

A Public Discussion

O n t h e Q u e s t i o n :

Does the Church of
Christ Offer a
Scriptural
Basis

F O R T H E

Union of All Christians?

B E T W E E N

E L D E R N E A L O V E R M A N,
DISCIPLE

A N D

O . B . W H I T A K E R,
CHRISTIAN

Held at Lincoln, Kansas, Jan. 8-11, 1906

Reported by W M . M . D A Y , Topeka

M. A. DONOHUE & CO..
Chicago

Copyrighted 1906

by

O. B. WHITAKER

PREFACE.

The following debate, which took place in the Opera House at Lincoln, Kan., Jan. 8th to nth, 1906, was reported by Wm. M. Day, stenographer, of Topeka, Kan., who, after having submitted to each of the disputants his respective speeches for approval or corrections, prepared and furnished to each of the parties a complete report of the entire Debate as it was given to the printer, and as it appears in the following pages.

By agreement between the parties previous to the Debate, O. B. Whitaker was authorized to copyright and publish the Debate.

The final correspondence leading up to the discussion was as follows:

Lincoln, Ivan., Dec. n, 1905.

The Church of Christ, Lincoln, Kan.:

Respected Brethren and Sisters: Inasmuch as I have conceded to you the choice of a representative of your church to meet me in public discussion, permit me to say that I shall expect you to select one in whose ability and fitness to present and defend the position of the "Church of Christ" you have the highest confidence. It will

certainly be to your interest, and I assure you it will be my pleasure, that you do so. The Debate will certainly go the general public in some shape, —probably in book form; and the general public will be justifiable in presuming that each denomination was amply represented. If I correctly caught the item, mention was made of a representative of Drake University, of Iowa. I assure you that he, or any other recognized representative of your church, will be entirely satisfactory to me, and I insist that you secure such a one, unless you consider Rev. Neal Overman, of Topeka (now of this city,) fully as well, or better, qualified to represent you..... Whomever you may select, I feel confident of victory, and have written this to you chiefly to the end that you may select a representative in whose ability you have the highest confidence.

Assuring you of my highest respect, for many of my best friends are among you, I remain

Yours very truly,

O. B. Whitaker.

To which the following reply was promptly received :

Lincoln, Kan.

“Be it resolved by the members of the Church of Christ at this place, that we place all confidence in the ability of Bro. Neal Overman, our pastor,

to defend the teachings of Christ as set forth by this church."

Dated this nth day of December, 1905.

A. Artman, Chairman.

Ralph W. Brunt, Secretary.

Hon. E. T. Skinner, representative of Lincoln County, was chairman of the Board of Moderators and presided during the entire debate. The other members of the Board were J. W. McReynolds, formerly treasurer Lincoln Co., Hon. C. C. Stoner, formerly representative of Cloud Co., J. D. Brockett, Manager of Chicago Lumber Co., and J. S. Stover, Cashier Farmers' National Bank.

We clip the following from the *Lincoln Sentinel*:

OVERMAN-WHITAKER DEBATE.

Never before within the memory of the oldest residents in Lincoln, was the opera house so packed, as during the public debate of four nights, January 8 to 11, between Prof. Whitaker and Evangelist Neal Overman on the question, "Does the Church of Christ offer a practical and scriptural basis for the union of all Christians." Each evening long before time for the discussion to begin, the house was packed, and on the last evening of the debate long before the doors were unlocked (which was an hour and a half before time for the debate to begin) the street was blocked

with an eager throng waiting for the doors to be opened. It was estimated that about 900 were in the hall the last night, and hundreds were turned away. The spirit and courtesy manifested by the disputants was commendable. The attention and order of the immense audience was almost perfect. No event in the recent history of Lincoln has created so great excitement or awakened so great and so wide discussion.

During the discussion and for several weeks after, it was the chief topic of discussion in all circles and places.

Question: "Does the Church of Christ offer a practical and scriptural basis, or platform, for the union of all Christians, requiring, as it does, baptism (immersion in water) in order to the remission of sins, and holding, as it does, the following doctrines:

- (1.) Christians are baptized (immersed) believers.
- (2.) The Lord's Supper should be observed every first day of the week (Sunday).

MR. OVERMAN.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Board of Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I count myself happy tonight that I have the opportunity and privilege of standing before you to present the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, concerning the necessity for the union of all God's people. The question for discussion binds me to prove that the people with whom I stand identified offer a scriptural and practical basis for the union of all God's people, while it does not bind my brother on the other side to prove anything, but simply show that the truth I may offer to you is not in harmony with the Divine Word. I am here tonight seeking the truth. I desire, above all things, that the truth may prevail. It is the desire of my heart that the people of Lincoln taking advantage of the opportunity that is now offered them, will have a better understanding of the Word of God than ever before in their history, and I accord to Professor Whitaker of the negative, the same desire. So far as I am personally concerned I stand upon a platform that will allow me to accept and put in practice any truth that may be presented from the other side.

The need for the union of God's people, it seems

to me, is apparent from the reading of the Word, in the Seventeenth chapter of John, the twentieth verse, which reads: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;" the 21st verse, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." This is the prayer of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, that his people may be one. This is the object of our coming together tonight. It is that we may find a reasonable, Biblical and practical basis for the union of all who love the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The necessity for this union is apparent to all lovers of Christ, when we see the present divided condition of the Church, and we seek for that platform upon which we can stand, testing the platforms of all denominations today and find that they are weak and unavailing, and we find that there is none other platform laid down than that which is laid by Christ Jesus. We find that the platforms built by men are too narrow to support their own bodies and that constantly they are breaking away from the body and adding to the already vast confusion. It is necessary for me to show our position, or the position of the church with which I stand identified, and that it is ordained of God and in harmony with the scriptures. In

order to do this I must show it from the Holy Word. There is none other book we can offer as authority save the Bible. We are not here to present to you the opinions of men. We are not here to give to you what we think the Bible teaches. We are not here to give to you what any denomination teaches aside from the Bible. But permit me to say this, that any congregation or church is right just so far as its teachings are drawn from the Word of God; just so far as it can say, "Thus saith the Lord," for that which it practices and teaches.

The question tonight, "Does the Church of Christ offer a practical and scriptural basis, or platform, for the union of God's people," depends upon who gave the law or platform; was he of Divine origin; and had he authority for this; had he the power and right to lay down the law of salvation?

I want to trace the history of the plan of salvation, for this is practically the question under discussion;—How shall men be saved? I want to read from Ephesians three and eleven, showing that God had a purpose in his mind all the time, desiring the salvation of men, then we shall trace that purpose and see what it was. "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord." Reading from the tenth verse of the third chapter, we have it thus:

“To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God,” and the eleventh verse, “According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord.” We want to turn, now, if you will, to Genesis 3:14-15, to find the purpose of God in Christ Jesus. “And the Lord said unto the serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life; and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel.” The first revealing of the purpose of God in the sending forth of the seed of woman. We find that this was fulfilled in 1st John 3:8, the fulfillment of the promise of the purpose of God is recognized as being given here. “He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.” Again, this promise made to Eve was renewed to Abraham and to Isaac and to Jacob. Reading from Genesis 12:1-2-3, and we have the promise renewed to Jacob—or renewed to Abraham, I should have said rather than to Jacob. “Now the Lord said unto Abraham, get thee out of thy

country, and from thy kindred, and from thy Father's house, unto the land that I will show 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 curse thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Here is the promise renewed again unto Abraham in this chapter. Again, he says to Abraham, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," Genesis the 46th chapter. This was fulfilled, we see, in Galatians 3:16. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many: but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ," showing that he had a Divine purpose in mind in bringing in the Christ. This gives to us the Gospel of prophecy.

We have the Gospel now in preparation, beginning with the ministry of John the Baptist. The mission of John the Baptist is found in Isaiah 40:3-5, showing that John had a mission to fulfill. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain: and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the

Lord hath spoken it." Again another prophecy thee: and I will make thee a great nation, and I is found in Malachi 3:1, giving another prophecy concerning this same man John the Baptist. "Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." So we have these two prophecies concerning the coming of John the Baptist, who shall prepare the way of the Lord and make his paths straight. So that we have the Gospel in preparation through John the Baptist. We read again from the New Testament, in Luke 1:17, showing how the Gospel was in preparation at this time. "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." Again we read in John 1:6, showing this same preparation of the Gospel, which is to be the "power of God unto salvation" in preparation. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." Reading on, "The same came for a witness to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light but was sent to bear witness of that Light. That was the true Light, which lighteth

every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own and his own received him not. But as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." I have read now from the sixth verse to the twelfth inclusive, of the first chapter of John, and I want you to note the last verse: "To as many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God." That they have the "power to become the sons of God." The people were not yet ready for Christ. John went before to prepare them for Jesus Christ. Again we read from the twenty-ninth verse, "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." "This is he of whom I said, after me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me.. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare rec-

ord that this is the Son of God." From the 29th to the 34th verses inclusive, of the 1st chapter of St. John.

Now, of John's prophecy of fulfillment, it was said that John was the greatest: that no prophet born of woman was greater than he. It was given to him to prepare the way of the Lord: to usher in the Lord Jesus Christ, and to show indeed that he was the Christ.

Again, I want to show that Jesus was to have power given to him and that he had authority. I read from Deuteronomy the 18th chapter and 15th verse, showing that the law should be given to him, or rather that he should have authority, and that the people should hear him. Deuteronomy xviii:15. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Now Moses gives to us a prophecy concerning the coming of the Messiah. Again I read to you from Isaiah, showing that he had authority placed upon his shoulders. "For unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to

establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." I have read from Isaiah the 9th chapter, the 6th and 7th verses. Now we see from these two passages of scripture that authority and power should be placed upon the shoulders of Jesus Christ according to Divine prophecy, and we read in the Word that no prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation but that holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. We turn to the New Testament to see if we find harmony in this respect. Turn to the Hebrew letter, 1st chapter, and we read, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things. By whom also he made the worlds." Turning again to the 2nd chapter of the Hebrew Letter, "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the

Holy Ghost, according to his own will?" So again we find how that the authority is laid upon Christ. We see thus, brethren, that whereas men were taught by the prophets; in these days we are to be taught by Jesus Christ himself.

We are to be ready to give a reason for the hope we have within us to every man that asks it. Every church and every organization must give a Bible reason for its existence or else it must go out of existence. If there be no reason for the existence of the Church of Jesus Christ, or the teachings that it sets forth, or if we can find no authority in the scriptures, or can give no "Thus saith the Lord" for that which we do, then we offer to you a platform which is neither scriptural nor practical: nor which should be accepted by the people. It would not be the platform with which all of God's people might be identified. But we propose to show you during this week that the position we occupy is not only in harmony with the Word of God, but that it is a reasonable and practical basis or platform for the union of all God's people. We propose to show you during the discussion that the Lord contemplated but one church and not *many* churches: that the Lord contemplated that all his people should be of one and the same mind. We propose to bring under condemnation the division or divided condition of the church as it stands today, and we propose to give to you, my friends,

the one basis that the Lord has offered; the only basis that the Lord has ever offered for the union so much desired by the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. We have no doctrines of men to offer. We have naught but the Word of God and men of the Bible, who were taught by the Holy Spirit. You will remember that Jesus, when he spoke of the Holy Spirit, said he would pray the Father that he would give you another teacher (or comforter, as we have it in King James' version) and when he comes he will bring to your remembrance all things whatsoever I have said unto you. Therefore, when we find that Jesus prays for the union of all God's people that they may be one as the Father and He are one; one in mind, one in purpose and one in work, it behooves us to know whether we are one; one in mind, one in purpose and one in labor. This is the reason why we gather before you tonight: that we may show you these things. In order to do this it will be necessary for me to show the authority—to show that the Church of Christ was organized and is organized in strict harmony with the Word of God—that it was instituted by the direction of our Lord, Jesus Christ—that the things we find in the church are just the same as we find in the church of apostolic times—that the same things we practice were practiced by the apostles. If we can show you this conclusively—that we are practicing nothing more or less than Peter

did, than did Philip, than did Paul—who preached the Gospel successfully to the Europeans;—if we show you conclusively that we conform to the Divine plan, it seems to me we can safely invite you to stand upon the same platform with us. It seems to me, brethren, if we show this, that my brother on the other side of the question will gladly extend to me his hand and say, “Brother Overman, I am ready to stand with you upon this platform and upon this faith, once for all delivered to the Saints.” We are commanded in the Word of God to earnestly contend for this faith—not in a lukewarm manner. And I am free to say that I expect my opponent tonight to contend for his position and try to destroy the position I have offered, with **all** the power and energy and zeal at his command. I expect him to arraign each point brought up here, and to combat it with all his power. I expect to leave the matter upon the hearts of this people, knowing full well that God will take care of His own, and that the seed sown here will not be in vain,—that God’s word will accomplish that which pleases Him. I am fully persuaded that ere we are through with this discussion we shall not only have convinced this audience, if it comes here night after night, that we are right in our position, but we shall convince the brother on the other side that to dei?y

any proof offered by us he will have to deny the words of Holy Writ. We know that it is possible for one man to overcome another, but it is not my purpose to combat Professor Whitaker at any time. I shall simply lay before you and before my brother the Word of God, and shall allow him to discuss the matter. I shall give you the words of Jesus, of Paul, of Isaiah, of Jeremiah and the host of Old Testament and New Testament writers and allow them to present the plan for the union, and show you that the one million, three hundred thousand people with whom I stand identified plead the Word of God,—the “Thus saith the Lord” for everything we offer and everything we ask other men to do.

I am perfectly willing, so far as I am personally concerned, to offer as proof for the position I occupy, nothing but the Divine Word of God, realizing that it is the highest authority that can be used in questions or discussions upon subjects pertaining to eternal life, realizing that we are commanded to “Search the scriptures” for the plan of eternal life. We have shown you tonight in this speech how Jesus was promised; how that he fulfilled the promise of the scripture—
(Time called.)

MR. WHITAKER.

*Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

Some of you may think this is a pleasure to me, and I assure you that it is. I am pleased with the spirit my brother has manifested in the beginning of this discussion. If my hoarseness does not overcome me I am sure my brother will not, and we will continue for the four evenings.

There has been nothing produced in defense of the question as stated. The discussion has been instructive, but there has been nothing said thus far that I do not fully concur in. I mean the matter in controversy has not been touched upon; therefore I have nothing to reply to. Does the Church of Christ, more popularly known as Campbellite, offer a practical and scriptural basis for the union of all Christians, requiring, as it does, immersion in water in order to the remission of sins, and holding the doctrine that Christians are immersed believers, and that the Lord's Supper should be observed every Sunday? That is the question before us. I had expected my brother on the affirmative to define the question. Since he has not done so I suppose it will devolve upon me to do it, though certainly this is taking time that should not be taken from me. Does the Church of Christ offer a practical and

scriptural basis or platform for the union of all Christians? Now this is an important question. Among the things handed down by the nineteenth century to the twentieth is the present divided condition of the Christian Church. I would not change what my brother has said about religious schism except to emphasize it. There is a spirit and feeling with which the atmosphere of the twentieth century is pregnant,—that sectarianism is an evil. It is manifested through Christian journals and other Christian publications. A short time ago three of the great denominations of Canada formed a union by taking the creed of one church, the discipline of another, and the form of local government of the third. Of course, none of them believe all of that platform, and so it is neither practical nor scriptural. In America this is manifested by the recent move known as church federation, ostensibly for the purpose of cultivating a better spirit and a more friendly feeling among denominations; but really for the purpose, I think, of building up the great denominations and probably blotting out of existence the smaller ones. Some of the Christian churches in America were refused seats, and in doing that some of the noblest and most highly respected men in America were refused fellowship or admission. But the question is: Does the *Church of Christ*

offer a practical and scriptural basis for the union of all Christians? I take it that when we say *practical* basis we mean one that every Christian in the world and of every age, past or future, may stand upon without cramping his conscience, without doing violence to his faith; and when we say *scriptural* basis I understand that to mean a platform that shall be in perfect harmony with every precept, principle and authorized practice of the Word of God. I presume my brother will accept this definition.

Now, when a church or individual offers what it professes to be a practical and scriptural basis for the union of all Christians, surely all Christians should consider it with earnestness and with honesty, and if it be found to be a practical and scriptural platform, upon which every Christian may stand, then certainly every Christian in the world ought to set aside his prejudice and pride and step out upon this platform. The world is seeking for such a platform, and wherever the Word of God speaks upon the subject it condemns division among the followers of Christ.

Now there are two ways of testing error. My brother has already said that he expects me to hold up this system before you under the severest criticism possible; he would be disappointed if I should not do that. Some people believe that a religious debate will always leave an ill

feeling between the disputants. There never has been a revolution of good except through public discussion. Our Divine Master began His debating eighteen years before He began to preach. Paul debated two years in one place, and Paul was one of the strongest personalities of apostolic times. All the apostles were debaters, and the man who says that religious debates are wrong is generally standing upon a platform whose constitution, profession or creed he does not wish to be held up before honest criticism.

The first test of error.—*Error is inconsistent with truth.* Do not understand by this that error is inconsistent with all truth; but *all* error is inconsistent with *some* truth. Any error is consistent with much truth. No doctrine was ever held by any church but was consistent with much of the Word of God. But if it be found that a theory or profession be inconsistent with *any* truth, that profession or theory is *error*. I knew of a man once that was saved from the gallows by an application of this principle. When the chief witness was testifying against him she said she had seen his face near the window. The attorney of the one who was being tried said to her, "How did you recognize his face? Was there a light in the house?" She answered, "No." "**Hoav**, then, did you see him at midnight?" She answered, "I saw his face by the light of the

moon." He turned to her and said, "Are you sure that the moon was shining that night?" She answered, "Yes." "Are you as sure of that as you are that that is the man you saw at the window?" She answered, "Yes." When the attorney came before the jury he showed by an almanac that the moon was not shining that night. That evidence was inconsistent with truth, and the Court asked no more. So, when anything is shown to be inconsistent with truth it is error.

Second Test.—*Error is sometimes inconsistent with itself.* If a theory is inconsistent with itself it is error. This is recognized by the attorney when he cross-questions a witness. If the witness is falsifying he expects to catch him.

Now I expect to test the Campbell system of theology by the application of these principles.

I take it to be beyond argument that the Word of God is true. The fifth rule governing this discussion makes that one of the principles upon which this discussion shall be based. I take it that if this system is found to be inconsistent in any particular with the Word of God that it is false, and I shall show you tonight not only one inconsistency, but twenty; and if my time will permit I shall follow that with ten inconsistencies with itself; and during the week, if my brother takes care of those, I shall follow up with one hundred; and if he shall answer

those, with five hundred. I wish you would watch closely, for my brother must show that these are not true, and that no honest man can believe them. He says it is not the opinions of men that he will offer, but truth. Let me show you the difference between opinion and truth. Now, proof admits of no opposite or contrary. Whenever a contrary is possible it is not *proof*, but *opinion*. So my brother must show that views contrary to his creed cannot be held by honest men.

1. This system has a test that cannot be worded in Bible language by which it judges others. Against such Paul asks: "Why dost thou judge thy brother?" (Rom. xiv:io.)

2. It refuses to recognize the opinions of equally intelligent and equally earnest followers of Christ. Of such Paul asks: "Why dost thou set at naught thy brother?" (Rom. xiv: io.)

3. It insists upon its own interpretation of the Scriptures being the only admissible one, thus violating the Word of God, which says: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." (Rom. xiv:5.)

4. It refuses admission into the church to all that are not immersed. But the Bible says: "Receive ye one another as Christ also received us." (Rom. xv:y.) But "Jesus himself baptized not."

5. They baptize sinners. This is nowhere authorized in the Word of God. But the Word of God teaches we are to baptize *disciples*. "The Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John" (John iv:i). Again, when Paul went down to Ephesus, he found "certain disciples" there, and when they heard Him "they were baptized" (Acts xix:i-5).

6. It professes to offer a scriptural basis for all Christians to unite upon, but requires acceptance of articles of faith that nine-tenths of the professed Christians of the world and of all ages since the time of Christ do not believe. They would thus compel them to act against their own faith and in violation of the Word of God, which says: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. xiv:23.)

