia" can "Come unto Me," as Jesus said, no one will object. God says "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth." When a "brephos" becomes a "Paidia" and can "Come unto Me"—Christ, baptize them. Jesus says: "Every man therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father, Cometh unto Me." Jno. 6:45. Who "Cometh unto Me?" Those that hear and learn. Christ says: "Suffer little children ('paidia') to Come unto Me, * * * for of such is the kingdom of God." When the "paidia" is old enough to hear and learn, then it can *Come unto Me*, and not till then. Ballard, is this an eight-day-old infant?

He affirms again that the children always shared in the blessing and curses of the parents; that there is not an exception; that I am wrong in the case of Korah. He says: "Only the families of Dathan and Abiram remained defiant * * * the men, their wives, and their little ones went down into the pit." Let us see if "the little ones went down into the pit." Hear the passage: "So they gat up from the tabernacle of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, on every side; and Dathan and Abiram came out, and stood in the door of the tents, and their wives, * * * sons, and their little children." "And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up,

and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their gods. They and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them: and they perished from among the congregation." Now read Num. 26:11, "Notwithstanding the children of Korah died not." Ballard says the "little ones died." God says they "died not." Ballard, did the children of Korah die? Answer. Did Korah die? Answer.

In your first speech you say God put the children in all the covenants and promises, and gave them the "sign or token." You say, "Mr. Nichol wants to know what sign or token was given of the first covenant God made with Eve * * * not one sign or token but two * * * The serpent was to crawl * * * the woman was in sorrow, was to conceive and bring forth children. Are these two signs in force today?" Two signs or tokens to this covenant, eh? And they are given to infants? Pshaw, Ballard, are you crazy? "Conceive and bring forth children" is a "token" of this covenant, and it is given to the children—infants, eh? Then infants are to "conceive and bring forth children." Such non-sense.

He attempts to prove there was a Church in the day of Abraham, saying, "Mr. Nichol will admit that the faithful belong to the Church of Christ." None of the faithful in the days of Abraham belonged to the Church of Christ, for it was not then in existence. If there was a Church then, and "the faithful belonged" to it, it would not include infants? Are infants *faithful*? Faithful to who or what?

Christ was not head of the Church in the days of Abraham. See Eph. 1:20-22. Not one word is said about the Church of Christ in John 8:56-58 nor Gal. 3-8.

He quotes Gen. 12:3: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," and says: "Here all families down to the remotest duration of time are embraced in this national Church charter, which was more largely developed in Gen. 17:4." Will you show where Gen. 12:3 is quoted in Gen. 17? Show where there is a covenant in Gen. 12, will you? There are two *promises* in Gen. 12. In verse 3 Christ is promised; verse 7 the land of Canaan is promised. In Gen. 15:18, the promise of the land is made a *covenant*, and in Gen. 17 this covenant is reiterated, and circumcision named. "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed" is *not* mentioned in this covenant; it was a covenant respecting the land, and was in the

flesh. The promise of Christ in Gen. 12:3 was confirmed with an oath in Gen. 22, and was the base or foundation of the new covenant. I did not say that this promise became a covenant in Gen. 22. I called your attention to this in my first speech. You ignore it and assert that Gen. 12:3 is renewed in Gen. 17, and quote Gal. 3:13-15 and assert: "Paul plainly states that in the full development of the Abrahamic covenant, in which the eight-day-old child received the sign or token." Gen. 17:11-12. Paul here quotes the *promise* to Abraham, and not the covenant of Gen. 17.

Gal. 3:24-29 is introduced with some splendid comments. Hear him: "Heirs of what? And according to what promise? Heirs of the great blessings that God promised to Abraham * * * that in his seed, Christ, both Jew and Gentile should be blessed, and thus we become heirs with, and children of the same covenant." The passage says: "Heirs according to the *promise*." Why do you say covenant? Again, Paul says: "Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are children of *promise*."

Acts 3:25 is introduced. No comfort there for you. The word "*made*" in the passage is from "*Dietheto*," from *Diatithemi*," and is defined by Thayer: "A disposition, arrangement of any sort, which one wishes to be valid." On the very passage which you introduce, he says: "God's arrangement, i. e., the promise made to Abraham." Of the word, Liddell and Scott say: "To set forth, to recite * * * absolutely, to make an argument with, to promise." Hence, the covenant which God promised. My contention. Gen. 12:3 was a promise. Mr. Ballard comments: "In the foregoing quotation we have the children of eight days put in the covenant with Abraham. In the New Testament we find Peter addressing the converted Jews after Pentecost, * * * as children of the Abrahamic covenant," not true. In the 19th verse of the same chapter Peter says: "Repent * * * and be converted." Still you say they were converted. Neither was the covenant, the Abraham covenant, but the *promised covenant*.

You read Gal. 3:29, "Heirs according to the promise," and say: "Thus showing that the Galatian brethren were in the Abrahamic Church which had its eight-day-old baby in it." Paul said they were "heirs according to the *promise*," and quoted the *promise* of Gen. 12:3. You have not proven that there was a Church in the days of Abraham.

I admit all Bible statements. Would admit infant baptism, if it was in the Bible. You declare the "Church in the wilderness" "received the lively oracles, and transferred them to us, who live after Pentecost, in the same Church which was at Sina." How did you learn this? Long after the death of Moses Christ said: "I will build my Church." Matt. 16:18. The Church "in the wilderness received the lively oracles, and transferred them to us," eh? If that was true, will you tell how the unconscious infant could "receive lively oracles and transfer them to us?" Stephen says: "Our fathers received the lively oracles." Is it possible that you do not know the difference between "fathers" and "infants?"

Moses says the covenant of Gen. 17 was "*in your flesh.*" Gen. 17:13; Rom. 2:28. Paul speaks of the circumcision of the heart—that of the new covenant, and not that of the *flesh*.

You say the Hebrew for "ancestors" is "aboth," and refer to Ex. 3:13, "the God of your fathers hath sent me," and ask: "Does this include the God of their children?" Should I say yes, it would not make "ancestors" or "fathers" include infants, for they are neither, as infants. Who were "your fathers," as mentioned in Ex. 13:3. Read Vs. 15, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, * * * Isaac, * * * and Jacob, hath sent me unto you." Your reference will not serve you for clearly it refers to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as the "fathers."

"Our fathers did eat manna in the desert." You ask: "Does this mean that the little fellows * * * starved?" No; but the word "fathers" does not include infants, as such.

He reads Heb. 9:19, "When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people * * * and sprinkled both the Book and all the people." You inquire: "Does all the people include the children?" Let Moses answer: "And he took the Book of the covenant and read it in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Not an infant contemplated, for they can not say, "we will be obedient."

Here his proposition springs a leak, and he tries his hand on the action of baptism. If you are tired of your proposition, and think you can do better on the action, then sail in. You say "*diaphorais baptismois,*" Heb. 9:10, is "literally translated divers, or many baptisms." Not true, sir. "Baptisms" is not a literal trans-

lation of "baptismois"—indeed, it is not a translation of the word at all. You say "*diaphorois baptimois*" was performed by sprinkling. Not true. You assert it. Proof, please. Paul had no reference to baptism when he spoke of the sprinkling.

What if the new covenant was made with the house of Israel and Judah? Neither of them was the Church of Christ. Of the new covenant, Paul says: "They shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest * * * and their sins * * * will I remember no more." Infants are without sins, then tell us, will you, how they are contemplated in this covenant?

Was the covenant made with Abraham abolished? Listen: "And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people. And it was broken in that day." What day? "And I said unto them, if ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver." Zech. 11:11-12. When Jesus was sold for thirty pieces of silver, God broke the covenant that He made with "all the people." Was it the Abrahamic covenant? Deut. 29. "And Moses called unto all Israel." "Ye stand this day before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, * * * wives, * * * stranger * * * that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into His oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day? Here is the covenant made with all the people. Is it the Abrahamic covenant? Read next verse: "That he may establish thee today for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." The covenant made with all the people is the one sworn to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in which God swore to be a God to their descendants. Where is it found? Gen. 17:7-8. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." This is the covenant made with "all the people"—the one that was to be broken in "that day," and Paul says

it was taken out of the way, nailed to the cross. This is the covenant of circumcision, Gen. 17, and not the promise. Gen. 12:3: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offerings of the body of Jesus Christ once." Mr. Ballard admits the covenant made at Sina was abolished. Thus he gave up his contention.

Gen. 17:14, "He hath broken my covenant," cannot reach infant baptism. God commanded that the infant be circumcised. To fail to so do was to break the covenant, and the child was "cut off from among the people." To fail to baptize the infant does not break the covenant. Should I grant your contention, what follows? Infant baptism or infant damnation—cut off from the saved.

Mr. Ballard, do you baptize under the commission given in Matt. 28:18-19, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?" If yes, what authority have you to baptize any save the ones taught?

What blessing does the "baptized infant" have that the one not baptized fails to get?

You say there was a Church in the days of Abraham, and that the infants were members of it. Tell us, are the infants you "baptize" members of the Methodist Church? Were not the infants in the old covenant before they were circumcised? Are infants in the new covenant before you baptize them?

Mr. Ballard, do all that are in the new covenant have to be "born again?" When you baptize an infant, does it bring it into the new covenant?

If, as you say, the Church, Kingdom, of today is the same as the Church in the wilderness, of which all Jews were members by natural birth, why was it that Nicodemus had to be "born again" to enter into the Kingdom? John 3:3-5. Why was it that the apostles had to be converted before they could enter into the Kingdom, Matt. 18:1-3, if they were in it, as you say?

Was it not the very institution that you call the Church of Christ that killed Jesus, i. e., demanded that He be crucified?

Mr. Ballard, Peter says that "baptism is the answer of a good conscience towards God." Will you tell us how the unconscious infant can have a "good conscience?"

Do you agree with Mr. Wesley that infants are guilty of "orig-

inal sin," that they must be freed from this sin, and that, "in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this is washed away by baptism."

Has Christ commanded that you or any man baptize infants? Please name the Scripture, chapter and verse that contains the command.

Does baptism serve the same purpose in the new covenant that circumcision did in the old?

Ballard's Third Speech

Mr. Nichol seems to have a full stock of interrogatories this time. Well, as it is easier to ask question than to argue a question, of course, as he cannot argue his side, he must, to keep up his courage, quiz mine. His play upon the words "our fathers" at the Red Sea baptism is pitiable. Re-read that, will you, and then read the following Scriptures, and see if "our fathers" includes only those that were actually fathers of children, or do they not rather include all the race, male and female, infants and adults. See Ezra 5:12, "But after that our fathers had provoked the God of heaven to wrath, he gave them into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed their houses and carried the people away into Babylon." Mr. Nichol, does "our fathers" here mean only those that were actually the fathers of children, or does the phrase include women and children, too? Poor Nichol! Dan. 2:23, "I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my fathers." Was he the God of Daniel's mother and sisters, too, if he had any? John 4:20, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain ;and ye say in Jerusalem is where men ought to worship." I wonder if "our fathers" here means only those who were the head of families, and they, too, males only? Poor Nichol! John 6:31, "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert." I wonder if the women and children ate any? What did the women and children two and three years old eat, Mr. Nichol? Please tell us. What did the boys, young men and old bachelors eat, Mr. Nichol? They were not fathers of children, were they? Poor old Nick! Done dead, and I am not half through with him. Acts 5:30, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." If "our fathers means only male parents, as Mr. Nichol tries to make it appear, then those women, old bachelors, boys and young girls and all the little children were without a God; for Mr. Nichol says "our fathers" don't include the children, and he says the express mention of a certain class excludes all others; the whole nation of Jews were left unbaptized, except those who were actually male parents. Poor Nichol! I am not surprised that he goes back on A. Campbell by saying, "Mr. Campbell, though a scholar, is not authority in divine matters." Mr. Nichol is, if we let him have his way. Mr. Nichol wants to know if I quoted

him in the Guide? I did not say I did. I only said you were one of its editors.