7. It considers and declares all unimmersed persons unfit for reception into its body; but John says, "The Blood of Jesus Christ," (and not immersion), "cleanseth us from all sin" (I. John 1:7), and the "voice" said to Peter, "What God hath cleansed, that call thou not common."

8. It claims that the only way by which one may *know* that he is saved is by immersion. The Word of God nowhere gives such a law; but says, in opposition to that, "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren" (I John 111:14.)

9. It holds that only the immersed are "born of God," which is nowhere taught in the Word; but on the contrary, "Every one that doeth righteousness is born of God" (I John 11:29).

10. It holds that immersion cleanses from sin, and that there is no other way of securing pardon, thus contradicting the Word of God, which says: "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin" (I John 1:7).

11. It teaches that God will not hear or answer the prayers of the unimmersed, while the Word of God teaches, "And the Lord said unto him (Ananias), arise, and go .. and inquire .. for one called Saul, of Tarsus: for, behold, he prayeth" (Acts ix:ii), and that was *before* he was baptized.

12. It teaches that God will not accept the works of the unimmersed, in open violation of the plain historic statement, "And the angel said unto (Cornelius), thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God" (Acts x.-4), and this was *before* Cornelius was baptized.

13. It teaches that the New Testament presents and recognizes no forgiveness of sins except through immersion; thus clearly contradicting Christ himself, when He says to the sinful woman: "Thy sins are forgiven," or to the palsied man, "Man, thy sins are forgiven," or to the thief on the cross, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke xxm:43).

14. It teaches that the Christian institution was impotent in the pardon of sins previous to the death of Christ; thus denying the Word of Christ when he said, "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins" (Matt., ix:6).

15. It holds that the Old Dispensation, or Covenant, was in full force up to the "Day of Pentecost," or at least until the death of Christ, and that the New Dispensation was without potency previous to that time; thus contradicting Christ's own words when He said, "The law of the prophets were until John" (Luke xvi:i6).

16. It teaches that the Gospel order requires belief (or faith) before repentance; which can nowhere be found in the Bible; but Jesus preached, "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel" (Mark 1:15), "Ye repented not afterward, that ye might believe" (Matthew xxi:32).

17. It holds that the only promise of salvation is to the immersed; but the Bible says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. x:9).

18. It teaches that none are accepted of God, save the immersed; but Peter said to an unimmersed man, "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him" (Acts x:34-35).

19. It adds to the church daily such as are immersed. "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" (Acts 11:47).

20. It defines "Christian" as "immersed believer," which definition the Word refutes, both affirmatively and negatively; 1st, affirmatively,— "By grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph., 11:8-9). Second, it refutes it negatively in the eighth chapter of Acts, where it says, "Then Simon himself believed ... and was baptized and when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, but Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee .. . thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God, for I perceive that thou art in gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."

Now if my time will permit I wish to give you ten inconsistencies of this system with itself.

1. It holds:

(a) That there is no remission of sins except through immersion;

(b) That backsliders (those who have after conversion turned away from God and sinned against Him), may yet turn again to God and be saved;

(c) That they cannot be saved without the pardon of their sins—and yet refuses to immerse them again.

2. The adherents of this system of theology pray daily, as do all Christians, more or less after the manner Christ taught His disciples, “Forgive us our sins” (Luke xi:i4), and yet they are *not* daily immersed.

3. It holds:

(a) That baptism in order to remission is a rite peculiar to the Christian religion.

(b) That the Christian Institution was not in force before the crucifixion of Christ, and yet that John the Baptist immersed in order to the remission of sins.

4. It holds that the Lord’s table is for the communion of Christians only: and yet welcomes and communes with the unimmersed, at the same time declaring them to be unpardoned sinners, and refusing them admission into the church.

5. It holds that “immersion is for the remission of sins,” and yet immerses those who come professing that their sins are *already* pardoned.

6. This church professes to have no creed but Christ; and yet refuses admission to millions who profess faith in Him.

7. They profess to hold no rule of faith and practice but the Bible; and yet *do* hold rules of both faith and practice that are nowhere found

in the Bible, neither can be stated in Bible language, a part of which constitutes the question under present discussion.

8. They denounce sectarianism; and yet are themselves one of the most exclusive of all sects, refusing membership to twenty-four out of every twenty-five professed Christians in the United States, and a much larger proportion outside of it.

9. The watchword of their initial movement was, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent:" but in practice they are loud where the Scriptures are silent, and are peculiarly silent where the Scriptures speak most emphatically. A more consistent and less deceptive watchword would be, "Where Alexander Campbell speaks, we speak; and where he is silent, we are silent."

10. According to its own creed and historical claims, this church was organized and established by *unpardoned, unsaved sinners*.

MR. OVERMAN.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It seems to me, friends, that the professor has taken considerable time to reply to nothing.

We shall not allow his ten or twenty inconsistencies to turn us aside from the question. We shall notice these as we go along,—in their proper time and place. I assured you that unless we can depend upon the teachings of Jesus Christ for our position, and unless we can show clearly from the Scriptures, that Jesus Christ had authority to present a plan of salvation, then we are not in harmony with the Word.

We have introduced Christ and shown that He was the Son of God, and that instead of the prophets and instead of the law we can now hear Christ. I want to call your attention to the mission of Jesus Christ and what He was sent to do—that he was sent to do his Father's will and not His own. Reading from John xvii:i8, "And as thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world," Jesus showing that he had received authority from God Then again from Matthew, the 6th chapter and 10th verse, we read, showing from whence cometh His authority and whose will He seeks to do—whether His own or that of another. "Thy

kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven." This is from the prayer of Jesus Christ. "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven," Jesus wanting to do the will of the Father. Again I read you John iv 143, showing that Christ came not in His own name but that He came in the name of the Father—not that He might gain for Himself notoriety or anything of this kind, but that He might exalt the Heavenly Father. "Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. For Jesus Himself testified, that a prophet hath no honor in his own country." Now again we turn to these words in the 48th verse, "Then said Jesus unto him, Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe. The nobleman saith unto Him, Sir, come down ere my child die. Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way." Again he teaches his whole life was to be lived for God rather than for men. Luke xxii:42. "Saying, Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from Me: nevertheless not My will but Thine be done." Again yielding up His life to the Father, not desiring that He should carry out other than the Father's will. Now we have seen that Christ's mission of ministry was limited. Again we read from Matthew the 15th chapter and 24th

verse, showing how that even Christ himself was limited in His ministry and in His mission. "But He answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The apostles were limited in that He said, "Go ye unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and with this message, that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," showing the limitations of the apostles as He sent them forth; that they were limited as to whom they go.

My brother, tonight we are discussing whether or not the plan of salvation was revealed by Christ previous to His resurrection. Was the Gospel for the entire world at the time that Jesus Christ was in the world, when He limits His disciples to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel? They were not to go unto the house of the gentiles, but were to go unto the house of Israel. We now take up the Gospel in its fullness. The promise is not now to the few but to the many: not to the Jews alone but to all nations. Genesis xii:i. We want a Gospel that will reach to more than just a few people. We read again, "Now the Lord said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show you, 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 again He says in the 46th chapter, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Turning to Galatians, *xiii:i6*, we find that He said, "He saith not, and to seeds as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." Again we read that the promise could not be fulfilled during the life of Christ, but only after He had broken down the middle wall of partition could all people be saved. If the gospel was presented to all people why were not the Gentiles bidden to come in? Why were not the apostles sent to them, that they might preach the Gospel unto these as well as unto others? But they were forbidden to go unto these people. Ephesians 11:14-15, I should have said, rather than Colossians 11:i4. "For He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Can you tell me how the gentiles were to receive the Gospel during the life of Christ? We have been charged with presenting the Gospel only back to the Day of Pentecost, and that it is not far-reaching enough, and yet we have the Gospel after the breaking down of the law, showing how that the gentiles were made one by the breaking down of the middle wall of partition. I shall

show you that Christ was a Jew: that He lived and conformed to every requirement of the law you know, and that He fulfilled all of the law. Up to this time the Gentiles were not brought in.

Again we turn to Colossians 11:13-14-15, "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." And so we have here a breaking down of this middle wall of partition in the death of Jesus Christ. Show me, if you can, where you and I could become heirs to the promises of God previous to the breaking down of this middle wall of partition, save only as we became Jews. I want to show that the plan of Jesus Christ was complete and that only after the resurrection. Matthew, 28th chapter and 18th verse, shall we read showing when Jesus claimed all power given unto Him and commanded in His own name. "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came and spake unto them saying, "All power is given unto Me in Heaven and in earth." This

is after His resurrection from the dead. I want to show you that now Jesus for the first time offered this authority—offers or exercises it. Because all power is now given unto Him in Heaven and earth, He says, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world; Amen." Matthew XXVIII: 19-20. Here we have the commission that is no longer limited. I showed you the commission a while ago that was limited. He said, "Go to the house of Israel," go to the house of the Jews, go to the circumcised people, go to my own people, the Lord's chosen nation, but this is the first time that Jesus declares, "Go ye unto all of the world and preach My Gospel." This is the new dispensation of power. He no longer placed limits as to whom they shall go. I want you to bear this in mind.

My brother has charged the church I stand identified with as being inconsistent in that it teaches immersion in water for the remission of sins, and yet here Christ said to His disciples, "Go unto all the world and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and I want

my brother to show that Jesus Christ ever commanded a non-essential. I want him to show before this discussion is closed, that baptism is not just as necessary as faith. I think if we would cut baptism out and make it read, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations" that my brother would leap upon his feet and say "Amen! Hallelujah!" to that. [Jesus says in Mark, xvi:i5,16, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here faith and baptism are joined together by the copulative "*and*," making them equal. Take away baptism, and by the same right I will take away faith. But the copulative conjunction "*and*" he desires to cut out of this part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.] (By mutual agreement of the disputants, the above is here inserted as having been a part of this discussion, offered at the time of this speech. I read from Isaiah ix 16-7, to see whether Jesus was in harmony with the prophecy of Isaiah; whether He had the right to so present the Gospel in this form; whether He had authority to grant or utter this commission unto His disciples. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God,

The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The seal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." Notice the government shall be upon His shoulder. Here is the first time, so far as I know, that Jesus Christ assumes the government of the entire world. It is true He says before, "Go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

Turn again to I Corinthians *xv.22*, to see whether or not Jesus was to say by what authority men preach the Gospel. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming. Then cometh the end when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down **all** rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For He hath put all things under His feet. But when *Pie* saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted, which did put **all** things under Him," showing that just now, and at this time, when Jesus declared this commis-

sion, all things and all authority were put under Him, even death, which He had conquered Again I turn to Hebrews 1:2, and read, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last days, spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds." I want to show you brethren, that there is no salvation to be obtained save through Jesus Christ. Reading from Acts iv:i2, "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under Heaven given whereby we must be saved." Now we see that salvation comes through the name of Jesus Christ. This is written after the ascension of Jesus Christ. It is written by Paul, one of His chosen disciples. I read again from John x:i-i2, Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. And when he putteth forth his own sheep he goeth before them and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers.

This parable spake Jesus unto them: but they understood not what things they were which he spake unto them. Then said Jesus unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever come before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy; I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is a hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep ana fleeth; and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep." We have shown that Jesus was the door; we must enter in by Him. In John xii:32, He says, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Now brethren, when we come to pass through the door it must be according to the teachings of Jesus. There is no other way. The opinions of men, as was stated, are of no avail.

Jesus delegates certain powers to His disciples. In Matthew xvi:i8, let us see what Jesus has to say. It is shown that Jesus had this power, and if He had it He had the right to be-

stow it upon whomsoever He would. "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind in earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." What would Peter loose and what would Peter bind? is the question now. Would he bind the broken hearted? Was that the idea? No, but one thing Peter could bind upon men would be law. It was said law should be written upon their hearts. Peter cut loose from the customs of the Mosaic law and could bind upon them the law of the New Dispensation. He delegates to Peter that power. He gives a new commission. The first was the commission limited. We notice the new commission after the resurrection. I give it again. Matthew XXVIII 119-20, "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Now my brother made quite a little stir about baptizing sinners. We are not baptizing sinners in the sense he would have you believe. We are baptizing *disciples*. I want to say that to be a

disciple of Christ does not imply that a man is a saved man. If my brother will study the definition of the word "disciple" he will find that "disciple" means one that shall be learned; one that is taught; a student of the Word. I want to read again the commission of Jesus Christ to the disciples. "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." We have a commission that even my brother here and every other minister in town, if he will accept it, will tell them just what they are to do. They are to teach, and baptize. We have a commission that reaches unto the end of the world. Mark *xvi:i5-i6*. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." I read again from Luke *xxiv:46-47*, showing what is to be preached. "And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooveth Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Now we see this commission is limited as to where it shall begin. "Beginning at Jerusalem."

I turn again to The Acts of the Apostles, first chapter and see what Jesus has to say according to Luke, in regard to this wonderful power. "And being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of Me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Now here he says, "Wait at Jerusalem," yet giving them a commission to go and preach the Gospel, but, "tarry at Jerusalem until ye be endowed with power from on high." We have this commission to *teach* and *baptize*. Will my brother say, then, that men are not to carry out the full commission of Jesus Christ? I shall show you later in the discussion how that every disciple went out and undoubtedly preached these things. I shall show you later in the discussion that the time had not come when Jesus lived, for men to be saved under the new law. My brother has this to take into consideration: Jesus Christ was on earth as the *revealer* of the Heavenly Father.

I want to correct a statement that the Professor made to the effect that this church teaches that Jesus had no power to forgive sins while He was on earth. This church never taught that Jesus had no power to forgive sins while He

was on earth. Either the professor is woefully ignorant of the professions of this church or else he has wilfully misrepresented it. I am not a student or disciple of Alexander Campbell, but I preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and time after time I have shown the forgiveness of sin in the very cases he has cited. Jesus had salvation in His own hands. It is His to bestow upon whom He will. Citing the case of the thief on the cross, there is not one single promise in the Word of God, or single statement that the man was saved, although I am willing to assume that he was. And in the case of the man sick of palsy, though Christ said to him, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," yet you will find this, that the man never asked for spiritual salvation; he neither asked nor expected anything but physical salvation. And so with the palsied man who was desiring to come to the Master. The house was crowded and the people cut a hole in the roof and let him down through the roof, and He said, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." If we are to take these as examples I have only to say to you that every man, woman and child in this city, county, state and world can be saved without even so much as crying out unto God, "Oh, Lord, have mercy upon my soul." When Jesus said to the palsied man, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," the people mocked Him. Jesus showed them that it was just

as easy to forgive sins as to heal the sick. When He said, "Take up thy bed and walk." He convinced them that the man who could command the palsied man to take up his bed and walk had power to forgive sins. He was here to give remission upon no condition or upon any condition whatsoever, just as I, if I have property, have the power to give that property to my children either upon condition or upon no condition. I can say to this one, "This is yours without any condition," and I can say to another, "You can work for me a certain length of time in order to obtain your property." But, after I have died; after I have made a testament, that testament stands probated and becomes effective only after the death of the testator. That is a principle in law. No man can inherit by a will until after the death of the testator. This is also true of Jesus Christ. Jesus said to Nicodemus, as recorded by John, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," and in the 15th verse, "Whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." From the third chapter of John. When could all this be put into effect? When He was walking up and down Galilee? (Time called.)

MR. Whitaker.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am still regretting that my brother is not discussing the subject named for discussion. I wish I could say something or do something that would bring him into the ring. I want to see the glitter of his steel. If this audience did not know what the question for discussion is I am sure from the brother's talks that he has so far made they could not tell. These are excellent sermons; but not one argument has he produced in behalf of a single point at issue between us. He has cited scripture from Genesis to Revelation; hunted for passages of scripture he could not find in the Bible; at one time hunting for scripture from the 28th chapter of a book that had only 25 chapters in it, and I agree with him that the scriptures he is hunting for are in the chapters that are missing from the Bible. (Laughter.) But if he has proven a single point I have yet to see it. I wish my brother would state the question tonight before he begins the discussion and would tell us what he is going to prove when he begins; or else, when he is through, that he would tell us what he *has* proven. He may prove this whole proposition without my knowing it. He will pardon me for saying that I am reminded of an old colored preacher down south that had a habit of going into the pulpit

and reading from the Bible wherever it happened to come open, trusting to the Lord to give him a text to preach from; and whenever his eyes fell upon a text he preached from that text. And one time the book opened at I. Kings, the 13th chapter, and his eyes fell upon the 13th verse, and he read, "An' he say unto he sons, Saddle me de ass." The old darkey stopped and stared at the remainder of the passage and read again, "An' he say unto he sons, Saddle me de ass." Then he looked in wonder at his audience, and said: "Brethren, I has bin readin' de Bible for nigh onto twenty yeahs, an' I has nevah befo' noticed dis passage, but de Lo'd helpin' me I will preach from it, but I do b'lieve dey are de wussest sons dat eber lived on God's earf.' Jes look at dis! Listen at what de Word say, "An' he say unto he sons, saddle me de ass, *and dey saddled him!*" (Laughter.) It is in the Bible all right, but the old darkey had read it wrong; he saw something there that no one else had ever seen. So I think my brother has probably seen in some of the scripture he has been quoting proof we have failed to see. I think probably he has seen proof for his proposition.

Now, the question before us is, Does the Church of Christ offer a practical and scriptural basis, or platform, for the union of all Christians, requiring as it does, immersion in water in order to the

remission of sins, and holding the doctrines that the Lord's supper should be observed every Sunday, and that Christians are immersed believers. Has my brother offered a single argument or cited a single passage of scripture that would prove the proposition that baptism by immersion is in order to the remission of sins? Has he cited a single passage of scripture that would prove that the Lord's supper should be observed on every Sabbath day, or that Christians are immersed believers?

In the twenty-five minutes I had last night (I am told I used only that much time) I placed before him and before this audience twenty inconsistencies between the Campbell system of theology and the Word of God, and ten inconsistencies in itself. My brother did not reply to any of them, save to mention two of the points, wherein I had pointed out inconsistencies between the Campbell system of theology and the Word of God, and in both of these, if I understood correctly, he misquoted me. He seemed to get a little warm, and accused me of gross ignorance or of wilful misrepresentation. Now I want to caution my brother against anything but the sweet spirit with which he started out. It will not be necessary for him to affirm that I am ignorant. The audience will get that as I go along. (Laughter.) As for my misrepresentations, they can

very easily be shown up without criticizing me in that manner.

His first objection was to the 14th proposition that I had offered. It reads like this: This system teaches that the Christian Institution was impotent in the pardon of sins previous to the death of Christ; thus denying the word of Christ when He said, "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Mat.9:6. My brother says I am either ignorant of what they teach or that I wilfully misrepresent. I shall be pleased at any time to have my brother ask me for my proof. I have mapped out my course in this argument very carefully. There will be errors, but there will not be the errors that would occur if I were to make an extemporaneous arrangement for my argument. I am ready to offer proof for every proposition I lay down. You know there is an old saying, "Chickens come home to roost." We will see whom this chicken belongs to, and if it belongs to my brother let him open the door of his hen-house and take it in. (Laughter.) If it belongs to the Campbell system as I said, let him take the old hen in; let him admit it; let him not try to palm this responsibility off on me. I don't blame him for not wanting her. I would not either. But it is wrong for him to refuse her when she returns home.

I will read from Mr. Campbell's "Christian

System." It is published by their publishing association at St. Louis. It is the highest authority in the church. It is often spoken of by the friends of this denomination as the "creed" of the Disciples of Christ. It is so advertised by their publishing association.

Mr. Overman: Will you read it please?

Mr. Whitaker: Yes, I will read it now. "*The Christian System*. This is the work so often cited by our denominational friends as the creed of the Disciples of Christ." Now I read from page 179 of the "*Christian System*." "From Abel to the resurrection of Jesus, transgressors obtained remission at the altar, through priests and sin offerings." From Abel to the resurrection of Jesus. That is the way it is stated. My brother says I am ignorant of the Campbell system of theology, or that I wilfully misrepresent it. Let him open the door of his hen-house and let the old hen in. (Laughter.)

He finds fault with my fifth proposition,— "They baptize sinners." I said, in reference to that, as well as I remember, this is nowhere taught in the Word of God, but on the contrary the Word of God teaches us to baptize *disciples*. My brother said, as nearly as I remember, that disciples of Christ are not *necessarily* saved persons, and that I had again misrepresented him. I wish to read again from the "*Christian Sys-*

tem," on page 198. Campbell gives this definition. Mark you it well. "A disciple, then, according to the commission, is one that has heard the gospel, accepted it, and been immersed." Again, "No person can be a disciple according to the commission, who has not been immersed." And again, "No person is altogether discipled to Christ until he is immersed." That is Campbell's idea of "disciple" and my brother said, in the only sermon I have heard him preach, that it is a proper name for the followers of Christ. What did he mean? He meant simply this: That the disciples of Christ are saved persons; persons whose sins are pardoned. And then when he has run up against a passage of scripture he can not interpret in the light of his erroneous doctrine, he says that this is not true. Now I ask him to cite a single place in the Bible where it is shown that disciples are other than saved persons. I have already shown two places where disciples are baptized, let him show *one* where they are not.

These are the only two points with which my brother has found any fault. I would have been well enough off to have had twenty-eight propositions left. I not only have twenty-eight, but you see the fault is with my brother and I have the thirty left. Unless my brother can show that these thirty propositions are false, then his system, according to his own assertion, falls to the ground; I

have shown him that the chickens belong to his own hen-house.

I hope my brother tonight will come up to the issue. I hope he will step inside of the ring. I want him to bring forward his passages of Scripture. He said last night he was going to place the writers of the Bible against me. He said he would bring Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, and Paul, and I know not whom all, to speak to me. I wish he would lead them out and have them speak. I think when he brings his authority that his name will be Alexander Campbell. I want him to introduce one of these men, and let us hear him say that "Christians are *immersed believers*." I want him to introduce one that will say "Baptism is in order to the remission of sins." I want him to cite a passage of Scripture in Matthew, or Luke, or Isaiah, or anywhere else from Genesis to Revelation, that will show that the Lord's Supper shall be observed on every Sabbath day. He says he will have them talk to me. I want to hear them. I want this question discussed. This congregation has come to hear it discussed, and they have a right to expect to hear it discussed. I stepped squarely into the ring and gave my brother thirty propositions to answer, and he has attempted to answer only two of them, and has failed to land his argument in either of these. I have tested this system first by

its inconsistency with truth, second by its inconsistency with itself. There is one other distinct way of testing error, and that is by its results. I want to apply the third test tonight if I have time.

The Chair: You have ten minutes.

Mr. Whitaker: Ten minutes, I think, will suffice. We often, in attempting to reason out a proposition, fail. I remember when Marconi first sent across the world the tidings that he had discovered wireless telegraphy,—that he had discovered the utility of it,—I doubted; yet today the world witnesses more than he even claimed for it. I remember when the X-ray was first discovered I did not believe all that was claimed for it. But results have proven more than was even dreamed of by the man who discovered it. So in institutions or systems, it is but fair that after we have tested them by logic we let them stand and see what the results are. Let us for a moment imagine that my brother's position is correct, that it is true, that there is no Christian in the world but one who has been immersed in order to the remission of sins. America. About thirty-three and one-third have more than thirty millions of Christians in America. About thirty-three and one-third per per cent, of the population are Christians,—probably seventy per cent, of the adult population.

This does not count those who do not hold connection with any denomination. But if my brother's proposition be true this dwindles down to only about one and one-half per cent. In America, which boasts of being a Christian nation, only one and one-half per cent, of her population are Christians! And all of those,—are they Christians? God knows and I and my brother know (but we would not like to mention it in public), that some of *them* are not Christians; and probably that would dwindle down, then, to even one per cent. But, if it is true, let it dwindle, my brother would say. "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" Let us see who are barred by this doctrine? If this doctrine be true John Wesley's soul is in hell tonight. Whitfield, and Spurgeon and Beecher are there. The fifty thousand converts following these great men followed them into hell. Horace Mann, John Milton, Whittier, the Quaker poet, and all of the great poets of America are there.

Yonder is a picture I see tonight. From yonder lonely thicket I hear a man calling upon the Lord. It is the voice of a commander; a voice that has sent terror into the hearts of his foes and courage into the hearts of his followers. But the voice is now broken by sobs. His cheeks are wet with tears. It is Washington, in the win-

ter of Valley Forge, calling upon the God of Heaven for power to sustain the great cause of liberty and to fight against tyranny. Did God turn a deaf ear to him? No! God heard the prayer, and gave in answer the greatest nation the world has ever known. If this creed be true, George Washington has gone to hell, and every man that helped to frame the Constitution of America is there, too. The men that framed our constitution upon the Word of God have gone to hell because they did not believe this doctrine. Who taught it? A man who said that slavery is right, and is taught in the Word of God. A man that upheld the greatest evil this nation has ever known, and a man who would not entrust his own salvation to the creed he was teaching.

Alexander Campbell was not converted under this creed. He was converted in the good old Christian way, if his own story be true. I want to read his own language regarding his conversion, if you will bear with me, and I want to say in this connection that I am reading now from the *History of the Disciples*, by Dr. Gates, the man that holds the chair of theology in the University of Chicago, representing the denomination of the Church of Christ in that great university. Here is Campbell's account of his own conversion. Mark it well. "From the time I could read the Scriptures I became convinced that

Jesus was the Son of God. I was also fully persuaded that I was a sinner, and must obtain pardon through the merits of Christ or be lost forever. This caused me great distress of soul and I had much exercise of mind under the awakenings of a guilty conscience. Finally, after many strugglings, I was enabled to put my trust in the Savior, and to feel my reliance on Him as the only Savior of sinners. From the moment I was able to feel this reliance on the Lord Jesus Christ, I obtained and enjoyed peace of mind," but he was not immersed. That was when he was a child. He was immersed after he had come to America, had been expelled from two churches, I believe, had married; and when the question of the baptism of his child came up, then he began to study, and was immersed. He was converted in the good old Christian way. He was a doctor who did not take his own medicine. He recommended it to others, but did not take it himself. (Laughter.)

According to what my brother said last night, and according to the claims of this church, it was established by men who were unpardoned sinners, because Campbell, according to their history, organized the church three years before he was immersed.

Again my brother says he is standing upon a platform that will permit him to put into prac-

tice or teach any truth he may discover. I wish him to tell this audience tonight what he knows about Professor Willett, and what he knows about Professor Garvin, of Butler College, and what he knows about Professor Van Kirk, the dean of their Bible Seminary. I want him to give this audience this information in the light of his statement that he is standing upon a platform that will permit him to put into practice any truth that he might discover.

He says: "I want my brother to show that baptism is not as important as faith." I wish he would define his challenge. If I should step up to him and ask him: Is a man's brain more important than his heart? or his heart more important than his digestive system? or his digestive system more important than his lungs? he would simply laugh at me and write my name down with his list of other fools that he has. But if I should ask him: Which is the most important in order to a proper circulation of the blood, or in order to proper digestion, or in order to proper assimilation of food, or in order to reasoning; then the question becomes answerable. If my brother means by this that he wants me to show him that faith is more important *in order to the remission of sins* than is baptism, which he certainly must mean, I shall be glad to accommodate him; though he has the affirmative of this question,

and should prove his proposition. But I am willing to do anything I can to help my brother. He has a greater burden than he can bear, and I am willing to help him. If that is what he means, I will not only prove that *faith* is of more importance in order to the remission of sins, but that many other things are of more importance. If he will turn to Hebrews xi:6, he may read that "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Let him substitute "immersion" and read it from the Word of God. Again, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." John III:36. Let him find in the Word of God, he that is *immersed* hath everlasting life. "Being justified freely by grace." Romans III:24. Let him show where we are justified by immersion in water in order to the remission of sins. "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke XIII:3). Let him show where it says: Except ye be immersed ye shall all likewise perish. Again, "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi:i6). Let him show in the Word of God where he can read, He that is not immersed in order to the remission of sins shall be damned. Again, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body (1 Corinthians xii:i3). Can he find in the Word of God where by immersion in order to the remission of sins we are all baptized into one body? Again, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth

us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). Let him show where it is written, Immersion in water cleanseth us from all sin.

He started last night to read from Matthew the 19th chapter. I was wondering whether he would read that; whether he would read about the young man that came to Christ to ask the way to eternal life and said, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" and every Campbellite preacher in the state would say, Be immersed in order to the remission of your sins. But Christ said, "Keep the commandments." The young man said, "Which?" Again every Campbellite preacher would say, Be immersed in order to the remission of sins. My brother would say that. But Christ said, "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And again the young man said, "All these things have I kept from my youth up; what lack I yet?" Again my brother would say, Be immersed in order to the remission of your sins, and every preacher in his brotherhood would emphasize it. But Christ said, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor." Did He say, Be immersed in order to the remission of sins? Not once did he answer that. I won-

dered if my brother would read that, but he had made a mistake. It was not the 19th chapter he was looking for; it was the 28th chapter, and that doesn't touch upon baptism in order to the remission of sins. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, commanding them (or teaching them) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."—This is not the exact Scripture. It is recorded three times in different gospels,—“Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” And then he gave me a lecture and wanted to know why I did not preach baptism. But I do preach it. I preach it until some of the people are tired of it. But I do not preach baptism in order to the remission of sins. There is no question between us tonight as to the necessity of baptism. It is essential. The question is, Is baptism by immersion in water necessary in order to the remission of sins? I expect my brother not only to state the question but to stick to the question and discuss it. I want him to cite his scripture. I know before this discussion closes he will bring Acts 11:38, Mark 1:6, 1 Peter 111:21, and will quote from 1 Corinthians. I want him to bring these passages, for by these very passages I expect to show the error of his system. Why does he hold them to the last? Because he is afraid I will break his argu-

ment down? I think he expects to wait until the close of his discussion in the hope that I shall not have time to reply. I want those passages, and I want him to prove at least one of these propositions tonight that I may have somewhat to reply to when he is through.

MR. OVERMAN.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Board of Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I was not expecting the free indulgence of wit and sarcasm that has been our portion tonight. I think about three-fourths of myself is Irish, and I am glad to be speaking with one from the "Auld Sod." (Laughter.) But, brethren, let me say to you that the theme under discussion tonight is superior and above wit, levity and sport. Dare a man come forth, claiming to be a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that man of whom it is said in history that he never was seen to smile, and attempt to turn the thoughts and hearts of the people away from the truth of God by display of wit and sarcasm? Wit never convinced anyone. Wit has no argument in it. And I dare say that before the professor is through with this discussion he will have heard all of the Scripture upon this subject that he dares or wishes to hear. The professor has asked me to prove certain things. He has asked me to notice certain things which he claims we teach. The question is not what Alexander Campbell teaches. That has nothing whatever to do with this discussion. Nor is it what Dr. Willet or Dr. Gates, of the Chicago University, teach. That has nothing to do with this question. The question is what the Church of Christ teaches.

He cites and makes the claim that the people with whom I stand identified advertise *Campbell's Christian System* as the creed of the church, knowing full well that no minister connected with the Church of Christ would ever so call it, knowing that they do not even speak of the Bible as the creed, but that Jesus Christ is our creed. We showed you last night, and affirmed in our opening address, that it was ours to show the position we occupied to be the Bible position; that in order to do this it would be necessary to show by whose authority we taught and practiced these things. His own committeemen interpreted the question yesterday afternoon, saying that I had the liberty and right to show this. I have only taken the Scripture from Isaiah, from Genesis and from Deuteronomy to show that Jesus Christ had authority. But just for a little while I want to notice some of the inconsistencies that we are charged with teaching.

We are charged with an inconsistency in that we do not teach that sinners should pray. Let us see whether that is according to the Word of God. Let me read to you from John's Gospel, the 9th chapter and the 30th and 31st verses. "The man answereth and said unto them, Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence it is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes. Now we know that God heareth not sin-

ners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth His will, him He heareth." John 14:30-31. Is it we or is it John that teaches an inconsistency?

Second, we teach inconsistencies in that we teach that faith precedes repentance, when, as he said, the Bible taught repentance and then faith. Is it we or is it the Word of God? Turn with me again, if you please, to Romans the 10th chapter, and let us read whether this be an inconsistency. If so, then charge Paul with an inconsistency. He wants these men to talk to him: we will let them talk to him. Romans 10:10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Where do we have repentance there? Again, I ask you to listen while I read, if you will, from Mark 16:15-16. Let us see whether repentance comes before faith in this case. Are we now inconsistent? If so, then let my brother charge Jesus Christ, your Savior and mine, with being inconsistent in that He says, "And he said unto them. Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Where is repentance coming before faith then. Faith is the prerequisite to all the steps that a man must take, and without faith it is impossible to please God,

for we must first believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. I want to say to you my brethren, that there is not a people upon the face of the earth that emphasizes the necessity of faith more strongly than the people with whom I stand identified, and that when the Christian faith was attacked by Robert Owen, the religious world searched where they would for a man to defend the faith, and finally settled upon a man that has been arraigned before you as a man who sanctioned slavery and things of that kind, and he sent the bonny Scotchman back to his own country to die of a broken heart because he had failed to win the discussion. While my brother is quoting Campbell it is a wonder to me he does not call upon me to defend the system of slavery, because Alexander Campbell defended it. I have heard more from Alexander Campbell during this discussion tonight than I have heard from him in all my life. I was not schooled among the preachers with whom I stand identified, but received my education from the Baptist people. If I preach then the Word of God as it is recognized by some of the leading authorities, and Campbell preached the same things, well and good; but I care not for Campbell. Campbell was not baptized for me. Campbell did not die for me, nor was I baptized in his name. He is nothing to me more than my brother

—just a man—that is all. It is claimed by the people with whom I stand identified that Jesus Christ is their creed. Does my brother know, in all of my preaching in this state, of my ever having made a claim to anything to the contrary? I want you to understand, and understand now, that Alexander Campbell was not the founder of the church of the living God. Have I exalted Campbell?

I want you to understand another thing that he was quoting from Alexander Campbell in regard to disciples, or those that are being taught. Again, he says, or emphasizes, that we are not saved by works and we teach an inconsistency when we claim men are saved by works. I want you to read with me from James, the 14th verse of the 2nd chapter, and let him charge James with an inconsistency. Brethren, it matters not to me what men say or who they are. We are not trying men for their present belief or opinion. We accord to them the liberty of opinion. I want to say to you tonight that no Alexander Campbell, no Herbert L. Willett, or the man from California, or J. W. McGarvey, of Lexington University; none of these shall set forth the doctrine that my brother is expected to overthrow and destroy, but this doctrine shall come from my lips as preached from the Word of God. I am now about to read James 11:14. "What doth it profit,

my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?" He answers again, in the 17th verse, "Even faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." Reading on, "Yea, a man may say, Thou hast 'faith, and I have works: Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believed, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" Again we read from the 26th verse, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

He said that he believed that baptism was essential, but that he wanted to hear the proof that baptism was necessary to salvation, and before he is through with this discussion I want him to show the difference between that which is essential to salvation, and that which is necessary.

I will give him the Scripture he calls for by and by.

Then again, he calls us inconsistent in that we believe or that we permit unbaptized persons to partake of the Lord's Supper. Inconsistent? Let us see. Is it an inconsistency of the people with whom I stand identified, or is it Paul who is inconsistent? Let me read from 1 Corinthians xi:23- "For I have received of the Lord that

which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine HIMSELF, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Where comes in the right, then, for me to say who shall eat and who shall not eat of the Lord's Supper. "Let every man examine HIMSELF and so let him eat." Where, in all of the Word of God is there a single passage of scripture that would say there is a single man or woman in this house tonight that is not entitled to take of the bread providing they do it discerning the Lord's body? Where is the word for it? Shall I, then, be charged with an inconsistency when I refuse to judge whether or not my brother is worthy to partake of these things ?

Speaking of the excellent sermons that I have been preaching. That is exactly what I intended to do,—preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ and set forth the truth as we find it there.

Now we shall have a little scripture, brother, just a little. My brother teaches salvation or remission of sins and the beginning of the Christian Dispensation before the death of Christ. That is, if we are to be saved we are to be saved like the thief on the cross. I think I have given it correctly. If I haven't, he has the privilege of correcting me. I want you to remember one thing that we showed you last night: that Jesus remitted sins when He was upon earth, but my brother claims here and charges me with not teaching that kind of a doctrine. He has said it in his speech only now closed. Let us see what the Scripture teaches. Hebrews ix:22. Let us read the Scriptures again, that we may have the Word of God in respect to this. "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without the shedding of blood is no remission." Reading on, "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the pres-

ence of God for us." Do you get the idea? No remission without the shedding of blood. Do you get that into your heads? Just keep it there. Then again, by the offering of Christ we are made perfect. Hebrews x:i4. Shall we read again? "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Men are made perfect by the offering of Christ. I want to ask you, friends, if you can dispense with this offering. Was there, then, salvation for men in the sense we receive it now, in that day? Christ was here. Salvation was in His own hands. He could bestow it upon whomsoever he would. I showed you last night that the will of Jesus Christ was not in force before His death, and shall show you the same thing tonight. I want to show you again, from passages of Scripture my brother quoted last night, in i John i:y, and see whether or not we have a proper understanding of this passage of Scripture. "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." Now notice, "The blood of Jesus Christ," as my brother said, "cleanseth us from all sin." Now then, how shall we apply the blood of Jesus Christ for cleansing our sins before His blood has been shed? "Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized in the Lord Jesus Christ were baptized in His

death?" (Romans vi 13) Now then, the blood of Jesus Christ was shed at His death.

Shall we hear now a little something further along the line of the blood? There are three that bear witness on earth: the spirit, the water, and the blood. 1 John v:8. Shall we read it for you from the Word of God, for, brethren, I want you to understand that not a single reference I make is my own, but that it comes from the Word of God itself. 1 John v:8. "And there are three that bear witness on earth, the spirit, the water and the blood: and these three agree in one." Will my brother take the water out of the testimony and say it has no place there? No. Will he rather receive the words given in the 9th verse of the same chapter, "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son." There are three, the spirit, the water and the blood. Shall we take the water out of the plan of salvation? Shall we say to men, You are Christians without complying with these things? You remember what Samuel said to Saul, the first king of Israel, who came back disregarding the commandments of God himself. You remember he said, "To obey is better than sacrifice." Again, I would have you read in the Roman letter, "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," and also in

the words of the Master, "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Now, I have given you the passages of Scriptures so far as the blood is necessary and so far as the law is necessary, and showing how the law is in effect. I will show this by Hebrews x:i-io. Let us see whether we have salvation under the new will or not. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offer year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when He cometh unto the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I am come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do Thy will, O God. Above when he said sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered

by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." The 10th and 12th verses. "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering and oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sins; but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God."

Now we have seen how the law was ineffectual. I want to show you again in Hebrews 7th chapter and 19th verse that by the which we draw nigh unto God, the law made nothing perfect. "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God." Now Jesus lived under the law, died under the law, and said of the law that not one jot or title should pass away until all should be fulfilled.

I told you that the Church of Christ, to offer a practical and scriptural basis for the union of all God's people, must be in harmony with the Scriptures as to time and place of institution. The professor brought before us in his arraignment of the Church of Christ last night the question whether it was in existence during the life of Christ. Let us see. Matthew xvi:i8. Let us read and see whether it existed at this time. "And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon

this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Future tense, if you please. Did the Church of Christ exist at that time? It was to be built upon a certain foundation. Isaiah xxviii:16. Let us read this. "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste." We have read you how the Gospel of the church in prophecy in Isaiah xxviii:16. Paul and Peter both preached this stone was Christ. Roman ix:33. Let us read again from Romans and see what Paul has to say. "As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." Let us read again from i Peter 11:6-8 and see what Peter has to say concerning this stone of the Church of Jesus Christ, upon which it is to be built. "Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief cornerstone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner. And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they

were appointed." "Ah! Something wrong here! Those people were offended and were disobedient. We find again that to obey is better than to sacrifice. Again, I want to read to you from 1 Corinthians III:-10-77, and let you hear the Scripture there again from Paul. "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Now we have the foundation of the Church of the living God; not the foundation of the Campbellite church. I want to say to you that the professor knows full well that the people with whom I stand identified are not willing to accept the name of Campbellite. Nor would I be guilty of the discourtesy of bestowing upon him a name that is distasteful to him.