He says I make a false impression on Mark 10:13-16; says "Brepheos" is in neither passage I gave. Why did Mr. Nichol leave out Luke 18:15-17, where "Brepheos" is used as I stated, and "Paidia" used interchangeably with it, and "Paidia" means a child very young. Thayer's lexicon: "Paidia: a young child, a little boy, a little girl." "To Paidia," the very words used in Westcott & Hort, means "infants, children, little ones." Mr. Webster says: "Infant: a child in the first period of life, beginning at his birth. In common usage, a child ceases to be called an infant within the first or second year, but at no definite period." Now, in Luke 18:15-17, the passage Mr. Nichol omitted in his quotation from my second speech, the word "Brepheos" is used in the 15th verse, and "Paidia" interchangeably with it in the 16th verse. Now turn to Luke 2:12, "Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes lying in a manger." Verse 16, "And they came with haste and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger." The word "Brepheos" is used to describe Jesus just born, and this word the one that was used when the parents brought their children to Jesus, and he said of such is the Kingdom of God. I wonder if these babes in swaddling clothes "could come to Jesus?" Mr. Nichol says that these of whom Jesus spake, means one "able to *come unto me.*" Those babies were smarter than they are now, then, for "Brepheos" "means a babe just born." "Ye shall find the 'Brepheos,' babe, wrapped in swaddling clothes." Good, Mr. Nichol; bring on your "Brepheos," infants, just born, "for of such is the Kingdom of God," or Church of God." Poor Nichol, I didn't mean to mash so hard, but you kept sticking your finger under the hammer and I just had to let it fall. Couldn't resist the temptation.

His answer to the covenant given to Eve is so weak that it scarcely deserves a notice. All I have to say is God made the promise to Eve. Her seed should bruise the serpent's head, and he should bruise his heel, and children are still born in sorrow. I may be crazy, Mr. Nichol, to believe God's word, but I do

He denies that the covenant in Gen. 12:1-3 was developed in Gen. 17. Well, let's see. In Gen. 12:3, "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Verses 6-7, "And the Canaanites were in the land. And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and

said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." Here are the covenants of grace to all families, and of the land to the Jewish race. In chapter 15:8, "In the same day God made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." Already given as mentioned in chapter 12:6-7. Now read chapter 17-4. "As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." Chapter 12:3, "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." In Acts 3:25, "And in thy seed shall all kindreds of the earth be blessed." "A father of many nations." "All families of the earth be blessed." "All kindreds of the earth be blessed." How similar, Mr. Nichol, not to be any kin! Mr. Nichol says the covenant of Gen. 17 "was a covenant respecting the land and was in the flesh." Ah, how you and Paul differ! Read Rom. 2:28-29, "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." Now where is the land? Paul says "in the heart," in the spirit; "neither is that circumcision in the flesh." Mr. Nichol to the contrary. But Mr. Nichol says circumcision was named with the land covenant, Gen. 15:17-18. But again he clashes with Paul, who was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, a doctor of the law. See Rom. 4:11, "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised." Paul says it was a seal of "the faith;" Mr. Nichol says of "the land." I wonder which is right? On Matt. 16:18 he tries to leave the impression that the words "will build" means to organize a Church. Let him affirm it. I will prove the contrary. I have already shown that we who are in Christ's Church are in the Abrahamic Church. Gal. 3:29, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." This was written to a thoroughly Gentile Church, and Paul considered them heirs with Abraham, because they belong to Christ. Poor Nichol! He gets so mixed up against Paul, and, in fact, the whole Bible; but "the way of the transgressor is hard."

He simply denies my argument about the people, men, women and children, being sprinkled by Moses, and Paul calling it divers

baptisms On Heb. 8:8 he wants to know how children have no sins to remember? Just as God also says, in Gen. 17:14, "the uncircumcised man child has broken my covenant," because his parents did not circumcise him. The deed of the parent was there counted against the child. So in all times the blessings of the parents have reached the children. Mr. Nichol then flies to Zech. 11:11-12, which shows to what a desperate strait he is driven, and tries to make this covenant refer to the Abrahamic covenant. If he had just read the 14th verse, it would have saved him this blunder. Read it: "Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel." In verse 10, God says this covenant was made with all the people. "And I took my staff, even beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people." Not with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but with the divided host of Israel; but Mr. Nichol contends that this refers to the Abrahamic covenant of land, and that Paul says it was taken out of the way. No, Paul, upon the contrary, shows that he had no reference to the Abrahamic covenant, but specifies that he meant the Sinatic covenant of ritualism, given four hundred and thirty years after the Abrahamic. Paul's Bible does not suit Mr. Nichol's assertions. In the space of one page, at the close of his second speech, Mr. Nichol only asks twelve questions, not one of which demands an answer. My proposition is, "The Scriptures teach that infants are proper subjects of water baptism." This we have shown by their being proper subjects for every covenant, promise, blessing and ritualistic service of the Bible. Mr. Nichol has not shown the contrary.

We will now notice where the New Testament says Christ's Kingdom or Church began, who was in it, and how long it was to last. I first quote the angel's words to Mary, in making known to her that she would be the mother of Jesus. Luke 1:31-33, "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Here, "The throne of David," and "the Kingdom or Church of Christ" are the same institutions. No Bible scholar will deny

this. Now if we can trace this Christ, this Kingdom of David, and this house of Jacob back to the Abrahamic covenant, which had the eight-day-old child in it, then the claim will be complete. Let us read Luke 1:69-73. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel," (House of Jacob) for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David," (Kingdom of David) "as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began; that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercies promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he swore to our father Abraham." This makes the chain complete from Abraham to Christ. Now there is just one more point to settle. Was the covenant referred to by old Zacharias, the one in Gen. 12 or 17? That he referred to Gen. 17 is seen by the fact that John was circumcised to keep the law, and at forty days was dedicated to God in the temple. And Jesus was circumcised at eight days (see Luke 2:21), and dedicated to God at the age of forty days. See verse 22. Old Simeon came by the Spirit into the temple to be at the dedication of the child Jesus. Mr. Nichol, would you do that? Verse 29, "And he came by the Spirit into the temple; and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law," etc. Here the ritualistic law was kept. and the Abrahamic covenant kept, at eight and forty days; and Paul calls these offerings of blood and sprinklings of blood and water baptisms. See Heb. 9:8-14. In Acts 15:15-16, in A. D. 52, nineteen years after Pentecost and Christ, we find the apostles talking about the Gentiles coming into this kingdom or tabernacle of David, in which these apostles were still members. Read it. Quoting Amos 9:11-12, James says, "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, after this I will return," come back, not begin a new, but return to something he had left, "and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down;" not organize a new Church, but build again the tabernacle of David, or kingdom of David, over which the angel said to Mary, her son should reign forever. I will build, from "Oikomeo," meaning "to promote growth in Christian wisdom, affection, grace, virtue, holiness, blessedness," Thayer. Acts 9:31. "To give one strength and courage, dispose to." Thayer on I Cor. 8:10. On

Matt. 16:18, Mr. Thayer says on this word, "By reason of the strength of thy faith thou shalt be my principal support in the establishment of my Church." Now with these definitions of the Word translated "will build," we see at once that the great revival of those days was the reviving, strengthening, setting up again the spiritual kingdom of David, over which Christ was to reign. But listen: "I will build *again*," not make a new tabernacle or church, Mr. Nichol, but "build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." Amos has it, "And I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old;" and, to be sure, in the "days of old" it had children, even the eight-day-old children, in it. Now let us turn to Mark 11:10, "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord." Mr. Nichol, was this a temporal kingdom, or was it the spiritual kingdom of David, now ruled over by Christ, the Anointed of God? Let Luke, or rather, Peter answer this, as Mr. Nichol may have a delicacy in doing so. See Acts 2:30-31. Speaking of David, he says, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne: he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." This forever settles the question of the throne, kingdom or Church of David, being the one over which Christ was born King of the Jews. Certainly, not in a literal sense; see John 18:37, "Pilate therefore said unto him, "Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." Thus, in this spiritual kingdom or Church of David, Christ was born king; ruled in it as king while on earth, and now reigns over it as he sits at the right hand of the Father in Heaven.

Just one more point to settle, and the work is complete. Did the apostles who were subjects of the Davidic kingdom under the reign of Christ still keep the infant children in it after Christ's crucifixion and resurrection? If they did, then they should be there still, unless some Joe Smith, or a Mrs. Eddy Baker, or a Mrs. White, has some new revelation to put them out, for no such orders are given in the Word of God. But let us see if the apostles with their converts still kept children in the Church after Pente-

cost. Read Acts 21:20, "And when they heard it," that is, Paul's success among the Gentiles, "they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousand of the Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law." Think of Christian Jews by the thousands zealous of the law; but what law? The moral law? Nay, verily, but the law that kept their children where God put them, and where they had been for two thousand years, and where they had been receiving circumcision and baptism as co-ordinate rites for fifteen hundred years, verse 21. "And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying they ought not to circumcise their children, neither walk after the customs." What customs? Verses 23, 24, "Do this, therefore, that we say to thee: We have four men that have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads; and all may know that those things whereof they are informed of thee are nothing;" (untrue, not so) "but that thou thyself also walkest orderly and keepest the law." But did Paul endorse and obey these apostolic injunctions? If he did, they were still in the old Jewish, Davidic, Mosaic, Abrahamic and God-instituted Church, with the eight-day-old baby in it. Read verse 26, "Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them, entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them." These purifications among the Jews are called baptisms by Paul and John's disciples. See John 3:25, 26, and Heb. 6:1, 2. But when did this event occur? Look and see. A. D. 60, or twenty-seven years after Christ, the converted Jews, by the sanction and direction of the Holy Ghost, were bringing their children into covenant relation with the Church of Jesus Christ, which was the Church, of the Jews, which was the Church of David, which was built in the days of old, which was built in the days of Abraham, with Christ and the children in it. Gal. 3:20. *Amen.*

Nichol's Third Reply

That you do not try to answer the questions is evident. Again:

1. "Name an apostle of Christ that baptized an infant? When? Where?"

2. "Is there un unmistakable case of infant baptism in the New Testament? Where?" Please answer. Do not worry about "poor old Nick."

No, sir; the word "our fathers" does not include infants, *as such*. He reads: "But after that our fathers had provoked the God of heaven unto wrath, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed this house, and carried the people away into Babylon." No, sir, "our fathers" in this passage does not include infants. Look at it "Our fathers" had "*provoked* the God of heaven unto wrath." Was there an unconscious infant in the number that "provoked" God? "Our fathers" had "provoked" God, and He gave them "our fathers," into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, and the king carried "the people"—men, women and children—"away into Babylon." Dan. 2:35 has no reference to "sisters," *as such*. "Our father David" does not mean David as an infant. "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain." Reference is made to those that "worship," and even a Methodist preacher knows that does not include an unconscious infant. "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert." Not one word in the passage about what the boys, "young men, bachelors," ate. You insist that "our fathers" includes infants, *as such*. Your "poor old Nick" denies. Now will you give the passage which teaches such? Only "our fathers" were baptized unto Moses.

Neither Campbell or Nichol are authority in religion. Methodism is resting on human testimony, and infant baptism has no higher authority.

You claimed to quote me in the *Guide*. Show that the quotation proves infant baptism or a Church in the days of Abraham. Why did you make the quotation?

You certainly made a false impression on Mark 10:13-16. No relief in Luke 18:15-17 for you. The word "*brephos*" is in the wrong verse to serve you. Hear it: "And they brought unto him also infants (*brephos*) that he might touch them, and when his disciples saw it they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto

him, and said, Suffer little children (*paidia*) to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God." It was the "*paidia*" that was to COME to Christ. Do you think the unconscious infant can COME to Christ? Tell us, what do the words "suffer," "forbid," and "come" mean in this passage? "*Paidia*" may mean an infant, but it does not in this passage, and the "*paidia*" in this passage is old enough to COME to Christ; and none can COME to Christ save those that have "heard and learned of the Father." John 6: 44, 45. "*Brephos*" may mean an infant just born, and it may mean the unborn foetus. Christ did not say. "Suffer the "*brephos*" to come unto me. When they BROUGHT the "*brephos*" to Christ it was not to have them baptized, but that Christ might TOUCH them. They BROUGHT the "*brephos*" to him, but he said suffer the "*paidia*" to COME unto me. Not one word is said about infants coming unto him. You say: "Good, Mr. Nichol, bring on your "*brephos*," infants just born, 'for of such is the Kingdom,' or 'Church' of God." Have you no regard for the truth? Do you think the people will not see the attempt you make? Jesus did not say: For of such, "*brephos*," is the Kingdom; but of such "PAIDIA," is the Kingdom; and of the "*paidia*" He said, Suffer them to COME unto me. Why do you substitute the word "*brephos*" for "PAIDIA?"