Now, then, we have the foundation. If the Church of Christ existed in the days of Jesus Christ, I want to say to you that it was built upon other foundation than Christ, for Christ had not yet been tried- Did the Church exist in the days of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, and of John the Baptist in the wilderness? Jesus said, "I *will* build my church." If the church already existed he would have said, "I

have built my church." Did it already exist? Then Jesus Christ had to join an institution that was not of his making. If the Church already existed, as the professor has said, it wasn't built upon the tried stone. Matthew xvi:i8. Let us turn back and read this same Scripture and hear what Matthew has to say about this matter. "I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." What is it the gates of hell shall not prevail against? Prevail against Jesus Christ? The gates of hell, or the gates of hades, or the gates of the pit are not to prevail against it. Was Jesus Christ at this time tried? Had He conquered death and hell? Had He come forth victorious on the first day of the week? Had this stone been tried in the days of John the Baptist? If so, then the Church existed before the death of Christ Jesus declares himself to be more powerful than death. John x: 17-18. Shall we read. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have the power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." Jesus laying claim to power that will give Him victory over death. Again we read from Mark the 9th chapter, 2nd to 7th verses,

inclusive. We want to read this showing how that He was recognized by the Father as being His Son, and that He had authority, and that His word was to be heard. "And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and He was transfigured before them. And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them. And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. And Peter answered and said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here; and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid. And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him." Now we read a little further on down, in the 9th verse, like this, "And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of Man were risen from the dead." How then could Jesus Christ be preached as the Savior of men—(Time called.)

MR. Whitaker.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

When my brother started out tonight my heart began to beat with hope, and then it all fled. What has he discussed? When we were determining the proposition for discussion I mentioned as one article of the creed of this church, —The Church was established after the death of Christ. My brother refused to accept that, saying it was not held by his church. Now he is spending all his time trying to prove the very article of faith he said his church did not hold, and that he refused to accept for discussion. Did he expect to take me thus unaware? But I well knew he would have to try to prove this error in order to support the others. My brother has not found me unprepared. However, it is not a question between us whether the Church of Christ was established before the Day of Pentecost, and all my brother's eloquence and fine display of oratory has not touched a single point at issue between us. The only question is, Were sins remitted under the Christian Dispensation without baptism in water by immersion? That is the question. Did Jesus Christ remit the sins of the sinful woman, who was not immersed, or did He falsify when He said, "Thy sins are forgiven," and when He turned to Simon, the owner of the

house, and said, "Her sins are forgiven, for she loved much?" If He did forgive her sins, did He do it under the Jewish Dispensation or the Christian Dispensation? My brother staggered last night when he came to the thief on the cross, then said there is no evidence that he was saved, then started back at his own assertion and said, Still I will admit that he was saved. The idea!

When the man on the cross expired-----

(Interrupted.)

Mr. Overman: I would like to correct the brother. I did not say I admitted he was saved. I said I was willing to assume that he was saved. I would like to have the reporter refer to his notes and give you my exact words.

The Chair: We will have the reporter look it up.

Mr. Whitaker: I will abide by the decision of the chair, but if I have misquoted my brother he could certainly correct it in his following speech. If we are to stop and have the reporter look up his notes every time there is a controversy we will spend half of our time in that manner.

The Chair: If it is going to take the reporter some time to refer to the notes I presume we had better not have it done..

The Reporter: It would probably take some time to find it.

The Chair: Then we will go on with the discussion and Brother Overman may have the privilege of having it corrected tomorrow evening. When I ruled at first I thought the reporter would be able to turn to the words readily.

Mr. Whitaker: I do not want to misquote my brother. It doesn't make any particular difference. The most of you were here last night, and heard him make the statement that there is no evidence that the thief on the cross was saved. Now this is the point I tried to make. If I did not say it before I do now. Look at the picture before us. There is the suffering thief on the cross. He turns to the Master, and says, "Lord, when thou comest into Thy kingdom, remember me;" and Jesus turns to him with a look of love and answers, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." No wonder the brother staggered when he said there is no evidence that the thief was saved. Christ said on the cross, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." If God was in Heaven then the thief on the cross was in Heaven.

It is a little queer, some of you think, that my brother should spend so much time—half of his speech last evening and all his speech tonight—trying to prove that the Church of Christ was established *after* the death of Christ. Why does he wish to prove this? Because one error must be supported by another. He starts out with the

great error—Baptism is in order to the remission of sins. My brother says that Jesus Christ is the essential part of their creed. There is not a Christian in this house but that believes on Jesus Christ, and yet there are hundreds here to whom he would refuse membership. There are millions of people who believe in Jesus Christ to whom my brother would refuse fellowship at the door of his church. He says tonight, "What authority have I to say who shall commune in the Church of Christ?" But I ask what authority has he to say who shall *come into* the church. If there is logic in one there is logic in the other. I did not point this out as error. I did not say that one was right and the other wrong. I said this: that there is inconsistency in the Campbell system of theology when they fellowship one at the table thus saying he is a Christian, and then refuse him fellowship at the door of their church. What would I give for a platform that would not fellowship John Wesley, or Moody; that would send the soul of the father of our country to hell? What would I give for a platform that would not fellowship a Milton, a Spurgeon, a Beecher? What care I for such a platform as that? My brother says he does not judge men by an opinion. What is his creed but an opinion? He cannot read in the Word of God,—Baptism by immersion is in order to remission of sins.

It is not in the Word of God. If the *words* are not there the *doctrine* is not there. There is no idea in the Word of God, except the idea expressed by the words. The reason my brother does not read it is because it is not there. He never can read it; no man can. Alexander Campbell spent thirty years trying to build up that system, and changed the platform time and again.

Last night my brother said they stand upon a platform that would allow him to practice any truth he may find. I wonder how much truth there is in that. I have to say something that I do not like to say; that it is painful for me to say, because I love you so. You know there is an old song like that. But it is true. This church is the most deceptive sect among all protestant sects of Christendom. Now I want to show you why this is true. I do not like to say that, brethren. I do not like to gain your ill will; but if it be truth bear with me patiently. My brother said, I stand upon gospel alone, yet he interprets the Word of God in such a way that all others, except the few in his own church, are excluded. Did not Wesley, and Luther, and Barnes, and Calvin know the Word of God as well as Alexander Campbell? Did *he* receive a new revelation? Do not you and I have as good a right to say what we find in the Bible as my brother has? I want him to discuss that, because their whole

system stands upon that proposition. I think he is going to leave it until the last. He is afraid to step out squarely into the ring and bring the issue before us. We are not discussing when the Church of Christ was established. We are discussing whether Jesus Christ remitted sins. He says that the Jewish dispensation covers all of Jesus' doings, and that the New Covenant was not in force before the death of Christ. But we read "The law and the prophets were until John," (Luke xvi: 16). Now I want to read you just enough scripture to settle this. I do not propose making this an issue unless my brother forces it. Why doesn't he discuss the issues before us? Why does he not discuss the propositions he has agreed to? Why does he take the one he said he would not discuss? But he is wrong also in this proposition. Let me read. "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John" (Matthew xi: 13). "The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the Kingdom of God is preached" (Luke xvi: 16). "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." (Matthew iv: 17). "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" (Matthew xi: 7) "The Kingdom of God is at hand" (Mark 1: 5). "The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke x:9). "Fear not, little flock, [this is

the church], for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom" (Luke xii: 32). Now turn to Hebrews the 6th chapter and 20th verse. "Jesus, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec," not from the tribe of Levi but "after the order of Melchisedec," the new dispensation. "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." What then? "For this (offering up a sacrifice) he did once, when he offered up himself." He was a priest. The priest must exist before he can offer up the sacrifice. The sacrifice was offered up when he was crucified. Then the priesthood existed *before* he was crucified. The only question between us here is, Did Christ forgive sins? not whether the church was established before the Day of Pentecost, though I have shown it was.

His reference to wit and sarcasm is about as consistent as his other arguments. He says it is not proper that I should resort to wit and sarcasm, but "I am an Irishman, and am glad to be with one from the Auld Sod, Ha, Ha, Ha!" (Laughter). He says we should not indulge in wit, but, "I am right here with you, we will have it if you want it." I did not intend to be witty. I do not intend to be even sarcastic, but if I am I am only following the example of Christ. What did he mean when he said, "You that gag

at a gnat and swallow 'A Campbell?'" (Loud laughter and applause). Wasn't that sarcasm? What did the prophet of God mean when he said, "Cry aloud: for he is a god. He is talking or pursuing." That is sarcasm. My brother indulges in it, and he certainly has a right to.

He objects to my reference to this (*Christian System*) as the creed of his church. He again misquotes me. I did not call him down because I did not think it proper to interrupt him while he was speaking. He said I had said that this was advertised as the creed of his church. I said it is spoken of by the friends of the church with which my brother stands identified, as the "creed" of the church, and that it was so advertised by his publishing house, and I read the very words from the advertisement. I know they say they have no creed, but they have. One article of the creed is, "Baptism is in order to the remission of sins." It is not in the Word of God, and therefore it is added. You remember it is said in the last chapter of the book of Revelation, "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Another article is, "Christians are immersed believers," and another "The Lord's supper shall be observed on every Sabbath day." Another article of the creed of my brother's church is, The church was not established until after the death of Christ.

I have already shown you twenty inconsistencies of this church with the Word of God. I expect now to offer as many more as my time will permit. Whenever I show you that this system is inconsistent with the word of God then it is wrong. Whenever my brother stands before you and says, We have no creed but the Bible, he makes a false statement, because he will not admit men just as honest as they are, and just as earnest, to that platform, reserving the right to interpret the Word of God for them. What sect does more? Is there a church of Christ today that does not claim the Word of God as their creed? The only difference is this church is coming before the public deceiving them and making them believe they have no creed outside of the Bible. I believe half of the people who go into the "Church of Christ" do not know what it holds. Otherwise I can not account for the great falling away in their numbers in their last report. Forty-five thousand cannot be accounted for in their last annual report, according to their own statistics. They do not know what has become of them. After assigning a certain number to death and various other things, there yet remains forty-five thousand they do not know what became of. Why? Because they thought they were converted when they were not.

Let me draw you another picture. On the

banks of Jordan John is preaching. The great throng stands spellbound by his eloquence. He looks up the banks of the Jordan and sees Jesus coming toward him to be baptized. John objects, saying: "I am not worthy to baptize thee. I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" What does Christ say? Does he say, Baptize me in order to the remission of sins? No. "Suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Was Christ baptized in order to the remission of sins? Yet Christ was an example unto us. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" (This is one of my brother's passages he will read after while) "but he that believeth not shall be damned." How about him that is not baptized? Does the Bible say he shall be damned? My brother wanted me to show where belief is more important than baptism. Here is one place. Again, John HI: 18. "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already." My brother says that is false. He may believe all his life, but he will be condemned just the same if he is not immersed. Again, "Whomsoever believeth on him might not perish but have everlasting life." My brother says it is false; if you do believe on Christ it will not save you unless you are immersed in water. Again, "Verily, verily, I say un-

to you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." Now watch my Campbellite brother when he baptizes. He leads a man down into the water. He says "Do you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" He answers, "I do." If he spoke the truth let us see what then. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but *is passed from death unto life.*" My brother immerses him. In order that he may pass from death unto life? No. He immerses a Christian. He immerses a disciple. My brother will not find in the Bible a single place where sinners were commanded to be baptized. Again, "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." My brother says you will die; you are going to hell if you are not immersed in order to the remission of sins. Again, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." Not, my brother would say, unless you are immersed. My brother will cite a passage of scripture along toward the last, trying to show that a man isn't born of God until he is born of water. Let us see. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (I. Jn. 5:1.) He is born of God then before he goes down into the water.

Again, "He that hath *the Son hath* life." But my brother says not without immersion in water. "Ask and it shall be given unto you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you." Again, "Ye shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins," but "Jesus himself baptized not," therefore he could not save them from their sins. Again, in the house of Simon, he says of the sinful woman, "I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven," for she was immersed?—"f-o-r s-h-e 1-o-v-e-d m-u-c-h."

My friends, just now a picture comes to my mind. I want to pause for a moment. It is a sod house in Kansas, in the sixties. There is a young man, the only son of a widow, dying from the wounds received from the savages in a recent raid. A doctor comes from forty miles distant and has just left. He says there is no hope. The mother reads to him while he is awake, and as he sleeps she goes into the farthest corner so that her sobs may not disturb his slumbers, and prays. He awakes. She is sitting at the bedside. I hear her say to him, "My boy, today you must make the choice. Listen while I read again from the precious Word." And she begins to read, and as she reads she feels the touch of a feeble hand upon hers. She reads on and feels the grasp of the hand in hers tighten. He looks

up into her face and says, "Mother, read those words again." And again she reads the words, and the clasp tightens upon her hand as he looks up into her face and says, "Mother, I am almost believing, read them again." Again she reads. A smile breaks over the face of the young man as he exclaims, "I believe, mother, I believe!" And then as the spirit passes away an angel touches the face and leaves a smile upon it. The mother falls upon her knees and thanks God. But my brother says you have nothing to thank Him for,—your boy's soul has gone to hell because you had no water there. Bah! upon such a doctrine,—a doctrine that would send such souls to hell.

And then I see another picture. It is a battle field. Ten thousand wounded soldiers are groaning, dying, praying, pleading, asking the way of life. I see, here and there, ministers, Baptist preachers, Presbyterian preachers, Methodist preachers, Christian preachers, and matrons of the Red Cross, stopping here and there, reading the word and praying. I see a Campbellite brother (and I beg my brother's pardon for that, as he objects to the language) pass along. Here is a soldier. Noticing the robe of the minister, he says, "May I have a word with you?" "What will you have?" "Tell me the way. I want to be saved. I remember now the words of my

mother. Won't you pray for me?" My brother says, "I can't help you; there is no water here." "But won't you pray for me?" "No. That won't do any good." "What shall I do?" "There is nothing I know of for you to do but to go to hell," and he walks on down yonder and looks out over the battle field. What else can he do? He stands there and sees the others working, and while he is standing there he says to himself, "If a fellow only had a tank of water here, what an opportunity to save sinners!" (Loud and prolonged applause). Now my brother will say this is ridicule. It is in accordance with his system, and if it is ridicule it is because the system is ridiculous. Will you believe the God of Heaven will let these souls go to hell because there is no water there, when He himself holds in his hands the government of the elements that produce the water? Do you believe that Milton, Wesley, and Stone, under whose teaching there were more converts in one week than under the preaching of both the Campbells in all their lives—do you believe that they were all deceived? Do you think your mother was deceived when she died with a smile upon her face?

My brother was converted in the Baptist church. He has not entrusted his salvation to the Campbell system. That is the way I would do it, too. (Laughter.) I would go into another

and get religion, then preach this, if it suited me better. My brother, if he was baptized in the Baptist church, was pardoned before he was baptized, for no Baptist preacher would immerse him until he professed that his sins were pardoned.

Mr. Overman: He did do it.

Mr. Whitaker: That is all very well. We can not help that. My brother can claim it if he wishes. Then my brother must have deceived the preacher, or else the preacher wasn't a Baptist preacher. And look at the consistency of my brother in the Baptist church anyway! He was a Democrat in the Republican party; (Laughter.) a liquor dealer in the prohibition party; he was a Campbellite preacher in the Baptist church. (Laughter.) Where is your consistency?

Now, my friends, I want to speak for a moment concerning the name I have used. We haven't done it with a lack of respect for this denomination. My brother says I have no right to use it. If he will show me an encyclopedia of high authority where that name isn't given in connection with this church, I will thank him for it. If he does find it so, and I do not show him more encyclopedias where it *is* used, I will cease using the name entirely. The reason I say *Campbellite* is because everybody knows what I mean. If I say Disciple of Christ I could mean any fol-

lower of Christ, and my brother says I might mean sinners, and I do not want to call him a sinner. (Laughter.) Here is what I find written in the Encyclopedia Britannica. "Disciples of Christ or Campbellites." "Disciples of Christ or Christians, sometimes called Campbellites or Campbellite Baptists." "Campbellites, the popular name for a religious order founded by Alexander Campbell." My brother says he didn't do it, but the encyclopedia says he did do it. I have one or two other references there but will not read them just at present. And so my brother will certainly pardon me for calling him something besides what he tells me to call him. I am not here to discuss his idea of the church. The idea of his being able to define the principles of the Disciple church, when he says he does not know anything about the system! But he does know it. He knows the Campbell system better than he knows the Word of God, or he would not cite a chapter that was not in it. He does know Campbell better than the Bible. Now he says Campbell is no authority. I want to read you from Dr. Gates. I have already told you who he is. This is copyrighted in 1905, and is right up to date. It is from one of the highest authorities in their denomination. Here is what he says: "While each church was perfectly free and independent, yet there was one master mind,

one controlling genius, who was leading them. He spoke through the pages of the *Christian Baptist*." I want to turn to page 227 and read to you again. "Yet Campbell continued to be the most authoritative person and his paper the most sensitive and influential." I want to turn to page 206, and show you where they got their doctrine. "John Rogers met and heard Alexander Campbell at Carlisle, Ky., in 1824, from whom he learned the true design of baptism—that is, in order to remission—the necessity for weekly communion, etc." He did not get it from the Bible, but from Campbell. That is where my brother got it. That is the reason he does not read it from the Bible. He could read it from this "*System* " but he is ashamed to do that before this audience. He reads that at home. (Laughter.) Now, my brother said he was going to show you that the order that they claimed of faith and repentance was right, but he hasn't cited any scripture where these two things are mentioned together. I saw you smiling when he was reading. I saw his own members looking sourer than pickles. But he can't read it from the Word of God. It is not in the Word of God. He can read it from the *Christian System* here if he wants it. But that order is not in the Word of God. He said, "I will turn and read it to you," but he read not a single passage where

faith and repentance are both even so much as mentioned. And suppose he had found it once? Did I not find it three times the other way? But when he has not found it at all and I find it three times in the reverse order, then does he still insist he is standing on the Word of God? (Time called.).

This is the first time I have been rapped down, and I was bound to speak my time out. (Applause.).

MR. OVERMAN.

*Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

I want to read again the question for discussion for the benefit of my brother. The question for discussion shall be, "Does the Church of Christ offer a practical and scriptural basis, or platform, for the union of all Christians, requiring, as it does, baptism (immersion in water) in order to the remission of sins, and holding, as it does, the following doctrines: 1st, Christians are baptized (immersed) believers. 2nd, 'The Lord's Supper' should be observed every first day of the week (Sunday)."

A man said to me today, "How could you keep your temper when the professor was talking about the Campbellites last night?" Easiest thing in the world, friends; he wasn't talking about me; he had no reference to me. (Laughter.) He tried to gain your sympathies by picturing battle fields, and the dying soldiers, then told what a Campbellite preacher would do under those circumstances, and I verily believe that he told the truth. I am not acquainted with any Campbellites. I do not know what they would do. I never have met one of them that I know of. Speaking of the Campbellite church,—I notice that in the question for discussion it is not

mentioned. Hence, as I said, the professor was not referring to either myself or to the Church of Jesus Christ when he spoke of Campbellite preachers. I do not know what a Campbellite preacher would do if one should ask him what to do to be saved. I do know, friends, what a Christian minister, minister of the Church of Jesus Christ would say to a man who came to him as they did on the Day of Pentecost, and said, "Sir, what must I do to be saved?" That man would say in the language of Peter, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you," not just a few but every one of you, "in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." "And the promise is not unto you alone, but unto your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts ii: 38. I quoted this now for fear I would not get to it. I had it on my list for discussion last night but did not get to it. The professor has been crying, "Why don't he discuss baptism?" last night and night before. I am astonished at this, for in the committee meeting I offered to discuss baptism and baptism only with the professor, but he would not agree to that. Again, he wonders why I am not discussing baptism, and yet he offers thirty, yea more, he says, five hundred things he would like to have me notice in this discussion, trying his best to keep me

away from baptism. I am astonished. I wonder at the professor's whining around because I am not discussing baptism when he has been trying to keep me away from it as much as he could. I have this to say, that we are not discussing stories; we are not appealing to the sympathies of the audience, trying to squeeze tears out of their eyes. Sympathy is not argument. I want the Word of God.

Why did not the professor, when he was picturing the dying youth in the house, slain by the cruelty of the savages, or the dying soldiers,—why did he not turn to the Holy Word and read, "In the day of judgment there shall be some come before the Master who shall say, Lord, have we not cast out devils in Thy name; have we not done many mighty works in Thy name?" and the Lord would say to them, "Depart from me ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you."

Referring again to the objection that we baptize men that are already saved because they state that they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and because they believe in Him. What does that signify? Does it mean that a man is saved simply because he believes in Jesus Christ? I want to say to you, upon that platform every man and every woman in this house, yea, more than that, the devils in hell, will stand before God redeemed, with the highest, and all upon equal terms.

We started out to establish something. Having established the following facts: First, That Jesus was the Son of God; second, that all power and authority is now vested in Him; third, that we now inherit eternal life under a different covenant or will than that which was in force during the time of Christ's life on earth; fourth, that the Church of Christ did not exist until after the death of Christ, we now give you the first declaration of the Divine plan for redemption, to-wit: that which was declared on the Day of Pentecost. You remember when Jesus gave the great commission He told the men they were to preach the gospel to every creature. Again, in Matthew's gospel, the 28th chapter, 19th and 20th verses, He told them to "Teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Again, in Luke's gospel: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Again, in the Acts of the Apostles, 1 st chapter, 1st to 8th verses, where he limited the time of the beginning. You remember the story how on the Day of Pentecost they were all together of one accord and in one place; how the disciples were gathered there, waiting

for the power to come down from on **high**. You remember how that Peter declared that with their wicked hands they had crucified Jesus Christ they were pricked in their hearts and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" What did they want to know? We are justified **in** assuming that they wanted to know what they must do to escape the consequences of having crucified the Christ. Then notice the words, "What shall we do?" "Then said Peter unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is not unto you only but unto your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Here are the words of Peter. "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." I suppose my brother will try to prove that they were not to be baptized **in** order to the remission of their sins, because their sins were already forgiven. I do not know whether he will or not, but this scripture I want you to remember. "Repent and be baptized, for the remission of sins." They were told there just what to do. Is this in harmony with the Divine law? If you will please read Isaiah 11: 1-3; Micah iv: 1-3; Psalms cx: 1-2, you will find that it is.

Jesus makes Jerusalem the beginning point. Luke xxiv: 45-4-; Acts 1: 1-8. And here we have the first declaration, men asking after the ascension of Jesus Christ what they must do. I want to say this: as a result of the annunciation of this law of pardon about three thousand souls were saved and added to the church. I want to say to you that these people never quibbled and they were baptized, and there were added unto them about three thousand souls. Read that in Acts 11¹⁴ for yourselves. The people never stood up then and said, Why, we do not want to be baptized; but the people in those days gladly received the Word of God and were baptized. I want my brother to show that this baptism is unscriptural and impractical. Is it so? Three thousand on the Day of Pentecost considered it was by Divine authority. They never questioned Peter's authority, because he clearly set forth by the scripture that Jesus had power to forgive sins.

I want my brother to remember that we are now under the new *will* of Jesus Christ, which has been successfully probated and there is only one way. Jesus says, "I am the way, the truth and the light," etc. By the use of the definite article "the" he makes *one* way by which we may come. The professor would have you believe there were as many ways as there are roads leading into Philadelphia, or spokes in a wagon wheel. Jesus

says, "I am the way." So there is only one way now. Jesus says, he that cometh in any other way the same is a thief and a robber. Do you want to be classed with the thieves and robbers? Jesus said in Mark, xvi 115-16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." What was Jesus' idea? He that believes the preaching of the gospel, then they were to believe on it and be baptized. Oh, but the professor says, you are not showing the people immersion in order to the remission of sins, because you haven't it there. I have it here and will read it later on. He could not find the word "immersion" in the scripture at all, so we assumed it. Last night he made the statement that we did not differ as to what constituted water baptism. I believe he teaches immersion and preaches immersion. We assume it was immersion. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But the professor says it does not say that he that is not baptized shall be damned. I want to say to you that if the professor had a ten year old child that would quibble like that with the plain scripture he would turn him across his knee and spank him, and he ought to do it.

Prof. Whitaker: No. I would not.

Mr. Overman: All right, professor. (Laughter)

All the time you take for cheers is lost time

for me, so don't do it any more. I don't need it. (Applause.) Jesus Christ is very reasonable, and any thinking man comprehends the fact that a man that does not believe will not be baptized. Do you think I would go down to the river where there is ice on the water and be immersed in the water unless I believed? It would be fair to assume, or would be to me, that Jesus Christ was not the Son of God; that he was not Divine; that he did not speak as one having authority, if his commands were thus to be disregarded.

By the way, I want you to get this idea right now in this discussion: that the people with whom, I stand identified do not teach that salvation is by baptism alone. Not for a single moment. I never heard a man stand up and say that he believed baptism alone would save him.

The professor says baptism is our creed: the Lord's Supper is our creed. He names these articles and tells this audience that they are articles of our creed. Do we ask of those coming into the church, "Do you believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost?" Do we ask, "Do you believe in baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, and the Lord's Supper should be observed each Sunday?" Not at all. What, then? "Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God?" I baptize because Jesus Christ commands

me to baptize, and yielded to baptism because I believed it to be right,—not because the church believed it or anything of that kind. When I was baptized it was because the Bible said be baptized.

Now, again, we see that salvation is not under the law. It comes now differently. Why? Because salvation is not under the law, "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Hebrew VII: 19. No law there. Get that down and remember it. Then, again, we read that the law was a schoolmaster, and since Christ has come we have no need of a schoolmaster. Gal. III: 24, 25.

It is a small thing that He asks us that we might be baptized.

Again I want to ask, how did the apostles understand Christ and apply His commission? Every man that attempts to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ must go for his authority to Christ. He must hear the words of Jesus who said, "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." If I went about saying baptism was not neces-

sary in order to the remission of sins how many people would I baptize, I wonder? Not very many people. A man must preach the things he wants the people to understand. We have seen how they understood it in Acts the 2nd chapter and 38th verse; how they gladly received the word and were baptized.

I want to call your attention to the second case of conversation,— that of the Samaritans, in the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. We find it is written that the disciples went abroad preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ and performing miracles, and looking on, the people believed and were baptized. Get that? Faith and baptism in this case. They believed and were baptized, if I am not misquoting the scripture. Now again, Simon, when he saw these things, believed and was baptized. I believe this is one place where the professor may make out a man was baptized that was not a saved man. I think that; I am not certain. I don't care.

And again, I want to call your attention to another case, Acts VIII: 26-38, that of the Phillipian eunuch. The spirit spake unto Philip, saying, "Arise and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, and he arose and went." As he approaches the road he sees coming toward him the Phillipian eunuch. Again the spirit said to Philip, "Go near and

join thyself to the chariot." He hears the man reading the scripture and says, "Understandest thou what thou readeſt?" and after a while we find baptism takes place. "And they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him.

We are not discussing now whether this is immersion, because he has admitted, I think, that immersion constituted the baptism of the scripture.

Again, I call your attention to another case in Acts of the Apostles the 22nd chapter and 1st to 16th verses, the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. I believe he was mentioned during the first evening of our discussion. Ananias was told to go to him for "Behold he prayeth." Saul said, "What shall I do, Lord?" and the Lord said unto him, "Arise and go into Damascus and there it shall be told thee of all things thou must do." Here we find Paul praying and seeking. We have an example of a man that believes, praying and fasting, calling upon the Holy Spirit, and what does Ananias say? Paul, let us have another sign? Isn't there something in your life you ought to give up? No, nothing of that kind. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Will he say that Saul's sins were already forgiven,—that they had been washed away by prayer? Then in this

instance the Holy Ghost was guilty of telling Saul to do something that was entirely unnecessary and uncalled for, and used language that was ambiguous and not to the point. I can't believe it. I want the professor to show that this was not necessary in this case. I want him to cease appealing to Alexander Campbell; cease appealing to the use of the darkey's ass; cease appealing to ridicule and vituperation; and appeal to the Word of God, the final authority that is to settle the points in dispute in this discussion.

Mr. Whitaker: I will call it all back and will not use it any more, if you will discuss the question.

Mr. Overman: All right. That is what I want you to do. (Laughter.) Get it in your mind. He told him to be baptized, washing away his sins. I want the professor to devote as much time as I have to this thing if he can and will, and show that Saul was not to be baptized because his sins were already washed away; that Saul was to be baptized for naught. "Be baptized in order to the remission of sins," was the thing evidently before him.

By the way, there is only one book in the Bible that I know anything about that tells us the way of salvation, and that is the Acts of the Apostles, after Christ's death and resurrection. A man could not preach the Holy Ghost until that time,

because the Holy Spirit had not come until then. Jesus had not ascended on high and been crowned King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

Again, we have the conversion of Cornelius recorded in the Acts of the Apostles 10th chapter. Here we have another man praying and fasting. This is an extraordinary case; the first time that the Gentile world received the gospel of Jesus Christ. Cornelius was sent unto Peter to be told what he must do. While Peter was talking we read that "upon them was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost," and they after all of this Peter says, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" He justifies himself in the 11th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, when he rehearses this matter in Jerusalem. Was Peter commanding them to do something that was unnecessary? He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and was it unnecessary? If so, Peter, sent by God to preach the gospel to these people, practiced something entirely unnecessary. Then why did he do it? Because Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Again, I want to call your attention to another conversion recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, xvi: 25-33, namely, that of the Philippian jailor. In this case a man wants to know what he must do to be saved, and Paul says to him, "Believe on

the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Baptism was so important at that time that the man was baptized straightway "in the same hour of the night." They did not wait six months or a year for baptism. It must have been an important thing. It is strange to me, if baptism is not important, that they should be in such a hurry.

I want my brother to listen again, and I will give him the gospel he wants. John **hi**: 5. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can in no wise enter the Kingdom of God." I want him to show that to be baptized is unscriptural and contrary to the Word of God.

While discussing this question I want to call your attention to another conversion, namely, that of Lydia and her household. On the Sabbath day Paul went out to the river where the women resorted for prayers, and she was baptized. Paul should have said to Lydia, "It does not matter whether you are baptized or not; that is not to be any test of your faith or anything of that kind." But he preached baptism there or she would not have known anything about it.

There can be no question of the right of a man to interpret scripture for another. I gave you one passage showing that a man can interpret scripture for another. Mark **xvi**: 15-16. "Go

ye therefore into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Tell me, if you will, What Jesus says man is to believe. If that was the only passage of scripture a man ever laid hold upon he would not know what he is to believe.

We see from this a man has a right to interpret. Every time the professor makes mention of baptism he interprets the word "Baptism" for you. He interprets it from the Greek into the Latin when he says "Immersion." So we find the professor interpreting; and he has a perfect right to interpret it; a perfect right to say why he believes this and why he believes that, as we shall show you later in the discussion.

I want to call your attention to another case of conversion under the preaching of the apostles,—that of the Ephesian people. Do you remember that? Paul was preaching there and found some of the disciples, and said unto them, "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed?" "Why," they said, "we haven't so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Paul knew where the trouble was and said to them, "Under whose baptism were ye baptized?" and they say, "The baptism of John the Baptist," and then Paul told them a few things and commanded them to be baptized "In the name of the Lord

Jesus" and laid his hand upon them and they received the Holy Ghost. They had been baptized under John's baptism but it was not sufficient. It wasn't the baptism of Christ. John could not say "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." You remember that Jesus spoke of John as the greatest prophet born of woman, nevertheless this baptism was not sufficient and Paul commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

So far as I know, brethren, these are the only cases of conversion in the new testament we have, and in every single one of these we have baptism mentioned. Have we not a right, then, to assume that baptism is of some importance and that it is in order to a definite purpose?

Again we notice the language, "Repent, every one of you, and be baptized for the remission of sins." Acts of the Apostles, 11: 38. For the remission of sins! Ring it into your ears and get it fastened there, and then let the professor with his sophistry and ridicule take it out and change the reading of the Word and show you that it is not there and that people who have been reading the scripture these many years are mistaken in it all.

I want to say another thing. An appeal to your sympathies is not argument, and that if every man and woman and child on earth should perish because they would not complete the plan

of salvation, has nothing to do with this discussion.

I have a friend in this house tonight that is not a believer in Jesus Christ at all, and yet he is a good man; a charitable man; a man I have seen and learned to love since I came to this town, and he tells me that it is impossible for him to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Living God. I should think at least the scripture teaches we must, to be saved, believe on Jesus Christ, and yet shall I plead against faith in Jesus Christ because he cannot believe or says he cannot? Am I responsible for the people's not being baptized? Nor are we going to bring these cases before **you** and then plead to your emotions. We want the Word of God,—a "thus saith the Lord" for **au-**thority in this discussion. I want to ask **you** again, referring to the second proposition-----
(Time called.).

Mr. WHITAKER

*Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

I am glad to see my brother doing what I said he would do—after half of our time is gone—beginning to give us the scripture that I said he would give. I am anxious to get to it.

I want to review, as fast as possible, the points I have not yet reviewed, to reach these passages of scripture; for by these very passages I shall show that the doctrine he holds is not logical but contradictory. There is no man in America that can defend successfully the affirmative of this proposition.

Now, last night my brother found fault with one more of my thirty propositions, which I have now increased to fifty. He decided that one is wrong. I said that his system taught that God would not hear favorably the prayers of sinners. He went back to John ix: 31 and read, "God heareth not sinners," but he read too much. I thought I would not reply to it at all, but lest there be some here that think that it bears the meaning my brother intended, I shall do so. It was a case where Christ had performed a miracle: the blind man had been given his sight. He had been brought before the Jews and questioned, and they wanted to condemn Christ, and said to the

man, How is it that thou hast been given thy sight? and he answered, "I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." Then said the Scribes, "This man is a sinner," and the man answered (now mark you, it was not Christ, it was not an apostle, we have no evidence that he was even a Christian, and if he was there is no evidence that he had been baptized, but this man answered), that "God does not hear sinners." But even had it been spoken by Christ himself, is it to be taken in that full broad sense, that God does not literally hear a sinner? That God does not hear a sinner when he blasphemes against His name? That God does not hear you when you lie and swear? There are some here that wish that were true. (Laughter.) That God does not hear the penitent soul when it cries out to Him? No. What he was proving was that God will not give a sinner the power to work miracles in His name. That was all. No *child* would read it with any other interpretation. Now, let us see if his proposition be true. For the sake of this argument I should be glad to accept his proposition as true. For he has cornered himself where Campbell and all his brotherhood combined could not save him. "God hears not sinners." Yonder is Paul. The Lord says, "Behold he prayeth." Did God hear him? I suppose He did. My brother quoted it. But Paul had not been

immersed. My brother says he was a sinner. What about it? "God doesn't hear sinners." All right, then Paul was a Christian before he was immersed, and that settles the whole question, and my brother cannot quibble on this because it was before the day of Pentecost, for it is in the Acts of the Apostles. He says he rejects all of the Bible so far as salvation is concerned except the Acts of the Apostles. Then he rejects all of the beautiful promises to our children, and all the Parables and miracles of Christ. But why does he reject it? Because it is not consistent with his system. That is all. Were it not for those whose sins Christ forgave without immersion, he would not reject it; it would be all right then. But he has taken a system, and everything *must* conform to that system. Suppose I say that a cow is an animal with two horns and a spot on her back. That isn't a definition for a cow, but I take it for a definition and classify by it. A farmer has an animal with horns and all the characteristics of a cow except a spot on her back. I say she is no cow. What's wrong? The cow is all right, but my definition is wrong. That is the position my brother takes upon this question. A man may have all the signs of a Christian, but my brother says unless he is immersed in order to the remission of sins,—no difference what other signs he may have, or what other qualifica-

tions he may possess, he is not a Christian. Again, I see yonder a man going to the temple to pray. Do you remember it? He smote on his breast and said, "God be merciful to me, a sinner." Jesus Christ said he went down justified. But God didn't hear him? No, sir. This system must stand in spite of the Word of God. "God doesn't hear sinners." Before Cornelius had been baptized, the angel said unto him, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." And yet our brother says God never heard them at all. Do you believe such a system as this? Do you believe that if a man should cry out to God tonight that He would not hear him? Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth, who heard the cry of the blind beggar by the wayside, who heard the leper's prayer and cleansed him, would not hear the sinner that would cry out to Him tonight? Is there a man or woman in this house who believes such a doctrine as that?

Yonder on the distant mountain is a hunter in his cabin. The blizzard is howling outside. He is alone, with no companion save his dog. He begins to meditate. He remembers the prayers of his mother. All at once the awfulness of his condition comes upon him. "What have I?" he says; "I would give all for Heaven." And his soul breaks forth, "My God, hear me." But God turns a deaf ear to him. That man cannot be

saved. God won't hear him. There is no such doctrine in the Word of God. My brother can't find it. Any child knows that the passage he reads here does not mean that God will not hear the prayer of a sinner seeking salvation. It means God will not give power to work miracles to those in rebellion against Him.

Again he takes us back now to James II: 14. "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?" He reads there to show us that faith cannot save a man. There is no place there that James has ever said that. I want my brother to remember that "save" has a double meaning. It means *rescue* or *preserve*. When you catch your child from before an engine you rescue him—you save him. When you build a fence around your yard to keep him in, you preserve him—you save him. So it is in the Bible. Where it is written, "They that endure unto the end shall be saved," it does not mean that they should be rescued; it means that they shall be preserved. When Noah and his family went into the ark they were saved—preserved. So James is teaching here. He says faith without works is dead. But what was my brother trying to prove? He was assuming that Baptism is a work. It is. I want him to remember that, because I won't have to go to the trouble of proving it. James does not here even

mention baptism, **does** he? **James says**, "Faith without works is dead." If a man says he is a Christian, and that he has faith, and he sees a poor widow starving and will not give her aid, he is no Christian, he has no faith, because his faith is not manifested in works. If he says, "I am a Christian," and will not obey God's word, that is faith without works, which is dead faith. So James says, "Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works."

My brother refers to the three witnesses, but he did not define them. It is not my duty to define these passages of scripture. He says there are three witnesses, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and then adds, "Are you going to leave out the water?" No; but I want him to show that this means baptism by immersion in water in order to the remission of sins. When he will make this application, I will take up the passage.

Now in reference to this name I have been calling him. It seems distasteful to him. I will drop that and take back anything I have said about it, —I will call him anything he wants me to, "Sugar," or anything sweet, if he will come up to the question. (Laughter.) But before I pass it, let me show you the reasonableness for it. I have not called him this continually. I have used the name "Church of Christ" more than any other. I have referred to every encyclopedia and die-

tionary I could gain access to, and have not found a single one so far that has not given this name. Now here is what the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says, and I will give you every reference in that great work to this church: "Disciples of Christ or Campbellites." "Campbellites, the popular name for a religious order founded by Alexander Campbell in 1811." Now I turn to the *Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, than which there is no higher authority: " 'Disciples of Christ' or 'Christians.' Sometimes called 'Campbellites' or 'Campbellite Baptists.' " Let me tell you now that this is written by Dr. Frederick D. Power, pastor of their church at Washington, D. C. I read again, " 'Disciples of Christ' or 'Campbellites,' as they are popularly called." I am not repeating, I am reading where it occurs twice in this work. Again I turn to the *Standard Dictionary*—"Campbellite, a member of the Christian denomination calling themselves Disciples of Christ, or Christians, founded by Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Baptist ministers of Kentucky." Again in the *Standard Dictionary*, under the word *Disciple*, I find "*Disciples of Christ*, a religious body that originated in connection with the labors of Thomas and Alexander Campbell. Called also Campbellites and Christians." Surely I do not have to change my language to please every one I meet. I do not deny that my brother

does not like the word, but it is his deception that prevents him liking it. He does not want the people to know that he got his doctrine from Alexander Campbell, and yet the Methodists do not follow Wesley, and the Lutherans do not follow Luther with half the exactness that this people follow Campbell. It is the only name that will distinguish them. They will admit that. Again, let me read from their own language, as used by Dr. Power: "From that hour Thomas Campbell gave place to his son, Alexander Campbell, who afterwards was the *soul of the movement.*" Here is Gates, in his *Disciples of Christ*: "Alexander Campbell recognized that his teaching had created a party, which had begun to be designated by various distinguishing names, as "Reformers," "Restorationists," "Campbellites," and "Christian Baptists."