Seriously, do you think infants, as such, bear children? If not, what is the sign of the covenant that you say was given to Eve and the infants?

Mr. Ballard, will you please tell what part of Gen. 12 contains a covenant? I deny, emphatically, that there is a covenant made in that chapter. There are two promises made there. In the third verse is the promise of Christ to bless all families, and in the sixth and seventh verses, is the promise of the land of Canaan. This land promise became a covenant in Gen. 15:18, and was developed in Gen. 17, when circumcision was given sealing Abraham's faith (and it was a seal to no other person), but there was not a promise concerning Christ in that covenant. You say: "In Gen. 12:3, 'And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed,' and verses 6-7, 'And the Canaanite was in the land. And the Lord appeared to Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land.' Here are the covenants of grace to all families and the land to the Jewish race." He then cites Gen. 15:18, where the promise of the land

(Gen. 12:6-7) is made a covenant, then Gen. 17, where land is again all that is promised; then Acts 3:25, and says: "How similar, Mr. Nichol, not to be any kin." You shall not hide the truth. Gen. 15 and 17 mention a covenant, it is true, but you cannot find one word about the promise of Christ as recorded in Gen. 12:3 in it as you well know. The promise of Christ was made to Abram when he was in Ur of the Chaldees, and the promise of the land was made after he had left the land of the Chaldees. The promise of Christ (Gen. 12:3) was confirmed with an oath (Gen. 22:15-18), and became the new covenant, in Christ (Gal. 3). Peter declares (Acts 3:25) that the covenant that had been promised to our fathers has been fulfilled. The PROMISED covenant, "In thee and thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed," was a PROMISE only to Abram and the Jews, but is now a COVENANT in fact. The covenant of Gen. 17, though it "became a law," could not annual the "PROMISE," and Christians are "heirs according to the PROMISE" (Gal. 3:29), and NOT according to the COVENANT of Gen. 17.

Ballard deposes: "Mr. Nichol says the covenant of Gen. 17 'was a covenant respecting the land, and was in the flesh.' Ah, how you and Paul differ." Not so fast, Mr. Ballard. Let us see if it was Mr. Nichol or God that said such. Hear God: "I will give unto thee * * * all the land of Canaan. * * * This is my covenant which ye shall keep, * * * and ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin. * * * He that is born in your house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your FLESH." Gen. 17:8-12. Who said the covenant of Gen. 17 was in the FLESH?

Matt. 16:18, "I will build my Church." Ballard, "will build," is that future? What does "will build" (oikodomeso) mean in this passage? Let Thayer answer: "By reason of the strength of thy faith thou shalt be my principal support in the establishment of my Church, Matt. 16:18." Ballard, the Church of Christ is a NEW institution. Paul calls it a "NEW MAN." Eph. 2:15. It is not the OLD institution.

Ballard asserts: "We who are in Christ's Church are in the Abrahamic Church," and cites Gal. 3:29. It would be refreshing to hear him try to prove there was a Church in the days of Abraham. Hear this quotation: "And if Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed,

and heirs according to the promise." According to what? The PROMISE. Not heirs according to the Abrahamic Church, but according to the PROMISE—the promise made to Abram: In thee and thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed. Gen. 12:3.

An inspired man never called sprinkling, baptism. Never. There were eighteen bathings under the law, in which the entire body was washed; to these Paul referred when he spoke of "divers baptisms."

Your attempt on Zech. 11 is a failure. The staff "bands" represented the severing of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel. The one I quoted says: "That I might break my covenant which I made with all the people." Hear the Lord: "And Moses called unto all Israel, and said unto them, * * * Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains, * * * elders, * * * officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy strangers. * * * That thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God and into his oath, that he may establish thee for a people, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath sworn unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob. Deut. 29:1-13. Where is this covenant found? Gen. 17:8, "I will give unto thee, and thy seed after thee, * * * all the land of Canaan, * * * and I will be their God." This is not the promise of Gen. 12:3. The covenant made with Abraham is the one that was with all the people, and was of the land. "Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." Ps. 105:9-11. In Isaiah 24 it is said the people broke this covenant, and Zechariah declared that when they weighed the price "thirty pieces of silver," God would break it. Matthew declares that this very amount is the price paid for Christ, and the covenant is declared to have been broken—taken out of the way, nailed to the cross. Col. 2; Heb. 10:9-10. What was "taken away?" "The law of commandments contained in ordinances." An "ordinance" is not a ceremony, but an "authoritative decree." The land covenant was given to Jacob "for a law." Ps. 105. The law was "taken away," with all that pertained thereto, that he might establish the new covenant, the one promised to

Abraham, Gen. 12:3; and to this agree the words of Paul, "Now this I say, the covenant that was confirmed before of God, four hundred and thirty years after, having become a law, cannot annul the promise to make it ineffectual." (I quote from the Greek text.) So the covenant of Gen. 17, the land covenant, the one in the FLESH, the one you try to prove infant baptism by, the one given to Jacob "for a law," was "taken away," that the promise of Gen. 12:3 might become a covenant, per the oath of Gen. 22, that all the world might be blessed in Christ, Abraham's seed.

Ballard says: "The throne of David, 'house of Jacob,' and Kingdom or Church of Christ are the same institution." To keep up courage he says: "No Bible scholar will deny this." Such assertions would startle a tyro in Bible information. The "throne of David" is the royal authority of David; the "house of Jacob," is Israel, and the "Church of Christ" is spiritual Israel. Three different things.

Your case of circumcision and dedication at the age of eight and forty days will not serve you, for they both belonged to the "law of commandments contained in ordinances," and it has been taken away. I would no more do such a thing than I would offer God a ram as a burnt offering, for the law authorizing such has been abolished. To do such is to rebel against Christ—to sin.

Acts 15. You are confused here. The "tabernacle of David" was not the Jewish nation. You want a passage which speaks of the "Church of Abraham," do you not? The "tabernacle of David" NEVER had infants in it. Only priests could enter it. Do you think infants are priests? Are infants in the Methodist tabernacle? Ballard, tell us, please, when was the tabernacle of David builded? "Tabernacle" is from the Greek, "Skenen," and Thayer says of it: "'E skenen David,' (from Amos 9:11) family reduced to decay or obscurity." Mr. Robinson says: "Anoikdomeso ten sken David ten peptoknian," (quoted from Amos 9:11) for the family or royal line of David, fallen into weakness or decay." For years no one of the family or seed of David had been on the throne, and God promised to raise up one to sit on the throne of his seed. Peter says God "raised up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne." Thus was the lineal descendants of David restored. Do you think the tabernacle of David was the Abrahamic covenant, and that it has been restored; that old covenant that had blood of bulls and

goats, fleshly circumcision and the Levitical priests, and that you are in it?

Is Mark 11:10 a spiritual kingdom, you inquire? If it is the old kingdom, it is temporal. But it was not to be built as in the days of old. Listen: "Thus saith the Lord God, remove the diadem and take off the crown; **THIS SHALL NOT BE THE SAME. * * *** I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it; and it shall be no more, until he comes whose right it is; and I will give it to him." Ezek. 21:25. This was spoken of the kingdom of David under Zedekiah, and God says **IT SHALL NOT BE THE SAME.**

You say that if the apostles kept infants in the Church of Christ after the resurrection, they should be in it now. Yes, but infants were never in the Church of Christ. This must be apparent from the wild search you have made. As proof that infants were in the Church he finally cites the case of Paul being at charges to be purified. What next? Ballard, those Jews were not wanting to baptize infants, but wanted to circumcise the people. You will observe that Paul never accomplished the days of purification. Had Paul preached against the law? Yes. Gal. 3:10-11; 4:21. You say: "These purifications were called baptisms by Paul and John's disciples." Indeed! Then in the case you cite Paul was baptized again, was he, and at the same time has declared that there is only "one baptism." Do you mean that Christ was "purified" when he was baptized? Do you "purify" infants when you baptize them? Baptism was never called "purifying" by an inspired man. You say: "The converted Jews, by the sanction and direction of the Holy Ghost, were bringing their children into covenant relationship with the Church of Jesus Christ? Who said that? C. L. Ballard. Well, who is he? Why, he is C. L. Ballard, a little Methodist preacher of Texas. Now, will you, C. L. Ballard, tell us, when you baptize infants, do you bring them into relationship with the Methodist Church? Be careful, but answer, please. Watch for the answer.

You say: Did the apostles "still keep their infant children in the Church after the resurrection of Christ?" Infants were never in the Church of Christ. Let us look at the membership of the Church for a moment. Listen: "And great fear came upon all the Church." Acts 5:11. Ballard, was there an infant in that number? Again: "He made havoc of the Church, entering into

every house, and hailing men and women committed them to prison. Therefore, they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." Acts 8:4. How many infants in that number? Still again: "That there should be no schism in the body (Church), but that the members should have the same care one for another." I Cor. 12:25. Infants in that number, eh? In Eph. 4:16, Paul says the Church "edifies itself in love." Unconscious infants, at the age of eight days in that number? Say, was there? Ballard, listen: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the **WHOLE CHURCH**, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul." Honor bright, Ballard, do you think there were unconscious infants in that number? Remember, the "**WHOLE CHURCH**" was pleased. "Tell it to the Church." Ballard, does that mean that you should tell the unconscious infant about the trouble? Oh, no, Ballard; there was not an infant in the Church of Christ.

I know you do not like questions, but tell us:

1. Where do you find those Jews "bringing their children (infants) into covenant relationship with the Church of Jesus Christ?"

2. How do unconscious infants have a good conscience?

3. Do you agree with Mr. Wesley that infants are guilty of original sins, and that in "the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless this be washed away in baptism?"

4. Has Christ commanded you to baptize an infant? Chapter and verse where the command is recorded, please.

5. Does baptism serve the same purpose in the new covenant that circumcision did in the old?

6. If Nicodemus had been a member of the Church of Christ all his life, why did he have to be "born again" to enter it?

7. Are infants in the house (Church) of the Lord?

I submit that the doctrine of infant baptism is not once mentioned in all the Book of God. Do you believe, my friends, that it is your duty to do in the **NAME** of **CHRIST** that which he has not one time mentioned in all His Word?

Infant baptism sets aside the child's agency and accountability. It is not only anti-Christian, but it is anti-American. The Bible says, "Whosoever will," let him come, and "to whom ye yield your-

selves servants to obey." This is the law of the New Testament. Infants do not yield themselves in baptism.

It is a human tradition. It renders the command of Christ to be baptized of no effect. Should we all agree on infant baptism, baptizing them, in a short time there would be no believers to be baptized, and believers are the class He commanded to be baptized.

Ballard, why not be as candid as Henry Ward Beecher? He said: "I have no authority from the Bible for the baptism of infants, and I want none. I have better authority for it than if even the Bible commanded it. I have tried it, and know from actual experience that it is a good thing. I have the same divine authority for it that I have for making an ox yoke—it works well, and therefore it is from God." Ballard, have you better authority? If yes, please give it.

One question more, please:

8. When you baptize an infant, is it born of God?

Ballard's Fourth Speech

Well, as I am not a Catechuman to be catechised, I shall leave my interrogation point to his glory, and pass on to notice what rebuttals he offers to my third speech on the question before us. His argument on the word "fathers," not including infants would be laughable, if it were not pitiable. Mr. Nichol says, "Our fathers does not include 'infants, as such'." I wonder where he learned that? The Bible does not say so, and Mr. Nichol says that "Neither Campbell or Nichol are authority in religion." So his statement that they are not included "as such" is not worth the room it takes to write it on. I have shown conclusively that it does include infants, and gave chapter and verse where infants, or little children, are referred to.