Now I take up my brother's argument for the evening. I want you to refer first to Acts 11: 38. I knew he would use this, but he was a long time coming to it. Acts 11: 38. I will find it after awhile. It reads, "And Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The revised version says, "*unto* the remission of sins." My brother says he wants me to prove that *for* does not mean *in order to*. It is his duty

to prove that it *docs*. He is not to prove that immersion is FOR or UNTO the remission of sins; he is to prove that immersion is IN ORDER TO the remission of sins. However, I will discuss the passage now, so that he may be satisfied that I am not trying to dodge the issue. We will turn back a few verses and read from the same sermon; "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Was that true, or did Peter tell them a story? "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." My brother first quoted "Men and brethren, what shall we do *to be saved?*" but he corrected that afterwards. They did not ask that. That question is asked only once in the Bible. My brother read it and said Paul made a mistake there and left out something. These ask, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter says, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for (unto) the remission of sins." My brother said I would try to prove *for* means *because of*. I shall at present do nothing of the kind. I shall let him prove that it means "*in order to*." If I say to you, "If you will come to my house tomorrow I will pay you for your work yesterday," does *for* here mean *in order to*?

If you will turn to the *Standard Dictionary* you will find that this preposition is defined by ten separate definitions, and those are subdivided,

and only a part of one subdivision will give him the definition he wants here. But, my friends, I will show you that it does not mean in this passage *in order to*. Peter says here, "Be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." But it is "*In the name of Jesus Christ.*" I want you to know that the Greek preposition here translated *in* is not *eis*. That is my brother's preposition. He has to prove that "*eis*" means *in order to*, or his system falls. This preposition is the Greek and means the same as our preposition *in*. *Eis* is translated in the Bible by forty-eight different words. It occurs in the Bible sixteen hundred times. If *eis* means *in order to* then we blaspheme *in order to* the Holy Ghost, for it is *eis* there just the same. The prodigal sinned *in order to* Heaven, and we sin *in order to* Christ, for it is *eis* in all these cases. If *eis* means *in order to*, is it not strange that of the forty-eight translations in the Bible not once is it ever so translated? But my brother says it means it here. Now let us again notice the passage; "Be baptized *in* the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." "Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." You can't do a thing *in* anything until you get *into* it. We could not speak *in* this hall tonight until we came *into it*. *En* can't be made to mean anything but *in*. They were baptized *in* the name of the Lord, therefore, they

were *in* the name of the Lord before they were baptized. I challenge my brother to show any authority by which he can prove anything different. I want him to bring his Greek lexicon. I want him to bring in all his Greek grammars. I want my brother to tell this people that where he reads *in order to* it is *eis*. When we get all these *eises* together then he and I will discuss them between us. It is not *ice* he wants, it is *water*. (Laughter.) This ice is thin—very thin. He is trying to get you Methodists and Presbyterians out on the ice with him. He knows it will break. He knows it will go down. He wants to give you a ducking, and I don't know but it *will* do you good. (Laughter.) But as soon as my brother steps squarely on this platform I propose to let him down hard enough that he will go through. Not because I am angry at him, but because I love him. He loves water. He was born of water. He believes that it is the mother, God is the Father, and they are the children. I hope he will ask me for my authority for that statement, for I want to give it.

He gives Matthew xxviii:19, but misquotes it. There is nothing Here to show that baptism is in order to the remission of sins.. "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is all there is there.

Then he goes to the 16th chapter of Mark,

the 16th verse. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," and he said I ought to spank my little boy if he did not say that it meant "He that is not baptized shall be damned." I should feel more like spanking him if he *did* say it—if he would add to the Word of God. (Laughter.)

My brother wanted me to show where belief is more important than baptism. Here it is. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that *believeth not* shall be damned." There is no immersion in order to the remission of sins here.

Again, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Now I want my brother to tell this people what he understands by "*wash away thy sins*" I want him to tell us whether this is baptism, as he has intimated. I want him to tell this people that Paul washed away his own sins. That is what he is intimating. If this expression means baptism it means that Paul washed away his own sins. But Paul was a Christian before he was baptized, because my brother says God will not hear the prayer of a sinner, and Paul prayed before he was baptized, and God said, "Behold, he prayeth."

I would advise him to let his whole system go, and come out on the broad Gospel of Christ.

He reminds me of a Baptist preacher I once saw immerse a big, fat, overgrown boy. Of course no one ought ever to smile on such an occasion, but I was a boy then. The boy had been converted and wanted to be baptized. He was not a very bright young man and some of the bad boys went to him and told him that the Baptist preacher, who was a very frail man, would drown him when he went to baptize him, and had him thoroughly frightened; and when the minister went to baptize him he remembered what the bad boys had told him (I didn't tell him), (Laughter.) and he began to struggle. The Baptist minister was determined to baptize him, but when he got his head under his feet would be out, and when he got his feet under his head would be out (Laughter), and to this day the people of that neighborhood don't know whether that boy was all baptized or not. (Laughter.) He was all under water, but different portions at different times. My brother reminds me of this. He goes to prove one part of his creed and condemns another. I want him to tell us whether Paul was saved before immersion. If he was *not*, then God heard the prayer of a sinner, but this condemns one article of my brother's creed; if he *was*, then immersion is *not*

in order to the remission of sins, but this condemns another article of his creed.

Jesus said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." He wants me to tell him what that means. Let him tell us whether it means baptism in order to the remission of sins, then we will take up the passage of Scripture. I want him to say that it does,— if he believes it.

He says he wants me to prove that baptism isn't essential. In all this argument he has been harping upon that. He says, If baptism is not in order to the remission of sins why is it practiced? I answer, Because Jesus commanded it. But He never commanded it in order to the remission of sins. God commands us to give alms, but it is not in order to the remission of sins. He commands us to be kind one toward another, but not in order to the remission of sins. God commands baptism as a *Christian* duty, and not as a *sinner's* duty. We become Christians by faith; we remain Christians by obedience. That is exactly the teaching of the Word of God, and my brother has never found one passage of Scripture to the contrary.

He says he is going to read a leaflet here to show that I believe in baptism by immersion. He does not need to do that. I have told him that two or three times.

He says whenever I write a leaflet and express my opinion I am interpreting the Word of God for others. He has made a nice concession here. He has been saying that he did not do that. He admits now that he does, and insists that he has a right to interpret the Word of God for others. But he is trying to get me into the same class with himself—he wants to be in good company, and I don't blame him for that. (Laughter.) When I interpret the Word of God it is as *my* opinion, and I do not make it a test of fellowship. There is not a Christian in this house tonight to whom I would not give the hand of fellowship, but there are probably three or four hundred here to whom my brother would refuse admission into his church. There is the difference between us.

Now, my friends, I was called upon last night to make a statement which it seems my brother did not take very well—regarding the deception practiced by this sect. Now when I said that, I meant exactly what I said. I meant that the writers, the ministers and the authorities in this church, in my judgment, deceive more than do those of any other sect, because they contend that they have no creed, and yet they do have a creed, and my brother has signed his name to it. Isn't it a creed when the church requires baptism in order to the remission of sins, when

thirty millions of Christians in America do not believe it and only less than one and one-half millions do? Isn't that an opinion? And yet he says that he will not judge men by an opinion!

What did he say about the battle field? He said, Don't make people cry; don't say anything that would make them laugh—that is not argument. He said that he did not know what a Campbellite preacher would do in such a case, as he had never seen one, but finished by admitting that he would do just like him. Of course he would, because he is one. (Laughter and applause.) I know he doesn't like the name. I wouldn't either. A man came to this town some time ago and called me a fool before an audience as large as this, and then wasn't manly enough to remain and defend his position. But did I reply by denying the charge? No. Like my brother, I did not like the title, but in honesty, I was compelled to say, "I have had suspicions of that kind myself." I did not like it. But there was too much evidence to deny it. (Laughter.) But it was not in the encyclopedia. There is much higher evidence that my brother is a Campbellite. The *Standard Dictionary* says he is; the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says he is; the *Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia* says he is; and *Reason* says he is. He teaches the Word of God as it is interpreted by this system. He

will not admit one to his church who will dare to interpret the Word of God other than it is interpreted by this system. (Time called.)

Mr. OVERMAN.

*Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

I want to give the doctor a little of his own medicine and let him take it. I want you to see the difference between Simon drunk and Simon sober. He says, "Church of Christ," or Disciples of Christ vs. the Bible." This is his tract he sends out to that people. He says, "Sometimes *erroneously* called Campbellites." Get the idea? I want you to understand that the professor, all the time he has been calling me a Campbellite, has been committing an error. Do you get it, and is not that sufficient? I am perfectly willing, as I said a while ago, that Professor Whitaker should talk all he pleases about the Campbellite church, and Campbellite preachers and I will take it sweetly. I will be like the little boy boot-black in the city who had a competitor in business, and he came to him and called him a lot of vile, vulgar and bad names, which he did not like. Now that boy was my kind of a boy. He looked him in the eyes and smiled and said, "Al dem t'ings w'at you called me you is dem." (Laughter and applause.) Now all the time you take to cheer is lost time *to* me. *Remember, you are taking my time when you cheer, brethren. I want all of the time I have and want to use it.*

I want you to notice another thing. I want to read some Scripture for you. I read from Acts of the Apostles 11:38, and want to hunt it up, because my learned brother has undertaken to destroy the meaning of it. I want to see if he did it. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." It is there just like it was before. The professor gave us a nice little illustration. I don't know who the fellow was who was to go to his house, but if you should work for him today and he would tell you to come to his house for your pay it wouldn't mean to come for your work—it is to come for your PAY, and the pay here is remission of sins we are to receive at the hands of God, and that is why we are baptized—*for—looking to*—the remission of sins.

He says the Greek *en* means *in* the name of Jesus. It is "*epi*," not "*en*" the name of "*Jesu Christou eis aphasis hamartion*"—for the remission of sins. We have a parallel passage with this in something else, but I want to read from Acts of the Apostles in another Bible and see if it is alike. I do not claim to be a Greek scholar. I do not claim to translate. I am not going to do that, but I am going to give you the authority of men who have written Bibles. I wish to read from Martin Luther's transla-

tion from the original Greek, in Acts, the 2nd chapter and 38th verse. *"Petrus sprach zu ihnen: Thut busse und lasse sich ein jeglicher taufen auf den namen Jesu Christi zur vergebung der zunden so werdet ihr empfahen die gabe des Heiligen Gistes."* Is that right? I see a German lady down here knows that it is right. Now we will see if I can give a reasonable translation of that. If I can not I will let any German come and translate the passage of Scripture. My brother charges me with presenting Scripture that thirty millions of Christians deny. I want to say to you that outside of the church with which my brother stands identified I think I would be able to say that all of the religions teach baptism. The Roman Catholics teach baptism for the remission of sins. Luther taught baptism for the remission of sins. Here is the translation: "Then Peter spake unto them, Do penance and let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ to (or for) the forgiveness of sins, and ye shall receive (or you may receive) the gift of the Holy Ghost." Is that any where near right, sister ?

Lady in Audience: Yes.

Mr. Overman: Do you understand it?

Lady in Audience: Yes.

Mr. Overman: All right, then I have not done violence to Luther's text. I want to read

from the Holy Bible—a new version of the passage in Acts of the Apostles, the 2nd chapter. Remember, this is the book of the Roman Catholic people, and the book they use. “Peter, to them, do penance, said he, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” I want to read another parallel passage of Scripture found in Matthew’s Gospel, the 26th chapter, and I think it is the 28th verse. We will hunt it up and see. Jesus, you remember, at the Last Supper, said, “This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” Now here we have *in order to* the remission of sins—that we may avail ourselves of His blood. You remember that Jesus, on one occasion said, “Except ye drink my blood and eat my flesh ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of Heaven,” and many people left off following them because they said, How can we eat His flesh? and Jesus said, “This is my blood,” and “This is my flesh,” and explained the matter to them. My brother says I got my doctrine from Alexander Campbell in regard to baptism for the remission of sins. I will quote for the first time from something other than the Word of God. Last night he said, “The brother quoted correctly from Campbell.” I will defy him to show one single cita-

tion from Alexander Campbell in this discussion. For the first time I am going to read from other than the Bible. I have here the works of Barton W. Stone, on baptism. I will read from page 28. "The subject of baptism now engaged the attention of the people very generally, and some, with myself, began to conclude that it was ordained for the remission of sins, and ought to be administered in the name of Jesus to all believing penitents. I remember once about this time we had a great meeting at Concord. Mourners were invited every day to collect before the stand, in order for prayers (this being the custom of the times). The brethren were praying daily for the same people, and none seemed to be comforted. I was considering in my mind what could be the cause. The words of Peter, at Pentecost, rolled through my mind, 'repent and be baptized, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' I thought, were Peter here, he would thus address these mourners. I quickly arose and addressed them in the same language, and urged them to comply. Into the spirit of the doctrine I was never fully lead," he says, "until it was revived by Brother Alexander Campbell, some years after." Alexander preached baptism in the presence of Stone in 1823, whereas Stone declared baptism for the remission of sins previous to 1809. Could not

my brother say I received my doctrine from Barton W. Stone?

I am not going to cite from Campbell. I want to read again from the Word of God and see whether this Scripture is in harmony with that which we have read before in King James version. Turn with me, if you please, to Matthew's Gospel, the 26th chapter and 28 verse, and see whether Jesus shed His blood because our sins were already remitted. "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." For remission of sins of the people. Did Jesus shed His blood because their sins were already remitted? I think not. "For without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins." Then in this language here *in order to* means that we might have the plan of the remission of sins. Peter says, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins." According to my brother's illustration he meant when he said that, that we might receive something—that we might receive the remission of sins—receive our pay—have our sins pardoned.

Again referring to the question. "Holding, as it does, that Christians are immersed believers." Is my brother ready to say that they are Christians before they are in Christ? Hear the

Word. Galatians 11:27. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." We must put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and it does not tell us here we are to put on Christ by feeding the widow; it does not tell us to put on Christ by faith. It is just what my brother said—it is obedience to commandment. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." I want to ask tonight, Is baptism in water the will of God, or is it the will of men? I am reminded of the Pharisees who came to Jesus Christ and asked for his authority for doing miracles. He says, "I will tell you upon one condition. Tell me whence came the baptism of John, from Heaven or of men." They were afraid to say it came of men because they feared the people for the people held John as a prophet. They were afraid to say from Heaven because he would say, Why don't you believe it? If it is from Heaven it must be done. Again, he says we are to obey, so we must obey these commandments. A Christian is one who obeys, one who does that which Christ commands. Would a man be a Christian, then, that refused to be baptized? Would a man be a Christian that refused to give aid to the needy? Certainly not, and I will agree with my brother. Would

he be a Christian if he refused to be baptized? I think not. I am almost certain.

I do not care for the hunter on the mountain side. Here comes some more of the touching stories to wring tears out of your eyes. Was the professor acquainted with that man? I don't know.

I want you to know that the professor has not shown that baptism is not scriptural or that baptism in order to the remission of sins is not practical—that the people could not do it. Is there anything to prevent them from doing these things? He finds fault with me because I said people are saved by baptism. I haven't said it yet. I am going to read it to him. Peter says, speaking of the ark and the few souls saved by water, "It is a like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." When a man's conscience is good toward God he feels happy—when his sins are pardoned and he is seeking for that thing. Peter says we are saved by baptism. I want him to hear it from Paul. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here is the washing. Is it the washing and renewing of the Holy Ghost?

By the renewing of the Holy Ghost He saves us. Here we have Paul speaking about about baptism for there is no doubt in my mind, for here it is the new birth. "Jesus saith unto Nicodemus, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven." Nicodemus could not understand this. He says, "How can a man be born again when he is old?" But Jesus does not explain. He says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" Now we have him explaining the birth, making it easy—something we can do.

Paul says, "I thank God that ye have obeyed that form of doctrine once delivered you." In Romans, I think it is, we find that baptism has its place, therefore we are to be buried with Christ by baptism into His death. Can we be cleansed by the blood of Jesus Christ except we come in contact with His death?

Again I want to call your attention to the picture shown Moses on the Mount regarding the tabernacle. It had its holy place and its holy of holies and no man could pass beyond the outer court or a priest into the holy place without first using the water of the Laver. No man could get into the holy of holies without passing through the holy place. Just as men then had to be washed so men must be washed now.

He makes quite a play on the washing away of the sins of Paul. I give you the Bible. I have quoted it as it is there. "Be baptized and wash away thy sins." I want to say if he was to go down to the river covered with the grime and dirt of the harvest field and a man should say "Jump in there and wash away the dirt" it would be for that purpose,—to wash away the filth of the body,—that is why he would go into the water. Now Annanias says, "Be baptized and wash away thy sins." That is what it is for—to wash away the sins of Paul. This is an extraordinary case. And the case of Cornelius—are we all saved like Cornelius? He happened to be the first of the Gentiles who received the Gospel.

But I want you to get the idea that baptism was performed in every single case of conversion mentioned in the Bible.

My brother brings before you a false statement when he says that I would reject all of the Gospel but the Acts of the Apostles. I said it was the only book in the Bible that gave us the plan of salvation. Every work of God is received, for a Christian can gain much inspiration from the entire Word of God. I am not here to claim that men are saved until they are saved. Neither am I here to send people to hell. He portrayed a great picture last night how I stand before the people and send them to hell. I never

did anything of the kind in my life, but only contend that we have—every man has the Word of God to tell him the promises and the conditions of salvation as laid down there. If men do not want to do it is it error to say that, they will go to hell?

I want to say to you, friends, that I agree with the professor and would not object to ducking my Methodist and Presbyterian friends if I could get them down to the river. I would be willing to get one along with the rest of them, but that would not do. It is only his play on the Greek preposition *eis*, like his telling of a story that was not to the point.

I want to say honestly and candidly that it is up to the professor that he shall show us that *for* does not mean *for* the reception of something. I want to say that if baptism is not *for* the remission of sins neither is repentance. It does not require the last clause to make repentance *for* the remission of sins. We have it, "Repent and be baptized." Why were they to be baptized? In order to the remission of sins. Did it behoove Christ to suffer and die that repentance and remission of sins might be preached unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem? Jesus said, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish," and *unless* a man *repents can he be accepted of God?* We *find the same language there and I*

want him to leave off the word *for*. We don't need it at all. These men came and said, "What must we do?" From the question, we have a right to assume that they were pricked to their hearts and they cried, "What must we do?" Was the pricking of the heart repentance? Was it? Then Peter told them to do a thing they had already done. Was the repentance in order to the remission of sins? Then they were baptized in order to remission of sins. Remember that, please, if you will.