He says I made a false impression on Mark 10:13-16. Not that anybody but Mr. Nichols, knows of. Re-read my argument on it, may be you will be able to understand, and see more clearly. He says "No relief in Luke 18:15-17 for you. I don't need any. He says, "The word 'Brephos' is in the wrong verse to serve you." Just the opposite is true. He admits "Brephos" may mean an unborn child. This is the word the Holy Spirit had Luke to use, which evidently means a very young child in this place, as they were brought to Jesus, then the Spirit had Luke to use interchangeably with this word, "Brephos," brief, short, etc., the word "Paidia," which also may, and does often, mean an infant, as in Matt. 2:8, where the Greek words "Ton Paidia," are used. Verse 9, "Ta Paidon" are used. Verse 11, "Ta Paidion," translated in each case, "The young child." Mr. Nichol, could Jesus run to any one then? Could he come to any one then? But read Vs. 13, "For Herod will seek the young child" (Ta Paidion) "to destroy him." Verse 14, "When he arose he (Joseph) took the young child," Ta Paidon, "and his mother." Now how old was this young child? See Vs. 16, "Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceedingly wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had dilligently inquired of the wise men." Now, Mr. Nichol, how old was Jesus when he was first called Paidia? Just born? Two years old? "Poor old Nick." But let Luke speak,

Luke 1:59, "And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the (little) child," "Ta Paidion," etc. My! My! How smart John was. Could come, old enough to come, at eight days, for Mr. Nichol says the "Paidion" were those who could come in Luke 18:15-17. Then why not in Luke 1:59? Why-y-y it does not suit Mr. Nichol's case. But you remember he says, "Neither Campbell or Nichol are authority in religion." "All of which I steadfastly believe." But read Luke 2:21, "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcision of" "Ta Paidion" "the child," etc. How old? How old? Eight days. What was he called? "Ta Paidion," "the child." What word is used in Luke 18:16? It is "Ta Paidia." But Mr. Nichol says it don't mean babes, infants here, but those that could come of themselves. But what does Jesus say? "But Jesus called them," (the infants, little children, Brephos, Ta Paidia) "unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such)) (Brephos, Ta Paidia, infants, little children) "is the kingdom" (Church) "of God." But no, says Mr. Nichol, it does not mean that here. But neither Campbell nor Nichol are authority in religion." With all my heart I believe it, therefore I can't follow them. Good bye, Mr. Nichol.

Well, glory, Mr. Nichol is confessing the truth one time. I wish he were authority. Hear him on the Abrahamic covenant. "This land promise became a covenant in Gen. 15:18, and was developed in Gen. 17, when circumcision was given, sealing Abraham's faith." All along heretofore Mr. Nichol has said it was a sign of the land covenant. Now it was a seal of "Abraham's faith." Verily the legs of the lame are not equal. Reconcile yourself, Mr. Nichol.

On Matt. 16:18, Mr. Nichol asks, "Is 'will build' in the future?" I suppose so. What does "Will build" mean in this passage? He quotes Thayer. He is good authority. Let us examine the word, (Oikodomeso). Mr. Nichol quotes, "By reason of the strength of thy faith thou shalt be my principal support in the establishment of my Church." But why did you stop here, Mr. Nichol? Hear Mr. Thayer further, "Dropping the figure, To promote growth in Christian wisdom, affection, grace, virtue, holiness, blessedness." "To grow in wisdom, piety, etc." "To give one strength and courage, to dispose to." Hear Groves, "To build, erect, build up; to

edify, instruct, improve, profit, embolden, encourage, etc." Robinson says, "By impl. 'to rebuild, to renew.'" Meta, "To build up, to establish, to confirm, spoken of the Christian Church and its members; internally in a good sense, to build up in the faith, to edify, etc." Be good, Mr. Nichol, and I won't hit you with the Lexicons any more. That is just what Jesus meant, for he said before that the Kingdom had already come. Yes, I believe that on Pentecost the Church, already organized in Abraham's day, was edified, built up, encouraged, strengthened, made bold. The Bible so teaches, and I believe it.

Mr. Nichol has tried time and again to inject the mode of baptism into this discussion, but I won't let this juicy plum go. Too rich.

Says my attempt on Zech. 11 is a failure. I leave the reader to say.

His sally at my argument on the Throne of David, the House of Jacob, and Kingdom or Church of Christ, is amusing. He says they are three different things. What if he does say it? He says, "Campbell or Nichol are not authority in religion," and I know the Bible does not say they are different things, neither does it teach it, much less say they mean what Mr. Nichol says they do. "Royal authority of David." Pray tell in your next speech where it says the "Throne of David" means that? "The House of Jacob is Israel, and the Church of Christ is spiritual." You are not authority, as you yourself admit, Mr. Nichol, so please give us chapter and verse in the Bible.

Oh, it is funny to see how he gets over the circumcision and dedication of Christ. He says they belonged to the Law Age. True. Yet Peter, James, John and all the apostles with Paul and the Church at Jerusalem were keeping up these law customs for twenty-seven years after Christ, even circumcising eight-day-old babies in the Christian, Abrahamic, Davidic, Apostolic Church. See Acts 21:20-27. Yes, these things were in the age of commandments, that the taking children into Church relationship, were in the age of apostles, are now, and ever will be. So mote it be.

On Acts, 15:15-16, he says I am confused here. But he is not authority in religion, so I cannot accept his *ipse dixit*. He quotes Thayer as saying "Skenen" means "David's family reduced to decay or obscurity. Yes Thayer says that and more. He

says "Skenen" means "The heavenly temple, in which was the tabernacle of the covenant." Then pray tell us, Mr. Nichol, how the spiritual conversion of the Gentiles, which was the subject under consideration, could build up the fleshly family of David? Please tell us. I am in search of more light. But shadows of consistency! Listen! Mr. Nichol goes on to say, "For years no one of the family or seed of David had been on the throne, and God promised to raise up one to sit on the throne of his seed. Peter says God 'raised up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne.' Thus was the lineal descendants of David restored." If this don't make a Tyro laugh, I don't see why. Now, Mr. Nichol, are you in earnest? Or are you trying to play a joke? You say, "Thus was the lineal descendants of David restored." How, Mr. Nichol? Did Christ sit on David's earthly throne? Or does he now, after his resurrection, sit on the spiritual throne of David in heaven? Did Christ while on earth have a literal throne, with laws, subjects, and all governmental institutions of an earthly empire? Where was the seat of his government, please? Let Jesus speak. "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." Again he says, Jno. 18:36, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." In David's literal kingdom there was war, arson, and blood, in the spiritual part of that kingdom referred to in Acts 15:15-16, when the Gentiles were converted, there was Christ the Prince of Peace, and also the babies in it, as is shown by chapter 21:20-17, or nine years after the incident in chapter 15. Now let us read Mark 11:10, "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest." I will just leave the reader to say whether this was a spiritual kingdom or a temporal one. Mr. Nichol says "it is temporal," but "neither Campbell nor Nichol are authority in religion."

Mr. Nichol's application of Ezk. 21:25-27 would amuse a novice. Mr. Nichol, Zedekiah was a sub-prince under Nebuchadnezzar, sworn in by him, and then rebelled against his rightful sovereign. Just read 2 Chron. 36:11-13. We give you the 13th, "And he also rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar, who had made him swear by God: but he stiffened his neck and hardened his heart from turning unto the Lord God of Israel." Now the one "whose right it is"

referred to in Ezek. 21:27, is not Christ, but Nebuchadnezzar, who at that time controlled all Palestine. Your false application won't work.

Mr. Nichol, why did you misrepresent me on Acts 21:20-27? You say I cite as proof that infants were in the Church, the case of Paul being at charges to be purified. I did not. I introduced Acts 21:20-27 to show that the believing apostles and their church members, and all believers in Christ, too, were 27 years after Christ, taking the eight-day-old babies into covenant relation with the Church, and that they kept all the Jewish rites, sprinklings and washings, which the Jews called purifying, and Paul called baptisms. Heb. 6:2, "Baptismon," and in 9:10, "Diaphorois Baptismois." Now, I referred to Paul in Acts 21:24-27, to show that he 27 years after Pentecost was keeping these purifyings, washings, baptisms, and offerings of the *law*. Yes, offerings of the law. Read verse 26. "Then Paul took the men (the men that had a vow on them) and the next day purifying himself with them, entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them." Here are three positive institutions of the law kept by Paul, yes, four—vows, purifications, offerings, and circumcision of eight-day-old babies, and all endorsed by the Church, by Paul and the Holy Ghost, for these were all inspired apostles. Mr. Nichol says, "To offer a ram or circumcise a child is to rebel against Christ—to sin." Well, Paul, with all the apostles, with all the first Christians at Jerusalem, did both. What a set of rebels they were, if Mr. Nichol is right, but he is not authority in religion.

Mr. Nichol asks, "Was Paul baptized again," and at the same time has declared that there is only "one baptism." That is true. That "one baptism" Paul speaks of is not water baptism but spirit baptism, which is the only true baptism, all others being figures, types and shadows. But if I were to grant that it were water baptism, it don't say it cannot be repeated, any more than for me to say there is one letter "a" or figure "1," says it cannot be repeated. This is no good to you, my friend.

Mr. Nichol asks, Was Christ purified when he was baptized? Certainly he was, in every sense that the Jews attached to the purifyings, which Christ passed through. If you will read Num. 8:6-7, you will find how the Levites, the priests of God, were set

apart, cleansed or purified for their office, not from sin, Mr. Nichol, but for official service, just as Jesus was, by John, a Jewish priest, the son of a priest, set apart to his priestly office, when he was baptized by his forerunner.

Mr. Nichol inquires, Who is C. L. Ballard? Then answers, "A little Methodist preacher of Texas." A great compliment at that. I had rather be a little bitsy tiny Methodist preacher and be in the Church that cares for the babies, than to be a great big robust Campbellite preacher kicking the babies out of the Church, of which Jesus said, was his Church or kingdom; hadn't *you*?

He asks if when I baptize babies do I bring them into relationship with the Methodist Church? Certainly, I thought every one knew that.

Among many questions irrelevant, many of them, he asks for chapter and verse where Christ commanded me to baptize an infant. Mr. Nichol ought to know where that passage is. Mr. Nichol, it is in the last line of the same chapter and verse where it says "baptize adults." You know where that is. But if you can't remember where that one is, turn to that other where it says "Immerse the grown people," and the last line of that verse reads, "and the babies, too."

It is a wonder that Mr. Nichol, in his patriotic zeal in opposition to infant baptism, had not quoted the great statesman, "Live or die, sink or swim, survive or perish, I give my heart and hand to this vote." Hear Mr. Nichol, "Infant baptism sets aside the child's agency and accountability. It is not only anti-Christian, but it is *anti-American*." Get up, ye patriots, "strike for your homes and for your sires. Strike, until the last armed foe expires." "Give me liberty or give me death." "*Argumentum vulgus ad captandum*." Mr. Nichol may appeal to prejudice to disprove infant baptism, but not to the Bible. The man that does not have his children baptized is anti-Christian, and anti-American. In our institutions and constitutions, State and National, children are especially provided for, though they know nothing of it, and even though the child be born after the death of the father, which often occurs, yet that child is born under the protection and rights of the law. Carry out the anti-Pedo-Baptist principles and our children would have no rights until they were old enough to understand the constitution and laws of the State and Nation; nor would they

have any religious claims or rights until they could understand the constitutional principles of the atonement with its rights and privileges. And who does fully understand these wondrous works of God? None. Who, then, can be saved? If Mr. Nichol and his kind be right, none can be saved. Again, the parent that does not baptize their babies robs them of their choice in the future. If the unbaptized child grows up, reads the Bible, believes it teaches baptism of infants, then he cannot be baptized as he believes the Bible teaches, for he cannot be a child again, thus his agency was set aside when he was a child by the neglect of his parents or sponsors. Suppose a rich father were to leave his child to the cold hand of charity to raise until he could understand the law of inheritance, before he would allow its claims on his estate, how much Americanism would there be in that? Just as much as there is Christianity in the other.

Mr. Nichol says it is a human tradition. This is the anti-Pedobaptist shibboleth. They should prove, not assert it. But they cannot, and "neither Campbell nor Nichol are authority in religion," and we may add, they, nor any other anti-Pedobaptist, have any authority for their position.