Let us go back and see how the professor misquotes me. He says I would spank his little boy if he did not put it in. I said he would spank him if he didn't put it in. Let it stand as it is. Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And I want to ask you, friends, if my brother is ready to stop just short of baptism and leave baptism off entirely. Let him take this away. It is written, "He that taketh from the prophecies written in this book, it shall be taken from his part in the tree of life." We have to bring all these passages of Scripture together and let the people hear them, showing the plan of salvation, making it so simple that the wayfaring man even shall not err therein. We are all saved alike here. There is no difference in the plan of salvation as I present it,—but every man and woman is saved

just exactly alike. I want to say this: that if you will take up the discipline of the Methodist church, or take up the catechism of the Roman Catholic church, or if you will take up any of these and read you will find that the minister before he puts water upon the head of the child says, "Inasmuch as Jesus has said, Verily, verily I say unto thee except a man be born of water and of the spirit he can in no wise enter the kingdom of God," and they state this as authority for baptizing. My Baptist brethren will not receive a single individual into the church unless they are baptized. Does my brother mean to insinuate that the Baptist people will do something entirely unnecessary, and make it harder for the members to get into the Baptist church than it is to get into Heaven? I want to say that the Methodist people will not receive them into the church unless they are baptized, into full membership. Does my brother mean to say that the Methodist people make it harder to get into the church than it is to get into Heaven? Do they not stand on the identical platform with me on the subject of baptism—that baptism is for the remission of sins? I want my brother to go out south of town and ask the Lutheran minister, "Do you let people into the church without baptism?" He will say, "No sir, they cannot be saved without it." Does he mean to

insinuate that the Lutheran people make it harder to get into their church than it is to get into Heaven? I want him to go over and ask Father McNamara if a man can get into the Catholic church without being baptized. Will he say that the Catholic people make it harder to get into the Catholic church than to get to Heaven? Then I want my brother to go up and ask Brother Jackman, of the Presbyterian church, if he receives them without baptism into church fellowship. And will he insinuate that the Presbyterian people make it harder to get into the Presbyterian church than it is to get into Heaven? I don't know whether Brother Jackman would answer him or not. (Laughter.) I am not sure about that. I don't think I will send him up there. (Laughter.)

I want to go to the Word of God. We have Christ sending the disciples forth, commanding that the Gospel shall be preached. I wonder, friends, if God was ever guilty of giving us something that was unnecessary. I wonder if He was ever guilty of giving us a commandment that I should say might be obeyed and might not. I wonder if God, looking down upon men, would give us something impossible to do. Why, certainly not. God, in his loving kindness, aimed to give us a plan of salvation that is simple.

My brother invites me out on a broad plat-

form. I am reminded of molasses in summer that is put out on a board and it spreads and spreads until it is so thin that the flies would not roost upon it. (Laughter.) My brother would get so thin that you could see clear through him—he would get so thin he would not even make a shadow. (Laughter.) I do not care that he should accuse me of being narrow, for here is the Word of Jesus Christ. "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Now for broad and liberal platforms of religion he says, "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth into death; and many there be which go in thereat." I want to be narrow and stand upon a narrow platform. I do not want it to be so thin that the people can see clear through me without having to put on their specs. (Laughter.) I'll tell you, friends, it is the Word of God we want. That is what we are after. The "Thus saith the Lord." Why does he not come up to the issue? He has been wrangling around here because I would not talk about baptism when I offered to debate on baptism and nothing but baptism. But no sir, he would not do that. It would not make his book large enough. He would not have had a chance to talk about Campbell—it would not have given him a chance to talk about all these things. Laughter and ap-

plause.) Brethren you may cheer tomorrow. I don't want you to do it tonight. I need all the time I have.

I want to read you from my correspondence with Brother Whitaker. There was something else I wanted to bring before you tonight, but I will drop it, and want to put Whitaker against Whitaker again. "I sincerely trust that many souls may be saved during your meeting here, and that your efforts in that line may be successful." I say, "Can a man gather figs of thistles?" Can we draw pure water out of a filthy cistern or spring? Ah, verily----- (Time called;) (Applause.)

MR. WHITAKER.

*Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

I trust that the audience will remember what the Chairman has said and refrain from loud applause or cheering this evening. You will remember that those in the extreme rear of the building—most of them, at least—want to hear what is said. Some last night could not. Please remember that. I hope this will not be counted on my time. It is the moderators' time.

My brother's style of argument and plan for the last evening were somewhat unique. His assertions that he was going to prove that baptism was *in order to* the remission of sins led many in the audience to expect that he would; and when he concluded by turning to me and saying that now he wanted me to prove that *for* does *not* mean *in order to*, they were somewhat disappointed. Suppose I should go into the class-room and tell my students that I am now going to demonstrate some theorem,—probably that the sum of the interior angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles; then I turn to them and say, "Let any one of the class prove that it is *not*." Would that be demonstration? My brother has the affirmative of this question, and this audience want to hear him prove, if it can be done, that baptism is *in order to* the remission

of sins, not *for* the remission of sins, or *unto* the remission. He said he would read it from Isaiah, and from Christ, and from Luke, and so on. We want to hear him read it.

His replies to my argument are not replies at all. I appreciate and admire wit, but he must remember that that must not constitute his reply. That is the spice of the speech. When I laid down one of my propositions showing the inconsistency of his creed with the Word of God, wording all of my proposition in God's own words, he should have replied in God's own words. I said, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." "What God hath cleansed call not that common." "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." "Receive ye one another even as Christ also received us." That was a logical chain. And what was his reply to it? I invited my brother to come out from his narrow creed cell and stand upon the broad platform of the Word of God, and I asked permission to stand upon that platform with the liberty to extend the hand of fellowship to John Wesley on the one hand, and Moody on the other; to fellowship a Spurgeon on the one hand and a Whitefield on the other; to fellowship a William Penn on the one hand and an Alexander Campbell on the other; and every American heart responds with

a patriotic *Amen* to such a sentiment, for that is an American principle and in harmony with the principles upon which this government was framed,—that all men are born equal and have the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. What is wrong with the platform? Would he reject any of these men? Yes, he would reject *all* but *one* of them. Only one of these great men could stand upon the platform with him. Does the Word of God authorize such a platform? What was his answer to my proposition? He said he had some molasses once, and it got thin—very thin. That was his answer. He says, “That is like my brother's platform.” Very well, let him show that that platform is wrong. Let him show his authority for rejecting such men as I have cited. Let him prove that we should not judge men by their fruits,—instead of saying, “I had some molasses, and it got thin, and thinner and thinner and thinner.” If it was as thin as his argument he had a right to kick. (Laughter.) I like anecdotes. There are two kinds of anecdotes I like. I like an anecdote that is to the point, and I like one that is not too stale. And his other anecdote last night that they laughed at.—That was all right; they had to cheer, because it was the understanding. “Anything funny. We must have the audience with us. Some one must

lead the cheering. We must have the audience whether we prove anything or not. We must make an impression tonight." So he told about that "little darkey." That darkey is the oldest negro in America. That darkey was born before my great-grand father, I think. (Laughter.) He has been all over the United States. I have heard of him in Georgia, in Louisiana, in Texas and in Mississippi. We laughed at that in the Gospel Tent two years ago, when the evangelist told it. I used to tell that story myself. It is a nice thing to take along with you. You can use it anywhere, at any time, on any occasion and in any connection. I have quit telling it because every time I tell it now I have to tell it to some one that knows it. So I have quit telling the story. But the old darkey, probably over two hundred years old, said that "Dem t'ings w'at you says about me, dem is you." And that applied to me. That is his answer to my reading of the highest authorities in America on the subject of the names of my brother's church. But I was reading those words from the mouths of *his own brethren*. And so the anecdote applies after all. (Laughter.) He has admitted just what he has been denying.

We have the issue now before us. I had hoped to have four nights to discuss it. My brother has done what I said he would do,

—he has forced it all upon me at once. I have to answer it in two speeches. I do not know that I shall be able to get through with my argument, but I am going to do the best I can. He has cited all his favorite passages but one, and that I may complete my reply, I will quote that for him. Now I ask for your ears. Do not listen for anything funny. Let us see whether our brother has proven what he has undertaken to prove.

Matthew xxviii:19. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." He will not contend that there is anything here to show that baptism is in order to the remission of sins. Next, Mark 16:13. I will leave that to the last, when I come to discuss the Greek preposition *eis*. Next, Mark xvi: 15, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned." The first objection to this is that it is not *for remission* of sins. My brother must show that. The second objection to this is that it is not said that "He that is not baptized shall be damned." My brother wanted me to spank my boy because he did not say that it said that. I should feel more like

spanking him if he did. (Laughter.)

I pass now to Acts 11:37-38. "Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then said Peter unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The first objection I make to this is that they use the word "*brethren*" I do not hang a strong argument on that, but Alexander Campbell says that the word *brethren* or *brother*, used among the disciples of Christ or one toward another, is indicative of their having been brought into the family or kingdom. So my brother has Alexander Campbell for it. At least it shows affiliation or a kindly feeling. The second objection is, the question is, "What shall we do?" They do not ask, "What shall we do *to be saved?*" because Peter had told them that not more than ten minutes before, in this same discourse. Peter had said, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." My brother's creed makes Peter tell a falsehood. No, they do not ask that question. The question, "What must I do to be saved?" I said last night, and will repeat tonight, is asked but once in the Word of God, and the answer there does not include baptism. Peter was here talking to a great multitude—three thousand people converted that day. There were probably ten thou-

sand people there to hear him. He was not talking alone to those who had made a profession. He was talking also to the wicked Jews, who wanted to put him to death. It would not be proper to think that he was talking to the one who had just now made the profession any more than to the one back there who was still in his wicked condition. He says, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." I leave *for* for the present, for it is the Greek preposition *eis*, upon which I shall speak later. I said the Greek word *en* means *in*. My brother said it is not so in his book. He says it is *epi* there. I do not know how it is in his book. There are some Greek testaments that give it *epi* in this place. A friend of mine handed me an old Greek testament today, published probably fifty or sixty years ago, given to him by his grandfather, and in that it is *epi*, but it seems that later, scholars have inclined toward the manuscripts that have *en* instead of *epi*. If they are right the burden of evidence is on my side. Suppose *epi* is in his Greek testament where *en* is given in mine. Would that mean *I am a dishonest man and ought to be damned because I have a Greek testament that has en? for this whole doctrine hangs upon it.*

If it is en then they were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and could not have been baptized

in order to the remission of sins, neither *into* Christ, as my brother's creed teaches. The Greek preposition *en* means just what our preposition *in* means. So you see, at the best he has but an *opinion*, and he ought to allow others a right to their opinions, and he has no right to reject others from fellowship unless he will admit that he holds *opinions* of Scripture for tests of fellowship. But what about *epi*? He did not tell us what it means. It is almost as strong a preposition as *en*, and for our purpose quite as strong. *Epi* means *upon* or *on*, sometimes *in* and sometimes *to*. It always carries with it the idea of attachment to or contact with. And so my brother has to meet the same difficulty by his own Greek testament. They were already *in* the name, or *on* the name of Christ, standing upon that as a foundation, and were therefore Christians before they were baptized. But let us turn over to Acts x 148, "And he commanded them to be baptized *in* the name of the Lord." Here is the very same expression. In every Greek testament I have had access to it is *en*. So, if my brother's Greek testament has *en* here that settles the question for good. Then, if that be true, his creed cannot be true.

He takes us next to Acts xxiii:i6. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." He says "wash away thy sins" means "be baptized." If that be true then Paul was baptized twice, or else

he will translate the Greek conjunction *kai, even*. He can do it if he wants to. It is allowable. "Be baptized, even wash away thy sins." But one of the verbs is active, and the other passive. They could not have been performed by the same person in the same act. Paul was then baptized twice.

I should like to know whether he wants this audience to understand him as teaching that *wash* in the Bible means *baptise*. This is not *baptizo*. It is *louo*, a different word entirely. I want to know whether he would like to have us understand that *louo*, in any of its forms, means Christian baptism. If so, then Paul and Silas were baptized before the jailer was, for the jailer washed their stripes before he was baptized; and Peter tells us about a sow that was baptized. The word *louo* does not mean baptize. It might refer to baptism in a figurative way, but it could not here mean the same thing. Now the conversion of Paul is recorded three times in the Gospel. Here is the only place this expression is used. To whom was he speaking? To the angry Jews. He was then speaking in their own language, for Paul was a Jew. Now, my brother agrees with me that there is no such thing as baptism *in order to the remission of sins* in the Old Testament. Let us therefore turn and see whether such forms of expression were used there. David says, "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse

me from my sins" (Psalms LI:2). Again, "Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow" (Psalms LI:7). Does that mean baptism? No. And yet the language is stronger than this in Acts. Isaiah says, "Wash you; make you clean; put away the evil of your doings before mine eyes" (1:16). Jeremiah says, "O, Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved" (iv:i4). And Pilate says, in this same great city, when they were about to crucify the Master, as he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person." Did he mean by that, I am washing away my sins? No, it was symbolic. He meant by that, I thus show to the world that I have freed my skirts of this charge,—that I have washed my soul of this guilt. And so Ananias here says, "Paul, arise, be baptized and wash away thy sins;" that is, Stand forth before the world, showing by this act that your soul has been cleansed by the blood of Jesus Christ. All authorities, I think, agree that this is a figurative expression.

President W. K. Pendleton, the successor of Alexander Campbell, as president of Bethany College, and one of the highest authorities in my brother's church, says, "This expression is not to be literally interpreted." Let us see. "Arise." Is that literal? Certainly. "Be baptized." Is that

literal? Most assuredly. What is figurative, then? There is nothing left except, "Wash away thy sins." Pendleton then says that portion **of** it is figurative. Another objection is, if my brother's position be true then Paul forgave his own sins. The next objection is, Paul showed every evidence of conversion before baptism. My brother admits that he has found here a miracle in the Word **of** God. Now a miracle is something that cannot be explained in the light of an accepted law or hypothesis. But this is not the only *miracle* my brother will find in the Bible if he reads it in the light of his creed. I have already shown him fifty others, and if my brother had begun this discussion at the proper time I would have shown him ere this fifty more miracles in the Word **of** God. If *wash* means *baptize* then wherever that is found in the Word of God it must be so translated. But my brother will not stand by this position. Alexander Campbell says, in his debate with W. L. MacCalla (he was forced to say it), "Paul was really pardoned when he believed." Paul was then converted on the road leading to Damascus, when he was stricken down by an unseen power, and said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" This, of course, was before Paul's baptism. This surrenders the whole position. Campbell himself surrendered it. But my brother says God will not hear the prayer **of** the

sinner. But God heard Paul's prayer before he was baptized (Acts IX:11). Therefore Paul was a Christian before he was baptized. So my brother also surrenders the position.

He takes us next to Romans *vi.3-4*. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." I have but to say, the word *into* in each of its three occurrences in this passage, is translated from the Greek preposition *eis*. I shall therefore leave that for the present.

1 Corinthians VI:11. "But ye are washed," (*apelousasthe*, the same Greek word we had before. My brother thinks that is baptism again), "but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified *in* (Greek *en*) the name of the Lord Jesus and by (*en*) the spirit of our God." "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified *in* the name of the Lord Jesus." I think my brother will find *en* here in his Greek testament.

I find it in every one of mine, without any marginal reading at all. If that be true then the passage destroys the very position he is trying to establish; for they were already *in* this name when they were washed. However, this washing was not with water, but "by the Spirit of our God."

He takes us to Titus hi:5. "Not by works,"—you will remember that my brother recently took us back to James, and read there to prove that we were not saved by faith but by works, thus assuming that baptism is a work. If he admits that baptism is a work, it is, of course, a *work of righteousness*. But if he had not admitted it, Christ did it for him when he stood on the banks of Jordan and said, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us (or behooveth us) to fulfil all righteousness." Now let us read it; "Not by works of righteousness which we have done" (not by baptism, by my brother's own admission, though I think he will turn around and say it does not mean that now.—That is the way he has to prove his creed), "but according to his mercy he saved us."

He takes us next to i Peter 111:21. "The like figure"—Mark that. Every one in this house that knows anything about grammar or rhetoric knows that a figure is not the thing it stands for. If I say, That man is a lion, it proves he is not a lion, if that is figurative language. The very fact that you assert a thing *is* something in *metaphor* proves it is *not* that thing. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us" (therefore it does not really save us), "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." What is the "filth of the flesh?" Does that mean simply the dirt of the body? The Greek words we have here are

sarkos rupou. The word *sarx*, *sarkos*, means the carnal nature of man, that which is contrary to the spiritual nature,—opposed to God. That my brother may not think I am making- my own definition, let me read from one of the highest authorities in America, Robinson's Greek Lexicon;—*Sarx*, *sarkos*,—"Of man's carnal nature, as an active principle of corruption and sin, ever at war with his higher spiritual nature as affected by the spirit of grace through faith." Now the word *rupou* occurs nowhere else in the Word of God, but the Greek verb from which it is derived occurs once, and only once; and that is in Revelation xxii:11. Let us therefore turn there and read: "He that is filthy let him be filthy still." It is very clear that it is not the filth of the body, but the sinfulness of the soul that is here referred to. Now we have the meaning of our words, let us see how it reads. "The like figure whereunto even baptism also doth now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,"—not the putting away of the carnal nature that is at enmity against God,—not the remission of your sins (for that is the only possible signification of these words in this construction)—"but the answer of a good conscience toward God." But Peter here again condemns my brother's creed. Three times Peter condemns it in this one passage. My brother got excited last night and said we get the "good con-

science" when we are converted. We get the good conscience by conversion. He says we are converted in baptism. But Peter here tells us that baptism is "the answer of a good conscience toward God." We have to have the good conscience before it can make the demand. So my brother's own concession, as well as the Word of God, again condemns his position. His creed is out of harmony with the Word of God everywhere it touches upon it. It was the good conscience of Paul, after his prayer had been heard, that told him to be baptized. It was the good conscience of Cornelius, after he had received the Holy Ghost, that demanded baptism. It was the good conscience of our Master on the banks of Jordan that caused Him to say, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it behooveth (or becometh) us to fulfil all righteousness." It was the answer of a good conscience. Three times has this passage condemned his creed.

Next he takes us to John 11:5. "Jesus answered, Except a man,"—this is *tis* and means *anyone*,—"be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Now he assumes that "born of water" means baptism. He must *show* that it does. Christ was talking here to Nicodemus. If I had another night I should wait for my brother to define this passage himself.

I will take it for granted that he understands that

born of water means baptism in water, for that is certainly what he means. "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit." Did Nicodemus understand it? No, he could not understand it. Could he understand baptism in water? Why certainly. If that were what Christ meant why did he not say, Come and go down into the water and be immersed in order to the remission of your sins? What did he say? "If I have told you of earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?" And when Nicodemus asks, "How can a man be born when he is old?" could not Christ have made it clear to him had he really meant water baptism? But what does Christ answer? He says, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Now this reminds me of the Day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit came like a "rushing mighty wind." Christ was here teaching Nicodemus the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and not water baptism. Christ says, "That which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." Flesh is here substituted for water. Water has disappeared. First water and the Spirit, then flesh and the Spirit. "Born of water," means the natural birth. Christ was here speaking to Nicodemus of the

spiritual birth. The very fact that Nicodemus did not, and could not, understand this, is overwhelming evidence that Christ did not mean water baptism, for it would be unreasonable to presume that Nicodemus could not understand that. Christ here uses a simple figure of speech, and Campbell seems to assume that he must fill out the entire form, circumstances and environments that would be essential were it a literal expression. This is a characteristic error of the Campbell theology. If one should have said to Mr. Campbell (on the same basis), "That man is a lion," he would looked for four feet with claws, and long teeth and a tail. (Laughter.) That is a figurative expression. Whenever it is written "born of the Spirit," or "born of God," it does not mean you have to find a literal mother. It doesn't mean you have to find all that would be essential to a natural birth. There is simply a resemblance in being born of the Spirit to the natural birth. A new world is before you. Things you once hated you now love, and things you once loved you now hate. Things seem new — as to the infant that is born into the world.

MR. OVERMAN.

*Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

I am glad the professor has deviated somewhat from his usual course in that he is trying to give us an argument tonight; the first during the discussion. I noticed that on last night he had a very acute attack of Campbellphobia and I thought certainly he would be over that by tonight, but still we have Campbell, Campbell, Campbell! I do not know what brings it about unless he notices that I am stoop-shouldered. (Laughter.) It seems to be a case of transitory mania. He commenced again tonight to prove all over that we were Campbellites.