Mr. Nichol keeps harping on what Henry Ward Beecher said about having no authority from the Bible for infant Baptism. Does he quote Beecher correctly? If he does, what of it? Mr. Beecher denied that the Bible taught an eternal hell. May be he had tried that, too, Mr. Nichol. Take your witness, please. I will none of him.

We will close this speech on 1 Cor. 10:1-2. They all passed through the sea. Were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Mr. Campbell says, "God made a covenant with them, after they had all—men, women and children—been baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." One witness. Moses says, Ex. 10:9, "We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters," etc. Now how old were these sons and daughters, or some of them? Read Num. 3:28. In the number of all the males, "*From a month* old and upward, were eight thousand and six hundred." What were they doing? "Keeping the charge of the sanctuary." What? Babies a month old keeping the charge of the sanctuary? That's what the Bible says. Do you believe the Bible? Mr. Nichol, could these month old babies come

to Jesus? You say "Ta Paidia" in Luke 18:16 meant those that could come. Well, what was done to all these sons and daughters from a month old and upward that went out of Egypt? And of these 22,273 first born males from a month old and upward, spoken of in Num. 3:43? A. Campbell says they were all baptized (Christian Baptist, p. 386). Witness number one. Paul says, "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Witness number two. I believe Moses and Paul, do you?

Of 500,000,000 Bible readers in the world, 475,000,000 say the Bible teaches infant baptism, only 25,000,000 deny it. Whom do you think is right?

Nichol's Fourth Reply

Mr. Ballard's fourth speech is before you. Is that the best that can be done for infant baptism?

It is the Lord's will that infants should be baptized? There is not a command for it; nor did the apostles practice it, so far as the record shows.

Baptism is an institution of the New Testament; and therein it is stated who are to be baptized. The divine warrant for baptizing is the "Great Commission," given by the Lord, after his resurrection. A study of this commission settles the matter as to who should be baptized. To say that the Lord gave a command that is ambiguous, is to impeach his wisdom.

The commission, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." Matt. 28:12. Are "nations" as such, to be baptized? Let us see:

1. Nations are composed of infidels, infants, idiots, as well as sane people.
2. Are nations, as such, to be baptized? If yes, then
3. Infidels, infants and idiots are to be baptized as well as sane people.

Is such, sound reasoning? If yes, then all are to be baptized, regardless of their moral or spiritual qualifications. Such reasoning is, manifestly, vicious; but granting that "nations, as such," are to be baptized, and the conclusion must follow.

Examining the commission, we learn who Christ commanded to be baptized. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." Baptize "THEM." What is the antecedent of "them?" It is evident from the above that it is not "nations;" and this is clearer from the principle in grammar that a pronoun agrees with the noun in gender. This is the rule in Greek, and is departed from only when there is an obvious reason. In the commission "Nations" (ethnee) is neuter, and the pronoun "them" (autous) is masculine. The antecedent is implied in the verb (matheeteusate), expressed in the Revised Version, "Make *disciples* of all nations, baptizing *them*"—the disciples. Mark tells to what extent one must be a *disciple*, "He that *believeth* and is baptized." The verb used in Matthew (matheeteuo) occurs in three other places in the New Testament, and in each instance the idea of instruct is present.

Thayer defines the word: "To make a disciple; to teach, instruct; Matt. 28:19." The commission limits baptism to *believers*, and he who proposes to baptize infants who do not, cannot believe, as such, rebels against God. Mr. Ballard, how do you get infants in the commission? When you lift your hand over an infant and say "By the authority of Christ, I baptize thee," do you have that authority? If yes, tell where it is recorded.

Refusing to answer my questions, is to tacitly admit that you can't.

Ballard, does "Our Fathers" include "infants, as such?" Infants in infancy? He will "leave this interrogation point to his glory." Here is a passage he cited to prove that "Our Fathers" includes infants: "But after that our fathers had PROVOKED the God of heaven to wrath." Ballard, how do unconscious infants PROVOKE God? Not an infant contemplated in that number.

Your attempt on "*brephos*" and "*paidia*" will not serve you. "*Brephos*" means an infant. "*Paidia*" means a child, regardless of age. A person is never too old to be a "*paidia*" of his parents, but he becomes too old to be called a "*brephos*" save in a figure of speech. "*Paidia*" means a child, and the context will show whether it is a day, week, month, or years in age. Mr. Ballard finds the word "*paidia*" in Matt. 2 and Luke 1, where Jesus and John are spoken of, and asks if they were old enough to COME to any one. No, sir. Certainly Jesus and John were "*paidia*" children, and it very plainly states that they were eight-day-old "*paidia*" children, too. But the eight-day-old "*paidia*" cannot COME to Christ; and the "*paidia*" spoken of in Luke 18:16 was old enough to COME to Christ. Christ says in Mark 5:30, "The damsel (*paidion*) is not dead;" and in verse 42 tells how old that "*paidia*" was. "And straightway the damsel arose and walked; for she was of the age of twelve." Here is a twelve-year-old "*paidia*." Luke 7:32, "They are like unto children (*paidois*) sitting in the market place, and calling one to another, and saying, we have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept." These were children, "*paidia*," but they were not infants. Again: After Christ's resurrection He appeared to His disciples, and said: "Children (*paidia*) have ye any meat? They answered Him, No." John 21:5. Thus, you see that men are called "*paidia*" for truly are the children of some one. There is the "*pai-*

dia" eight years of age, the "*paida*" twelve years of age, the "*paida*" in the market place piping, the "*paidia*" disciples of Christ that had fished all night, and then there is the "*paidia*" spoken of in for of such is the kingdom." The "*piadia*" to *come unto me*, and FORBID them not; for of such is the kingdom." The "*paida*" in this verse was old enough to "COME UNTO ME." This is not the infant, for none can COME till they have been taught John 6:44-45. Jesus does not say, "Of such '*brephos*' is the kingdom," but he says, "Of such, '*piadia*,' is the kingdom." They BROUGHT the '*brephos*' to him, and of the "*piadia*" He said, Suffer them to "COME UNTO ME, and FORBID them not." Ballard, what does "FORBID" mean in this verse?

Yes, circumcision was a sign or token of the land covenant and a seal of the righteousness of Abraham's faith. Proof: Gen. 17:11, 'And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a TOKEN of the covenant betwixt me and you.' A what? "A TOKEN of the covenant." But what was the covenant? Gen. 17:8, "And I will give unto thee * * * all the land of Canaan." Then it was a TOKEN of the land covenant. The keeping of the TOKEN was what? "And he received the sign of circumcision (token of the land covenant), a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Rom. 4:11. It was a sign—TOKEN— of the covenant, land of Canaan, and this sign—token—as kept by Abraham, was a seal of the righteousness of his faith; but it was a seal to no other person. But the Abrahamic covenant had not one spiritual blessing in it; it was a "covenant in your flesh," Gen. 17:13, conveying to them 'all the land of Canaan.' The spiritual blessings came through the promise of Gen. 12:3.

"I will build." (Oikodomeso.) What does the word mean in Matt. 16:18? Hear Thayer: "To found: i. e., by reason of the strength of thy faith thou shalt be my principal support in the establishment of my Church, Matt. 16:18." In *Baptist Blunders*, Thayer is quoted: "You ask whether the word in Matt. 16-18, translated, "I will build," means also enlarge, embellish, etc., and whether one would be justifiable in putting either of these definitions in that language of Christ. I feel constrained to reply in the negative. To translate the term "build" in this connection by "enlarge" or "embellish" would mar the metaphor and dilute the

thought." Hear Prof. Alexander, of Vanderbilt University: "It does not mean to enlarge, embellish, or strengthen a house already built; it simply means "I will build;" and, so far as the mere word is concerned, it implies that the building was not yet done, but was to be done." *Ibid.* Of course, Ballard is, as usual, wrong.

Ballard says: "Jesus had said before this that the kingdom had already come." Where did Christ say such? I deny it. Watch for his answer.

You are the man that introduced the "mode" of baptism in the debate. See your second speech.

Throne of David. He says, "Pray tell where it means royal authority." Gladly. Throne is from "thronon," and Thayer defines: "A throne, seat, i. e., a chair of state, having a footstool; assigned in the N. T. to kings, hence by meton; for kingly power, royalty. Luke 1:32, Acts 2:30."

Circumcision. You say, "The apostles * * * and the Church at Jerusalem were keeping up these law customs for twenty-seven years after Christ, even circumcising eight-day-old babies in the Christian, Abrahamic, Davidic, apostolic Church." Proof, please, that the "Abrahamic, Davidic" Church is the "apostolic church." He will not try to give it. If they were practicing circumcision and baptism, too, they had failed to learn that baptism came in the room of circumcision. Where did Ballard learn it? Ballard, the subject of circumcision that was not circumcised was cut off from the inheritance. If the infant is not baptized, will it be cut off from the inheritance? Does not your position on infant baptism demand the damnation of all unbaptized infants? If not, why not?

We would like to have the chapter and verse that says infants are in the Church at this age.

Acts 15:15-18. Certainly I quoted Thayer correctly; but he makes no such statement about "skenen" in Acts 15:15-16 as you quote. On Acts 15, you inquire, "Tell us, Mr. Nichol, how the spiritual conversion of the Gentiles, which was the subject under discussion, could build up the fleshly family of David." You are dense. The "spiritual conversion of the Gentiles" was NOT under discussion. What was? Hear Luke. Acts 15:1, 2-5-6, "Certain men which came from Judea taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. * * * They determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of

them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. * * * But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and elders came together for to consider this matter." Your question grew out of your failure to understand what was under discussion. Nor was it the "fleshly family of David" built up, but royalty in Christ, who was on David's throne.

Christ on David's throne. "Earthly throne?" No. When you learn that David's throne is the "kingly power, royalty," you will not be astonished. David's throne was the LORD'S THRONE, I Kings 2:12, I Chron. 29:23. David had the "kingly power, royalty," to command the Lord's people. This power was to be given to one of the descendants of David, Ps. 89:36; and to Christ, who descended from the loins of David, was this authority given. That throne is in heaven, and Christ is ruling.

Pshaw, infant baptism is not mentioned in Acts 21:20-28. Ballard, tell us: If infant baptism and infant Church membership was under consideration in this place, and it is right, why does it say, "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they OBSERVE NO SUCH THINGS." Why do you practice it?

He says Zedekiah was a sub-Prince of Babylon, sworn in by Nebuchadnezzar, and rebelled against him, and therefore Ezekiel 21:25-27 could not refer to him. "I will overturn, overturn it." Tell us what is meant by "overturn" three times? God "left the kingdom to another people," even the Babylonians; "overturned" it to the Medo-Persians; "overturned" it to the Grecians; "overturned" it to the Romans; "and it shall be no more (among David's seed), till he comes whose right it is; (Christ came) and I will give it him." Ballard, tell us what "overturn" used three times means.

He tries "mode" of baptism again. The "baptism" of Heb. 6:2 and 9:10 were not "sprinklings." Baptize is from the Greek word "baptizo," and sprinkle is from "rantizo." "Baptizo" never means sprinkle.

He says the "one baptism" on Eph. 4 is Holy Spirit baptism. I deny it. Give us some proof. Assertions will not do when you are to prove.

Ballard says Christ was purified when He was baptized by John. Proof would be accepted. He says: "Jesus was, by John, a Jewish priest, the son of a priest, set apart to His priestly office when He was baptized by his fore-runner. Listen. Christ healed the leper, Mark 1:40-44. After cleansing him, He said, verse 44, "Go thy way, show thyself to the priest." Had Ballard been there he would have said, "Jesus, YOU are the PRIEST, and I am in your presence; look at me and THE PRIEST will see me. Again: "The law maketh men high priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forevermore." Heb. 7:28. Ballard says Christ was made PRIEST according to the LAW. Paul says Christ was made PRIEST by "the WORD OF THE OATH," SINCE the law. Still again: "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest." Heb. 8:4. Ballard says He was. Which do you believe? Christ was made priest "SINCE THE LAW," and the law was taken out of the way at the DEATH of Christ. Eph. 2:15, Col. 2:14.

Ballard says when he baptizes babies he "brings them into relationship with the Methodist Church." Wonder what that "relationship" is? Are they converted, born again? Why don't you put their names on your Church book? Hear the Disciple: "The visible Church is a congregation of faithful men." Ballard, are infants FAITHFUL MEN?

He says the command to baptize infants is "in the last line of the same chapter and verse where it says baptize adults." I remember where it says they baptized "both MEN AND WOMEN," but do not find a word about the INFANTS. He says: "If you can't remember where that one is turn to that other where it says 'immerse the grown people,' and the last line of that verse reads 'and the babies, too.'" There are many infidels and immoral people that are "grown people," "adults." If Christ gave the command, "Baptize 'adults,' 'grown people,'" then it would be right to baptize every "adult" regardless of his moral condition or faith—even though he is an infidel. But Christ commanded the baptism of BELIEVERS. In the answer Ballard admits there is not a command for the baptism of infants. Thanks.

In the face of the above admission, Ballard says, "The man that does not have his children baptized is anti-Christian, and anti-American." Anti-Christian not to do what Christ never com-

manded and the apostles never practiced, eh? Anti-American, eh? Yes, children are provided for in our nation, but no one has to stand "sponsor" for it and have the oath administered, as in the nonsensical practice of infant baptism, in the Methodist Church. Our Nation provides for the infant and no oath necessary, just so Christ provides for the infant, without the foolishness of "infant baptism." Your practice is wholly a tradition of men. Dr. Bledsoe, Methodist, Editor of *The Southern Review* (Vol. 14, p. 334), says: "With all our searching, we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism."

Your case of the "Rich Father" is not a case in hand, for Christ says of little ones, "their angels do always behold the face of my Father."

Hear Ballard: "Mr. Nichol says it is a human tradition. This is the anti-Paedobaptist shibboleth. They should prove, not assert it." Sir, you should PROVE, you are affirming. We say it right, but you say "shibboleth," and prove yourself worthy of death. Infant baptism is a "tradition of men."

Beecher got his "no hell" idea the same way he did his infant baptism. He wanted it that way. No hell and infant baptism stand alike on the idea of uninspired men.

Hear Ballard again: "Of 500,000,000 Bible readers in the world 475,000,000 say the Bible teaches infant baptism, only 25,000,000 deny it." That does settle it. Ballard, the people that believe in infant baptism, with the Baptist Church added to the number, declare that infants are born "Hereditarily totally depraved," and you say you do not believe it. What about the number now? You are badly in the minority. Are you the Infallible one? You are wrong about the numbers. Many in the Methodist Church know that the Bible does not teach infant baptism.

Look at the record of the ones that were baptized in the days of the apostles.

Acts 8:41, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Not an infant in that number.

Acts 8:26-39, the eunuch. One man—not an infant.

Acts 8:12, the Samaritans. Baptized, both "men and women."
No infants.

Acts 9:18, Saul of Tarsus. Not an infant there.

Acts 10:48, Cornelius, "Commanded them to be baptized." Not an infant.

Acts 16, Lydia and her household. Verse 40, "And they (Paul and Silas) went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them." No infants.

Acts 18:8, Crispus and the Corinthians. "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believe and were baptized. No infants in that number.

Acts 19, twelve men at Ephesus. Still not an infant. Ballard, do try to tell where there is the record of the apostles baptizing an infant.

While with the disciples Christ said to them: The Holy Spirit will "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I said unto you." And again, "He will guide you into all truth." Ballard, tell us where the Holy Spirit brought to their "remembrance" the command to baptize infants? Where did it "guide" them into such a practice?

Peter says that God has "given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness." Where has he given one word about infant baptism? Not in all the Bible. Then it does not pertain to "life and godliness."

"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." II John 9. Infant baptism is not in the doctrine (teaching) of Christ and he who practices it, abideth not in His doctrine, therefore has not God.

Ballard, why do you baptize infants?

Ballard's Fifth—Last Speech

There are but few things in Mr. Nichol's last speech that deserves a reply. He says "Baptism is an institution of the New Testament." This is incorrect. The Jews had been practicing baptisms, 32 in number, for nearly fifteen hundred years before Christ came into the world; and Paul in Heb. 6:1-2 exhorts the Jews to go on to perfection, leaving the doctrines "of baptisms and of laying on of hands." Baptism was a thing more practiced and better understood among the Jews before Christ, than among Christians since Christ. And under the Jewish economy the children were always circumcised and baptized with their proselyte parents, who accepted the Jewish religion, and the Jews had been used to this custom for more than a thousand years before Christ gave the commission, which Mr. Nichol says "a study of this commission settles the matter as to who should be baptized." And so say I. Now if the Jews and the apostles were all Jews, had been use to the children of proselytes from other nations being circumcised, baptized, and making an offering when they came into the Jewish, or Abrahamic Church with their parents, what more natural than for them to understand the commission to make proselytes of all the nations, and I agree with Mr. Nichol that "Matheeteusate" is properly rendered make disciples, or proselytes, of all nations. I say, what more natural than for these disciples, who had been use to the children coming in with their proselyte parents to interpret this commission to mean to bring the children of these disciples, or proselyted nations, in with them? Especially as there is not a hint, or an illusion, nor a word that can be so distorted as to convey the idea that children were to be left out, while the believing parents were received into covenant relationship with the Church. And that, too, when we read the 20th verse of the commission, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Now Jesus had commanded the disciples to suffer the infants to come to him, for of such is the kingdom or Church of God. See Luke 18:16-17, and he commissioned these disciples to make proselytes of all nations, while the command to receive the infants in his kingdom still rang in their ears. Now let us see if it were the custom of the Jews to receive the children, and how they received them, when their parents were made

proselytes to the Jewish religion. I quote from Wall's History of Infant Baptism, first, because no scholar will deny the correctness or impartiality of Mr. Wall; second, because he says, "I have taken upon me as my task to show: How the primitive Christians did practice, and this I do by giving you their own words, without omitting any that I know of for the first 400 years after Christ." He first quotes Maimonides, a Jewish Rabbi, who surely understood the law, and their customs; hear him, Wall, Vol. 1, p. 3, of "The Introduction." "So in all ages when an ethnic is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice; or if it be a woman, be baptized and bring a sacrifice. As it is written, *'As you are, so shall the stranger be.'* How are you? By circumcision and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice. So likewise the stranger (or proselyte) through all generations; by circumcision and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice." We next give the words of the Talmud Babylon Mass. Jevamoth. Fol. 7 Wall Intro. p. 4-11. "When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised; and then when he is cured (of the wound of circumcision) they baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, Behold he is an Israelite in all things." In Gemara Babylon, "The proselytes entered not into covenant, but by circumcision, baptism, and sprinkling of blood." Maimonides says, "By three things did Israel enter into covenant, by circumcision and baptism, and sacrifice." And so says the Talmud Tract. Repudii. "Israel does not enter into covenant but by three things, by circumcision, by baptism and peace offering; and the proselyte in like manner." Rabbi Solomon, in loc. "Our Rabbis teach that our fathers entered into covenant by circumcision, by baptism, and sprinkling of blood." But Maimonides being a Jewish Rabbi, who understood their laws and customs we will give one more quotation from him; hear him, "Concerning the age of a child to be baptized they had this rule: Any male child of such a proselyte, that was under the age of thirteen years and a day, and females that were under twelve years and a day, they baptized as infants at the request, and by the assent of the father, or the authority of the court." I could fill all the time for this speech with quotations from Jewish authors like the above, showing that for more than a thousand years the

Jews had practiced infant baptism, and unto Jews who had known nothing else but children being baptized with their proselyte parents, Jesus gave the command to make disciples or proselytes of all nations, so that these twelve could not believe the children were to be left out, unless Jesus had expressly said so: this he did not do—not even hint at such a thing. So we find the disciples keeping up the law of circumcision, purifying, and offerings for thirty or forty years after Christ, and such a stickler was Peter, that none but a person who was, or would become, a Jew should have the gospel, that God had to convince him by letting down a sheet three times out of heaven, and telling Peter to kill and eat of the beasts and birds, and creeping things therein, before Peter would dare to offer the gospel to Cornelius. Then hear Paul in Rom. 15:8, "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promise made unto the fathers." This was spoken A. D. 60 the same year in which Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem and found the apostles and elders at Jerusalem with thousands of the believing Jews still circumcising and bringing their children into covenant relation with the Christian Church, and still keeping the law of Moses, by keeping the purifyings and offerings of the law. Read Acts 21:20-21. Now if this commission excluded children, as Mr. Nichol says it does, these inspired apostles, filled with the Holy Ghost, with Paul and Barnabas, were a most stiffed neck and rebellious set, for it is evident by the above scriptures that Christ was a minister of the circumcision, and that the apostles kept it up, which is contrary to the commission, if Jesus intended it to exclude the babies, and contrary to the Jewish Talmud, and to all the Jewish Rabbis. But Mr. Nichol says "Infidels and idiots are in nations," and if nations, as such, are to be baptized, "then infidels, infants and idiots are to be baptized as well as sane people." Now, Mr. Nichol, you find one place where Jesus took infidels or idiots, as such, in his arms, and commanded his disciples to suffer such to come unto him, because of such infidels and idiots was his kingdom, and you will have specific directions in the commission for their baptism, for Jesus said, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," and he commanded the disciples to let the infants come into his kingdom. Luke 18:16.

Mr. Nichol's dissertation on the pronoun "*them*" in the com-

mission is a laughable piece of grammatical analysis. He says *ethnee* is neuter, and refers to nations, while *autous* (them) is masculine, and makes it mean the disciples, or discipled. Now can a masculine gender come out of a neuter gender, Mr. Nichol? And really do you think all the converts, or disciples made by the twelve apostles were men, and not one female among them? Thus it would have to be, if your analysis is correct, Mr. Nichol. There is something wrong somewhere, for Luke says in Acts 8:12, "But when they believed Phillip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Now where is your masculine gender analysis, Mr. Nichol?

But he says, the "*poideon*" in Luke 18:16 were old enough "to come." I deny it, and demand the proof. Luke says they were brought, and that the disciples rebuked them, that is the parents that brought them were rebuked, for Mark puts it thus: "And his disciples rebuked those that brought them." Not the children, Mr. Nichol, if you please, so your "come" cob-house is all down. But this "*paidia*" and "*brepfos*" in Luke trouble Mr. Nichol's visions; so he goes off to find a damsel twelve years of age, who is called a "*paidia*," and thinks he has escaped, and in Luke 7:32 the children piping in the market place are called "*paidia*," all which is true. But, Mr. Nichol, do you not know that a child was a babe, or in its infancy among the Jews until it was 13 years and one day old? If not you should read more and to a better purpose. If it were a male child, he was so called until he was 13 years and a day old, if a female, she was so called until she was 12 years and one day old. Read the quotation from Maimonides as given above. Yes, says Mr. Nichol, the disciples were called children, "*paidia*," by Jesus after his resurrection, and they were not infants. True, neither did Jesus ever call his disciples "*brepfos*," infants either, Mr. Nichol. Another cob-house down. Poor Nichol.

Mr. Nichol says there is not one spiritual blessing in Gen. 17, "It was a covenant in your flesh." Well, I will just let Paul answer that statement, or assertion, for it is no argument. Read Rom. 4:16-17, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (as it is written, I have made thee a

father of many nations).” This last clause is a quotation from Gen. 17:5. Yet Paul says these spiritual blessings came through this promise, though Mr. Nichol begs leave to differ from Paul. Poor Nichol, I pity you.

On “Oikodomeso,” Mr. Nichol quotes “Thayer,” “Baptist Blunders,” whatever they are, and Prof. Alexander of Vanderbilt University. Well, I will just quote Thayer, on the spiritual meaning of this word with some others that I have before me. With the temporal meaning we have nothing to do; for we are writing, or speaking of a spiritual Church. Hear these lexicons. Thayer: “To promote growth in Christian wisdom, affection, grace, virtue, holiness, blessedness. To grow in wisdom, piety, etc., to give one strength and courage, to dispose. *Oiko domee*, in the N. T. metaph. ‘edifying, edification,’” etc. Parkhurst: “To build in a spiritual sense, as the Church, Matt. 16-18; to promote spiritually, conduce to spiritual advantage, to edify.” Robinson: (B) “Internally, in a good sense, to build up in the faith, to edify, to cause advance in the divine life.” This on Matt. 16:18. Groves: “To build, erect, build up, to edify, instruct, improve, profit, embolden, encourage.” Mr. Nichol, you had better take these authors, their own words, rather than quotations from “Baptist Blunders.” Who expects to get anything right from a Baptist Blunder Buss? And other men’s opinions, what are they worth? Proof, Mr. Nichol, proof is all that counts here. I am sorry your cob-house won’t stand the truth. Poor Nick.

Mr. Nichol wants chapter and verse where it says infants are in the Church in this age. I will give it, a thus saith the Lord. In Luke 18:15-17. Infants were brought to Jesus, they did not “come,” as you say, but were brought, “infants,” and Jesus said, “Of such is the kingdom of God.” The word kingdom means church, Mr. Nichol. Then Jesus said of such infants or children is the kingdom of God, or church of God. He says in Acts 15:15-16, says the spiritual conversion of the Gentiles was not under discussion, where it says, “I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down.” Just read the next verse, 17th. “That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.” Is this a discussion of the conversion of the Gentiles? I leave the reader to answer.

Well, in referring to the baptisms of Heb. 6:2, 9:10, Mr. Nichol says, "Baptize never means sprinkle." This is his assertion. I assert that it does. And mine is as good as his. But in Heb. 9:10, Paul says, "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (*diaphorois baptismois*) and carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of reformation." Then Paul goes right on and tells how these divers washings, or divers baptisms, were performed by sprinklings, in verse 13, and in verse 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 wood and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people. Question: Did all the people include the babies, if so they were sprinkled, and Paul calls these sprinklings baptisms in verse 10 and 6:2. What say you, reader?"

Mr. Nichol struggles to get rid of the priesthood of Christ, because this once admitted would establish the perpetuity of the Jewish Church, babies and all, and this would run into fits all the anti-pedobaptists in the land. But Josephus, who lived in the times of Christ, and passed the highest encomiums on Christ, and whose statements will be called in question by no lover of the Truth, boldly asserts that Jesus helped the priests in the temple. Now I have Josephus, and will give you the words of Suidas in *voce Jesus*, about A. D. 980. He, commenting on Josephus, said, "We have found Josephus, who hath written about the taking of Jerusalem saying openly in his memoirs of the captivity, that Jesus officiated in the temple with the priests. This we have found Josephus saying, a man of ancient times, and not very long after the apostles, etc." See Josephus, Vol. 2, p. 532.

We find Jesus speaking and acting with authority, Matt. 7:29. "For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." That he was a priest with authority is proven by his going into the temple and teaching the people with authority. Matt. 21:23, "And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? And who gave them this authority?" Jesus immediately referred them to John's baptism and silenced their caviling. For John, according to the priestly, or Levitical law, waited till he was 30 years of age to begin his preaching and baptizing, just as every priest had to do.

Jesus waited until he was 30 years old before he came to John to be baptized of him, for thus the law required. See Num. 4:2. "From thirty years old and upward even until fifty years old, all that enter into the host, to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation." In Luke 3:23, it says, "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age." Now in Matt 5:17, Jesus says he came not to destroy the law or prophets, but to fulfill; not to break but to keep them. Yet again, in Mal. 2:7, it is said: "The priest is the messenger of the Lord of host." And in Mal. 3:1 it says, "Behold I will send my messenger" (priest) "and he shall prepare the way before *me*," that is Christ would send his messenger (priest) before him, "and he," (my messenger, my priest), "shall prepare the way before me." Now listen. "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple." Mark it says his temple, thus giving him authority over his own house, as Paul says, Heb. 3:5, "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant;" verse 6th, "But Christ as a son over his own house." Now finish Mal. 3:1, "And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger" (priest) "of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." Here Christ is called the "messenger" or priest of the covenant. No getting around it. Then in Heb. 2:17, "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." And on the cross with his last breath he said, John 19:30, "It is finished." So Christ finished the great plan of redemption on the cross as he offered himself, and none but a priest could make the offering. Compare Heb. 9:28, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." 1 Pet. 2:24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." Here these apostles say Christ was offered on the tree, and that "*by his stripes*," which were made on him before he was crucified, "ye were healed." Heb. 9:13-14, "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the

living God." Here Paul says Christ "offered himself without spot," and Peter says he bare our sins on the tree. So we have Christ the Priest offering his body, the sacrifice, on the cross, the altar. Paul says in Heb. 5:4, "No man taketh this honor unto himself," that is the honor of being a high priest, "unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest;" that is, he did not assume it of his own accord, "but he that said unto him, Thou are my Son, today have I begotten thee." Here Paul emphatically says that God made Christ a high priest, and then in verse 6, quotes Ps. 110:4, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Too plain to need comment. Poor Nick! If his position be true, he is a priestless, childless church. I am sorry for him.

In this discussion we have found that:

1st. In every covenant that God ever made with man, he embraced the children, even the unborn children.

2nd. We have seen that the Church, with Christ and the children in it has existed in some form from Adam until today. A. Campbell, replying to Rice on the Patriarchal Church from Adam to Moses, says, "I have conceded that there was some religious society, and the whole Christian world admits that there was a church state of some sort, during that period, though no public worshipping assemblies." Mr. Nichol made a similar admission in his debate with me at Lometa, Texas, in the fall of 1907.

3rd. We have found that God has always commanded the children to receive the sign or seal of all his covenants.

4th. We have found that the Jews always took their children, whether natural born or proselytes, into the covenants, and gave them the seal thereof in their infancy. No exception to this rule.

5th. We have found that the old Abrahamic Church still continues, in which God put the infants, and that Christ before, and the apostles after Pentecost, took the infants into this kingdom or Church of God.

6th. We have found that Moses says that the children, young and old, went out of Egypt with their parents; and Paul and A. Campbell say they were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. I believe it, do you? Paul further says, in Heb. 9:19, that Moses sprinkled the book and all the people. I suppose all the

people included the children, do you? And Paul called these sprinklings *baptisms*, in verse 10.

7th. We have found Christ a priest keeping the law, and living and dying in the Abrahamic Church, also his disciples, and all these still keeping the babies in the Church.

Nichol's Last Speech

Authority for baptizing infants could not be found in the Bible, and Ballard shows his knowledge of the fact by introducing Wall's History.

"Baptism is an institution of the New Testament," is incorrect he says. He failed to give a passage of scripture as proof, for he knows, "Baptism is an institution of the New Testament."

He asserts: "The Jews had been practicing baptisms, 32 in number, for nearly fifteen hundred years before Christ came into the world; and Paul in Heb. 6:1-2 exhorts the Jews to go on to perfection leaving the doctrines 'of baptisms and laying on of hands'." I deny, emphatically, that there were "baptisms, 32 in number," recorded in the Old Testament. He failed to cite proof. There is none. In the Old Testament there were only eighteen bathings, (*louo*, not *baptizo*) in water only; there were twenty sprinklings, none of which were with water only. The word "*baptizo*" does not occur in connection with these bathings in the Old Testament, save in the case of Naaman, and this is the word in the New Testament for baptism.

You accuse Paul of saying: "Leaving the doctrine of 'baptisms and laying on of hands'." You accuse Paul falsely, and should know better. He said, "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ."

Ballard says: "Baptism was a thing more practiced and better understood among the Jews before Christ, than among Christians since Christ." His assertion is the proof he offers.

In the law for circumcision, Gen. 17, Num. 15:14-16, God says, "One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger." When you declare that baptism is connected with it, you only assert that which is not true.

The unclean had to offer the sacrifice, have the water of separation sprinkled on them, wash their clothes, and bathe (*louo*) their flesh in water. These bathings were an immersion in water only, and Paul refers to them as baptisms, and calls them "carnal ordinances."

Agreed, the commission settles the matter: Who should be baptized. It authorizes the baptism of believers only. Mark 16:15-16. Not a place in the commission for infant baptism.

Failing to find infant baptism in the Bible, he tries to get some consolation from Maimoides and Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*. Ballard reasons: The apostles being Jews would have followed the Jewish proselyte custom of making disciples. Your witness is against you. He says: "Maimoides gives at the same place an account of several circumstances of time, place etc., observed in the action of baptizing a proselyte. As that, they baptize not a proselyte on the sabbath, nor on a holy day, nor by night." Introductory, p. 6. The Jewish custom was never to baptize a proselyte at night, but the apostles did baptize at night as well as on the Sabbath. Acts 16:14-33.

"And the Lord said unto me, * * * I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. 18:17-18. Christ was that Prophet, and spoke all the words that God commanded him, but not one time did he "speak" infant baptism.

These customs, referred to by Wall in proselyting, were "traditions of men;" they were not authorized by the law, and Christ says. in vain do they worship me teaching for doctrine "the commandments of men." The apostles did not follow the "tradition of men" in making disciples or proselyting.

Subjects were brought into the Old Covenant, and then taught to "know the Lord," Jer. 31:31-34. In the New, they are taught and then enter the Covenant. Your ramble through history does you no good.

He quotes: "Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." He asserts that at that time the Jewish Christians were "still bringing their children into covenant relation with the Christian Church." His assertion is barren—not one word of truth in it. Yes, Jesus was "a minister of the circumcision." He was a "minister," and "of the circumcision"—a descendant of Abraham "that he might confirm the promise made unto the fathers." What was that promise? Gen. 12:3, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." It was confirmed by God's oath, Gen. 22. Jesus was a "minister" and of Abraham's seed—"of the circumcision." He established the New Covenant. Infants are safe. When they sin,

not be a priest." Heb. 8:4. Ballard says he was!! Christ was made a priest by the oath of God, "since the law." Heb. 7:28—the law was taken out of the way at the death of Christ; since then he was made priest. Mr. Ballard quotes: "So Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; that is he did not assume it of his own accord, 'but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee'." Acts 13:30-33, Paul says: "But God raised him from the dead: * * * and we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promises which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfill the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Paul says this "begetting" was in the resurrection, and it is used in reference to the priesthood, showing that he was not priest till after his resurrecton. As to the offering of the body on the cross; he gave himself for the world; Annas and Caiaphas the priests had him crucified, but in the death of Christ the law was abrogated and they ceased to be priests. Christ offered his blood in the most holy place, heaven itself for us.

Mr. Ballard's effort to prove his proposition: "*Infant baptism is authorized by the word of God,*" is before you. Expunge his assertions, and what have you? Not a command for nor an example of infant baptism has he been able to find in all the word of God, nor has he attempted to show where Christ commanded the apostles to practice it. It rests wholly on the "tradition of men."

We are agreed that the commission, Matt. 28:18-19, settles the matter as to who should be baptized. In so agreeing he admits that all his ramble through the Old Testament *has not one thing to do with infant baptism*. Hear the commission: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." Baptize who? It is apparent from my last speech that it is not nations, as such, for then infidels and immoral men would be subjects of baptism. "Go teach (or disciple) all nations, baptizing them." What is the antecedent of "them?" It is nations, as "discipled." The pronoun must agree with the noun in gender. This is true in Greek. "Nations" (*ethnee*) in neuter, and the pronoun "them" (*autous*) is masculine. The antecedent of "them" is implied in the verb, (*matheeteusate*), expressed in the Revised Version: "Make dis-

Failing to find infant baptism in the Bible, he tries to get some consolation from Maimoides and Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*. Ballard reasons: The apostles being Jews would have followed the Jewish proselyte custom of making disciples. Your witness is against you. He says: "Maimoides gives at the same place an account of several circumstances of time, place etc., observed in the action of baptizing a proselyte. As that, they baptize not a proselyte on the sabbath, nor on a holy day, nor by night." Introductory, p. 6. The Jewish custom was never to baptize a proselyte at night, but the apostles did baptize at night as well as on the Sabbath. Acts 16:14-33.

"And the Lord said unto me, * * * I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. 18:17-18. Christ was that Prophet, and spoke all the words that God commanded him, but not one time did he "speak" infant baptism.

These customs, referred to by Wall in proselyting, were "traditions of men;" they were not authorized by the law, and Christ says. in vain do they worship me teaching for doctrine "the commandments of men." The apostles did not follow the "tradition of men" in making disciples or proselyting.

Subjects were brought into the Old Covenant, and then taught to "know the Lord," Jer. 31:31-34. In the New, they are taught and then enter the Covenant. Your ramble through history does you no good.

He quotes: "Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." He asserts that at that time the Jewish Christians were "still bringing their children into covenant relation with the Christian Church." His assertion is barren—not one word of truth in it. Yes, Jesus was "a minister of the circumcision." He was a "minister," and "of the circumcision"—a descendant of Abraham "that he might confirm the promise made unto the fathers." What was that promise? Gen. 12:3, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." It was confirmed by God's oath, Gen. 22. Jesus was a "minister" and of Abraham's seed—"of the circumcision." He established the New Covenant. Infants are safe. When they sin,

they must be taught to "know the Lord," believe and be baptized to enter the Covenant.

On Acts 21:20-21 he asserts: "Christ was a minister of the circumcision, and that the apostles kept it up." In this very connection it is "revealed" that they should not require it of Gentiles, and it was observed by the Jews for only a short time after that.

Mr. Ballard says: "Nichol's dissertation on the pronoun 'them' in the commission is a laughable piece of grammatical analysis." To an ignoramus trying to dodge the truth, that may be true. The facts stand as I gave them.

Yes, I said the "*paidai*" in Luke 18:16 were old enough to "COME." Ballard denies it, and demands proof. Proof: Suffer little children to COME unto me, and forbid them not." Luke 18:16. They brought unto him the infants (*brephe*) that he might touch them—not baptize them; but the "*paidia*" were to COME unto him, and he tells the disciples that they are not to FORBID them. How could they FORBID an unconscious infant, and how could they COME? "*Paidia*" is a child of any age, while "*brephe*" is an infant. They are not babies until 12 and 13. You are as usual wrong; the boy was 13, the girl 12.

You fail to find a spiritual promise in Gen. 17. God said, "It shall be a covenant in your FLESH." Ballard to the contrary. Your citation, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations)." Will not serve you. You say this last clause is from Gen. 17. Correct, but is the statement, "a father of many nations have I made thee" a spiritual promise? NO!! Gen. 17 was to one nation only—the circumcision. You differ from Paul. The spiritual promise was in Gen. 12:3. Not one spiritual promise in Gen. 17.

On "will build" (*oikodomeso*) he dare not deny the definition I gave. He tries to darken counsel and confuse the reader with what he calls "spiritual meaning." Run a Methodist preacher aground and he will begin to "spiritualize." The word has no such meaning, and I think Ballard knows it. The definitions he cites are metaphorical, not "spiritual," and Matt. 16:18 is not given by Thayer as having the meaning Ballard wishes.

Acts 15 was a discussion of the circumcision of the Gentiles, and not their conversion.

He quotes me: "Baptize never means sprinkle," and says, "That is his assertion, I assert that it does." Proof would be acceptable. I am negating. Baptize is from "*baptizo*." Sprinkle is from "*rantizo*." They are never used interchangeably. They are no more related than "immerse" and "sprinkle." "*Baptizo*"—immerse, "*rantizo*"—sprinkle. Ballard knows all scholars so declare, and he asserts without proof. He declares that Paul speaks of "divers baptisms" in Heb. 9:10, and that they were performed by sprinkling. What will he say next? None of the sprinklings under the law were with water only, and only eight of them had water in them. The eighteen different bathings under the law in which the whole body was washed in water are referred to by Paul and called "diverse baptisms."

He next tries to prove by history that Christ was a priest and assisted in the temple. He says, "I have Josephus." Yes, I have Josephus, *too*, and he never one time said that Jesus Christ officiated with the priests, not one time did he say it. You "have Josephus" but you are unable to find in your Josephus where it states that Christ officiated in the temple with the priests. Josephus speaks of seven men by the name of "Jesus" that were priests, but none of them were Jesus The Christ. Christ was of the tribe of Judah; not of the priestly tribe according to the law, and Paul declares he did not attend at the altar, Heb. 7:11-14, under the law. You quote Sudias. His statement is not worth anything in the face of the fact that we have copies of Josephus older than the date of Sudias. We have Latin copies dating back to A. D. 500. The Encyclopedia Britannica says of Sudias, his "work is uncritical, and the value of his articles very unequal." Sudias claims to quote from Josephus' "Memoirs of the Jews' Captivity," a book never heard of elsewhere. You boast of having Josephus, but you are not able to find in any part of Josephus that Jesus Christ officiated with the priests in the temple. You have succeeded admirable in displaying your ignorance of Josephus.

Your effort to prove that Christ was a priest while on earth is a failure. Paul declared that no man of the tribe of Judah "attendeth at the altar," under the law, and the law was not abrogated till the death of Christ. Col. 2:14, "If he were on earth he should

not be a priest." Heb. 8:4. Ballard says he was!! Christ was made a priest by the oath of God, "since the law." Heb. 7:28—the law was taken out of the way at the death of Christ; since then he was made priest. Mr. Ballard quotes: "So Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; that is he did not assume it of his own accord, 'but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee'." Acts 13:30-33, Paul says: "But God raised him from the dead: * * * and we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promises which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfill the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Paul says this "begetting" was in the resurrection, and it is used in reference to the priesthood, showing that he was not priest till after his resurrection. As to the offering of the body on the cross; he gave himself for the world; Annas and Caiaphas the priests had him crucified, but in the death of Christ the law was abrogated and they ceased to be priests. Christ offered his blood in the most holy place, heaven itself for us.

Mr. Ballard's effort to prove his proposition: "*Infant baptism is authorized by the word of God,*" is before you. Expunge his assertions, and what have you? Not a command for nor an example of infant baptism has he been able to find in all the word of God, nor has he attempted to show where Christ commanded the apostles to practice it. It rests wholly on the "tradition of men."

We are agreed that the commission, Matt. 28:18-19, settles the matter as to who should be baptized. In so agreeing he admits that all his ramble through the Old Testament *has not one thing to do with infant baptism*. Hear the commission: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." Baptize who? It is apparent from my last speech that it is not nations, as such, for then infidels and immoral men would be subjects of baptism. "Go teach (or disciple) all nations, baptizing them." What is the antecedent of "them?" It is nations, as "discipled." The pronoun must agree with the noun in gender. This is true in Greek. "Nations" (*ethnee*) in neuter, and the pronoun "them" (*autous*) is masculine. The antecedent of "them" is implied in the verb, (*matheeteusate*), expressed in the Revised Version: "Make dis-

ciples of all nations, baptizing them,"—the disciples. Thus the commission authorizes the baptism of "disciples" only, and an infant is not of that number, as all know, even Ballard knows that much. Ballard's quibble on gender is absurd. Any school boy knows that when a pronoun is used to include masculine and feminine, the masculine is used, this is true in Greek and English, hence there are men and women in "*autous*." You note that Ballard did not deny what I said about the gender of the words. He knows I am right. He did not deny that the nation as "discipled" is the antecedent of "them;" he knows I am right. Jesus said: "Go teach (disciple) all nations, baptizing them"—the disciples. An eight-day-old infant is not a disciple—cannot be taught. "Go teach." This word, "teach," as used by Christ, occurs in three other places in the New Testament, and in each instance the idea of "instruct" is present. He said, "Go teach"—instruct, make disciples of the nations, baptizing them—the disciples. An unconscious infant cannot be thus instructed, discipled, and is not to be baptized. This is the commission, the authority for baptism, we have agreed, and there is not an infant in the number; they are excluded, for the authority is to baptize the "disciples." The man who presumes to baptize an infant, rebels against God—sins.

Let us see who the apostles baptized, when laboring under this commission:

Acts 2:41: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized."

Acts 8:12: "They were baptized, both men and women."

Acts 8:28-39: One man—the eunuch.

Acts 9:18: Saul of Tarsus.

Acts 10:48: One man—Cornelius.

Acts 18: Lydia and her household. Verse 40, "And they (Paul and Silas) went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them."

Acts 16: The jailor. Verse 34, "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with *all* his house."

Acts 18: Crispus and the Corinthians. "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with *all* his house;

and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized."

Acts 1: Twelve men at Ephesus.

Of the entire number baptized by the apostles, there was not an infant. All had been taught, were disciples, believers.

Ballard introduced Wall's History. Hear Mr. Wall: "Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any *infant*."—Pref. p. 29. Dr. Bledsoe, Methodist, editor of *The Southern Review*, (Vol. 14, p. 334), says: "With all our searching, we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism." Henry Ward Beecher said: "I have no authority from the Bible for the baptism of infants, and I want none; I have tried it, and know from actual experience that it is a good thing. I have the same divine authority for it that I have for making an ox yoke—it works well, and therefore it is from God." Infant baptism is not authorized by the Word of God, as all candid Bible readers have to admit.

Ballard says when he baptizes infants he "brings them into relationship with the Methodist church." See who were members of the Church of Christ: "And great fear came upon all the Church." Acts 5. Not an infant in that number. Again: "He made havoc of the Church, entering into every house, and hailing men and women committed them to prison. Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word." Not an infant in this number. More: "That there should be no schism in the body (Church); but that the members should have the same care one for another. 1 Cor. 12:25. Not an infant. In Eph. 4:16, Paul says the Church "edifies itself in love." Unconscious infants in that number, eh? Listen: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the WHOLE CHURCH, to send chosen men * * * to Antioch." The WHOLE CHURCH was PLEASED!! Was there an unconscious infant in that number? Again: "Tell it to the Church." Were they to tell the unconscious infant of the trouble? There was not an infant in the Church of Christ.

Ballard declares the Church of Christ began with Adam, and that the Jews were all members of it. Four thousand years after Adam, Christ said: "I will build my Church." Nicodemus was a Jew, had been a member of the Jewish institution all his life, but had to be "born again" before he could enter the "kingdom of

God" Jno. 3:3-5. The apostles were Jews, members of the Jewish institutions, but had to be converted before they could enter the "kingdom of Heaven," still Ballard says they were members of it all the time. That Jewish institution, which Ballard calls the Church of Christ, killed Jesus—demanded his death. The Church of Christ is a NEW INSTITUTION. Paul calls it a "NEW MAN." Into the new institution only those who are taught to "know the Lord" can enter; while into the old they entered without "knowing the Lord." Heb. 8:7-13.

Where God placed children they are mentioned. Infant baptism is not mentioned in any of God's laws, commands, covenants or promises.

There is not a blessing promised to the "baptized infant" that is not promised to the unbaptized one also.

I have asked Mr. Ballard:

1. Is infant baptism authorized by being mentioned in the scriptures? If yes, where?
 2. Name an apostle of Christ that baptized an infant. When? Where?
 3. Is there an unmistakable case of infant baptism mentioned in the New Testament? Where?
 4. How do "unconscious infants" have a "good conscience?"
 5. Has Christ commanded you to baptize an infant? Where is the command recorded?
 6. Do you agree with Mr. Wesley, that infants are guilty of original sin, and that "in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless this be washed away in baptism?"
 7. Does baptism serve the same purpose in the New Covenant that circumcision did in the Old?
 8. If Nicodemus had been a member of the Church of Christ all his life, why did he have to be "born again" to enter it?
 9. When you baptize an infant, is it "born of God?"
- What has been his answers to these questions?
- The Apostle Peter says baptism is the "answer of a good conscience toward God." 1 Pet. 3:21. The unconscious infant cannot have a "good conscience." Therefore infants cannot be baptized.
- The authority for baptizing is the commission: "Go teach (make disciples) of all nations, baptizing them," the disciples. Baptize who? The disciples. Unconscious infants cannot be "dis-

cipling," and he who presumes to baptize them rebels against God—sins.

The doctrine of infant baptism is not once mentioned in the Word of God. Do you believe, my friends, that it is your duty to do in the NAME of Christ that which he has never mentioned?

God, by His "divine power, hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." II Pet. 1:3. He has not given us infant baptism; therefore, infant baptism does not pertain "unto life and godliness."

While with the disciples, Christ said: The Holy Spirit will "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." It did not one time bring to their "remembrance" a command to baptize an infant. Therefore, Christ did not command it.

Again: The Spirit was to "guide them into all truth." The Spirit did not "guide" them into the practice of infant baptism. Therefore, it is not of the truth.

"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." II John 9. Infant baptism is not in the doctrine (teaching) of Christ, and he who practices it abides not in His doctrine; therefore, has not God.