Mr. Whitaker: I beg your pardon,—I promised not to use that word, and I haven't.

Mr. Overman: Implying it,—it is all the same. I accept the apology, however.

Mr. Whitaker: It isn't an apology.

Mr. Overman: I will have to have one of the moderators sit on *you* pretty soon. (Laughter.)

Here he comes again with Campbell, Campbell. He took it all back but he likes to say it so well that he has said it all over again. He would like to say it over again tonight if he had not promised not to do it. He will be good once in a while, and I am glad of that.

But here I notice the third proposition for discussion, and I want to do that before I get away. The one pertaining to the Lord's supper. That the Lord's Supper should be observed every Sunday. This point is not now nor has it ever been a doctrine that would keep anyone out of the church, for the reason that the church never has tried to compel its members to observe it. I will give you the teaching of the church, or rather the Word of God. Jesus said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ye have no life in you." John vi: 53. From this time many of his disciples left him because they could not understand how this thing could be. In Matthew xxvi 126-28 Jesus shows how it is. He takes the loaf and the wine and says, the loaf represents his body and the wine his blood, and says. "This do in remembrance of me." We have a positive command, so far as these disciples are concerned that it is to be done. If we find nothing in the Word of God further than this I would not ask the people to practice it at all. Paul brings it out more fully in I. Corinthians xi 123-27. He says, "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this

do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

Now then, as to every Sunday, we turn to Acts XX: 7, and find "when the disciples came together upon *the* first day of the week to break bread, Paul preached unto them." We have the definite article *the* again, indicating the succeeding first days of the week. This was the primary object of their coming together. We know that it is a matter of history that the church did this thing, but we are not quoting from history tonight. We give this from the Word of God. Is it unscriptural to practice the Lord's Supper, and to observe it upon the first day of the week? Is it impracticable to do this? We find for almost a hundred years my people have so practiced, and have never found it impracticable. This was not a test of fellowship, nor is it now, for we would have trials in the church to put people out of the church because of their failure to comply with it. It is inserted here for, I suppose, no other purpose than to make a large book, and I told the professor we did not make it a test of fellowship. Jesus said, "Do it in remembrance of me." Whatsoever Jesus has said that we will do.

Now then we want to notice something else.

In the professor's charge that I have not noticed his argument. How in the name of high heaven does he expect me to notice his argument when he has not offered a single citation of scripture so that I could answer it without the use of a concordance, except those I have given? He has not offered chapter and verse in any of them, so far as I have heard. I doubt very much whether the stenographer's notes would show this. In so doing he has barred me from his argument. I haven't asked him for it because it wasn't worth noticing. (Laughter.) He has not given you chapter and verse for *his* authority except when referring to the many passages of Holy Writ to which I have called *his* attention. He has spent most of his time in vindictive arraignment of Alexander Campbell, trying to gain a point in that Campbell favored the institution of human slavery, and in the same breath exalting George Washington to the highest heaven, a man that was a slave owner, and possibly owned more slaves than Alexander Campbell did—I know not. The same spirit that would drag the bones of Alexander Campbell from his grave and bring them here and try to besmirch them was exhibited when Oliver Cromwell's bones were burned in England to satisfy the thirst for blood of those people. I am glad that he comes tonight with something more tangible. His argument consisted *largely*

of sarcasm and an appeal to the sympathies of his audience, not giving them the Word of God and teaching you with the scriptures. Why did he not, when he was picturing this battlefield, speak of the man that was descending in a mad charge upon his enemy when the bullets of the enemy found his life and he fell with a curse upon his lips. This man ought to be saved as well as the one that is wounded, and when he is in the presence of death turns coward and calls upon God. He turns and cites a passage of scripture, "Everyone that call? upon God shall be saved." I turn to the passage which reads, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my father which is in heaven."

I want to call your attention to the baptism of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, where Jesus taught "This is to fulfill all righteousness," and then coming up out of the water John says the heavens opened and he saw the spirit in the form of a dove descending and resting upon Him, and a voice from heaven saying, "This is my son in whom I am well pleased." This is the first time, so far as I know, that God ever publicly acknowledged Jesus as his son. Does my brother expect then that God is going to do more for men today than he did for Jesus Christ?

Again, I want to show you that our brother has

been going around for some time with a chip on each shoulder for the Presbyterian preacher and the Church of Christ. When he wants to whip Presbyterians he comes to the Church of Christ. I want to read again from one of his Tracts. This is his tract on the Presbyterian church. " 'Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person.' With all due respect to this church, the author must say that he believes that the devil himself would tremble to assume such authority! To stand between God and his creatures and declare that what God commands is not necessary is certainly not the work of Christians or the True Church." Is not necessary for what? If Baptism is not for the remission of sins or in order to the remission of sins in the name of heaven what is it for? Anything that is necessary and needful can a man be saved without complying with it?

It is not necessary for me to prove my point tonight, for the professor did it for me when he said that the word *for* meant to receive something and illustrated it by his story of the man working for him who came up to his house and got his pay—*for* his pay. When Peter said to these people, "Repent," were they to repent because their sins were already pardoned? Were these people saved when Peter said to them, "Repent?"

I think not. If they were not saved then they were not saved until they were baptized. These people were seeking for repentance, and we find that after my brother's learned exhibition from the Greek it reads just as it did before. He makes a great play over the greek *en*; we certainly could not be baptized in Christ because we were already *in* Christ. I am willing to say that the Greek word occurs in certain places in parallel places. In Matthew it is *en* and in another place it is *eis*. It is rendered the same. When our men took possession of the Philippines it was in the name of the United States. What does it mean there? When Columbus took possession of the new world in the name of Isabella and King Ferdinand of Spain it was by their authority. If my brother attends the baptismal service he will hear the minister affirm that by the authority of Jesus Christ I do this. That is what we understand when Peter said to repent and be baptized in the name of Christ. It was in the authority and by the authority of Jesus Christ and not because they were already in Christ, and nobody but Professor Whitaker, if I must say it, would think that when Jesus said "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," that we can say we are saved without baptism, because they are joined together.

He still insists in misquoting me in saying that

I said he would spank his boy if he came before the people even at ten years of age, with a paltry doctrine that baptism is to be cut out. But cut baptism out and what do we have? "He that believeth shall be saved." But Jesus puts something else here—belief and baptism, making them one and the same thing. What is the end? Salvation. Can a man be saved before he does all that Jesus commands?

Go back to the great commission. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Will the professor say that these people were in the Father, were in the Son, were in the Holy Spirit, and that these three are one, but that it was not by the authority of these they were to be baptized? Now why did he send the people out to preach like that? So that they might be saved,—Jesus Christ gave them that better insight when he told them what to do.

Then my brother makes a great play on the washing,—that I said washing was baptism in water. The professor has a wonderful faculty to tear and twist and rend the meaning out of man's *mouth*. *But I am not surprised at this when a man undertakes to teach the scriptures as he has from night to night. I made the statement that in baptism the sins of Saul were washed away. I will show it to you with a practical illustration.*

A man, as I said, can dip himself in the water and wash off the filth of the body, and yet you say, Go dip yourself in the water, washing the filth off, as in the washing of sheep, we dip the sheep in the water and wash away the filth of his body. He makes a great play that Paul was baptized twice. I never claimed that the word *wash* was from the Greek word Baptizo,—not at all. The sins were evidently washed away in the obedience of the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ. "BLESSED is the man that doeth his commandments, for they shall have a right to the tree of life." I want to illustrate the question. Suppose I should buy a farm out here somewhere and want to stock it with cattle, and hear that Professor Whitaker has some good stock to sell or trade, and I would go and look over the Professor's cattle, and would say, I would like to have these to stock my herd with, how much will you take for them? He says, I will take so much, and I say, I have a team of horses and hundred dollars I will give you for these cattle, when you drive them over to my house. He comes over tomorrow with the herd of cattle and I lead out the team of horses and say, I am glad to get the cattle, professor. "But," he says, "where is the hundred dollars?" I say, "You are not to have the hundred dollars, the word *for* only means that you are to have the horses and that is all,—just the horses,

professor." (Laughter.) In this case we have repentance for the remission of sins, and that is all he gets out of it. He says *for* means he is to have the horses and one hundred dollars for the remission of sins, (Laughter.) or for the cattle, I should have said. (Laughter and applause.) He is to have the horses and one hundred dollars, and I hold back the one hundred dollars. "No, sir," he would say, "the word *for* means I am to have the hundred dollars and the horses." Why does he quibble about this? What is the end sought for in baptism? Why does he charge it to Alexander Campbell when I read last night that it was practiced in the church for at least fourteen years before the man had met Alexander Campbell? He had preached the same thing and believed it. When it is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, the doctrine of the Greek church, and the doctrine of the Lutheran church as well?

He has charged me with quoting Campbell correctly and yet I have not given a single quotation from Alexander Campbell. I have quoted from Dr. Whitaker and from Dr. Stone, I will admit, and then I have read from the Holy Word, giving chapter and verse for everything I have offered. I will give it to you again.

He wants me to notice his five hundred exceptions to the Church of Christ and yet he is harping on the subject of baptism. Did he touch

baptism last night? He certainly gave you no argument whatever. Tonight he gives us the argument. He spends his time in arguing at naught, and when he is through, brethren, you will find your Bible just as it was before.

As I told you last night, I am not a Greek scholar. I prefer to give you that which has been written by men. That is why I read from these four translations. We have in the Greek, however, *eis* remission of sins, or *into* the remission of sins, or *unto* the remission of sins. If this be true then the remission of sins is still beyond baptism, for it is *to* as well, and is he ready to say that *eis* is not sometimes translated *to*? If it is *to*, then faith and confession and repentance and baptism only lead us up to it,—that is all. We don't get it even then. If it is *unto*, it is practically the same thing,—it brings to it, but if it is *for* in this case, and the context shows it to be so, I want to tell you that the Word of God is sure and steadfast, and He gives them all He promises them. I want you to settle this among yourselves—and this is an intelligent audience—whether we can expect God to do more for men today than he did for Jesus Christ. Settle that, if you will. Shall we be called “Sons of God” before we have fulfilled all righteousness. “Because ye are the sons of God, God hath sent forth the spirit of *his* Son into your hearts, whereby ye cry Abba

Father." Shall we expect that God will acknowledge us as *his* son in whom *he* is well pleased until we have complied with all of the conditions of salvation?

My brother said he would fellowship Martin Luther—he would fellowship John Wesley. Why does he not do this thing then? Why does he not go down and join the church that stands for John Wesley today, if he can fellowship it? For the simple reason that they do not interpret the scripture the same as he interprets it and that is the reason. For the same reason he does not unite with the Presbyterian people. I am fully persuaded in my mind if we allow the professor to interpret our scripture for us then we can come into his church and he will fellowship us. We have given you the scripture as it is, and we plead, brethren, that the scripture will interpret itself for itself. When I put the scripture up and let you look at it for yourselves there is no need that I explain it. You know when you send your little boy down for onions to the store he goes *for* onions. You know that if I work for thirty dollars I am working *for* thirty dollars. You know that the *for* indicates in order to. You know that, and the professor may come with his *twisting and skill and try to change it, but it is there just* the same, and it was put into King James version before ever this was a testing point.

And I do not stand alone, as I showed you last night, in this respect.

Again, he talks about a figure of speech in First Peter 111:21. The symbol must always be true to the thing symbolized, What is the figure? Is *baptism* the figure? Not at all.. The salvation by water is the figure. "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." The professor has tried to give you something else along this line. There are versions of scripture that make it the seeking or the interrogation of a good conscience toward God. The figure we have is the saving, as the ark saved Noah. How did the ark save Noah? By carrying them from the antediluvian into a new world where there were no sinners. How, then, is that a figure of baptism? Because baptism carries us over from the side of sin into the side of righteousness. The symbol must be true to the thing symbolized. The symbol must be in perfect harmony. He says the symbol makes the thing something else than it is.

Again, he goes on talking about the washing of the flesh. I say this, that Peter is trying, evidently, to correct an error in the minds of the people. It was the sins of the people that were being washed away in the water. It is clear to my mind

that the people thought they were being washed in the water,—getting rid of the sweat and grime of the body— and Peter wants to correct that idea.

By the way, before I got away from this, I was to notice his statement that birth of water means the natural birth. I am surprised at the professor saying that. Water birth! Does it mean that? It says, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a *man* be born again of water (he did not say baptized—born of water) except a man be born of water (not baptized)," I would like to ask the physicians, if there are any here tonight, are all children born of water? No, they are not, some of them are not. There is what is known in medicine as the dry birth. We know this to be true. I want to ask him if these people have ever had a birth if it is the natural birth. Certainly not. Jesus is explaining the spiritual thing, and the water birth is spiritual and figurative there, and Jesus taught them parables that the people might not understand, save that which he taught his disciples. He gave them a parallel there to birth. We see it today and understand it in the light of later evidence. It is brought out in the washing of regeneration. Where is there a washing save in baptism—in regeneration? Do we have it anywhere else? Certainly not. He goes on to the washing of the old testa-

ment scripture. What was the dipping of Naaman in the River Jordan for? What was the object? That he might be cleansed of his leprosy. My brother would say that Naaman was cleansed before ever he dipped himself seven times; that the intention to be good would cleanse him. But not so.

I want to say to you in reference to this broad platform, friends, that it is possible for a platform to be so broad that it would come under the condemnation of Jesus Christ, who died that we might have life—that it will lead into hell. Our brother said that we were sending people to hell. The only expression I have heard of that kind since we have been discussing, was when he said, "To hell with such a doctrine—to hell with such a church as that!" That is the only place I find it. We did hear him say to hell with something, and that is the only thing we have heard yet. I read you last night that he prayed success on our efforts here to save souls. Again I say, "Can men gather figs of thistles?"

The professor has given you my pedigree, but he has not given you any argument. We have given you Whitaker against Whitaker, and we have cited passage after passage to prove our position—we have read Stone, and nothing else aside from the Word of God. I want to say to you that his argument would be ruled out of any competent

court because the professor has not given us chapter and verse for any of the passages he has quoted, because there an attorney, in making his argument, must in making his citations, say where he finds it so that the opposing attorney might find it and read it and investigate his argument for himself to know the thing quoted is absolutely correct. Why has he not done this thing? Was it because he forgot it? Then his argument is weak and will not stand. If we find chapter and verse in the book after it has been published, then it will have been added since this debate—if it is found there.— (Time.)

Mr. WHITAKER.

Mr. Chairman: I am feeling better. I felt hardly able to speak when I came here this evening, but I have just asked the brother for another night or two. I would like to finish my argument. I shall ask the Chair if he will notify me when I am within eight minutes of my time.

Mr. Overman: Mr. Chairman, I object to this notice of eight minutes. It is unfair. I ask that the brother shall speak just as I have.

Mr. Whitaker: Let it go, Brother Overman; I will time myself.

Mr. Overman: All right, time yourself; that is what I have been doing.

Mr. Whitaker: I have forgotten to say, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think. This is my last speech, and I wanted to complete this argument. I want this to go to the public, and I wanted it to constitute a complete refutation of the Campbell system. That is the reason I have asked the brother to continue the debate for two more nights. Last evening, after the discussion had closed, I arose for that purpose, but the Chair could not gain the attention of the audience.

Mr. Overman: Will you allow me the time to show why I do not think it is necessary to continue the discussion?

Mr. Whitaker: I would, but you could not tell any way. (Laughter).

My brother starts out with my Campbellphobia. Every one here knows I have spoken of Alexander Campbell only in the most respectful terms. I respect him more highly than my brother does. He got his creed from him and his church was founded by him, and yet he declares he has nothing to do with him. I respect Alexander Campbell. When I said he advocated slavery and that he held that the scriptures justified that evil, I was simply showing you that that great man could and did make mistakes, and why not in his other interpretations of scripture? Washington held slaves, but it was at a different time. Campbell advocated slavery at a time when it was a national issue. His paper advocated it. If Washington had lived at the time slavery was an issue I have an idea he would have done as he did in many instances,—he would have set his slaves free. I do not like to have my brother accuse me of becoming so malicious. I have tried not to be. It is probably my nature to speak a little sharply at times, but I have entertained no feeling against my brother or against Alexander Campbell.

He says I have not given my scripture references and that he has not asked for my manuscript. Just to refresh my brother's memory, I will say he *did* ask for the manuscript last night for the first time. I said, "It is the only copy I

have, but you may take it at any time and make a copy, or I will consent to the stenographer's making you a copy," and I turned to the stenographer and said, "Make Brother Overman a copy of my thirty inconsistencies against his church." That is all I know about it. These are the simple facts. I do not know whether he called for it or not. Had my brother asked for references at any time I would have given them to him. If he will continue the debate I will give him all the notes and references he wants. I will not give him *all* of my notes, because I have references there that I have not used. It is loaded and hasn't been shot off yet, and I would not let him have it for the same reason that I would not let my boy have a loaded pistol—he might blow his brains out, and then he couldn't do as well as he *is* doing. (Laughter and applause.) Brother Overman had no reason to bring this accusation at the last. I have not tried to keep anything from him. I have sometimes omitted the place in the scripture from which I have quoted because I wanted to get through with my argument. I expect to insert that in the book. That is customary.

He refers to Barton W. Stone as the founder of the church with which I stand identified. He did not get that from any encyclopedia. However I am glad to hear him make this reference, for he

has here borne valuable testimony against a deception practiced by his church. Barton W. Stone never was a member of my brother's church. Yet they are trying to claim him. Here in this history of the "Disciples of Christ," by Dr. Gates, an entire chapter is given to the life and works of this great man, apparently with the purpose of presenting him to the world as one of the founders of this denomination. The national census report of 1890 startled those who were familiar with the life of this noble man and with the history of the great religious, awakening of which he was an important factor, by the statement in connection with my brother's church—a statement prepared by an official in his church,—to the effect that Barton W. Stone was one of the founders and a member of that denomination. Stone was not of that cool, calculating, scheming turn of mind of Campbell, but was a man afire with the spirit of evangelization—a man under whose preaching there were more conversions in one week than there were under the preaching of both the Campbells in their entire lifetimes. Campbell and his co-workers seeing *this desired to effect a union with Stone and certain other ministers, but this very doctrine that my brother has been in vain trying to prove* prevented such a union. My brother is decidedly in error when he quotes Stone to prove his posi-

tion; for the answer Stone gave to Campbell was that "the doctrine of immersion in order to remission of sins is contrary both to my understanding of God's word and to my own experience." But seeing that a union could not be effected on the position held by Campbell, a proposition was made to unite upon the Bible alone, granting to each the right to interpret it for himself. This was the position already occupied by Stone and his followers, and the proposition was readily accepted. Stone believed the union to be all in good faith and went on preaching the gospel and showing the lost the way of salvation, while the followers of Campbell went among the churches newly organized by Stone and his fellow-workers, instilling into their minds the teachings of Campbell, and proselytizing to their peculiar creed. As a result many of the churches organized by Stone and much of the noble work done by this man of God were lost.

This is not an exception, but rather the rule by which this denomination was built up. When Thomas Campbell was refused readmission into the Presbyterian church, they applied for admission into the Baptist church and were admitted. Alexander Campbell at once seized the opportunity thus offered him. Posing as a Baptist, though of course well knowing that he was undermining the very fundamental principles of

that church, he secured at once a large circulation for his paper, the "*Christian Baptist*" The members of this church thought they were taking and reading their own literature. Besides this he sent out his disciples among the Baptist churches to teach the Campbell doctrine of "immersion in order to the remission of sins." As a result when the inevitable separation came, in every church where Campbell and his followers had been able to secure a majority they took the churches from the Baptists. In this way they secured a large number of churches and a large amount of church property. Of course they were laboring under the impression that their doctrine is right and everything else is wrong; and therefore it is right to utilize everything they can for so noble a cause.

My brother says *en* and *eis* mean the same. I am sorry he said this, for Greek scholars will read this book, and they will smile when they read it. I have nothing more, I think, to say about that.

He says that Columbus took possession of America *in* the name of Isabella. Exactly. He had to be a subject of Isabella before he acted. He has proven just exactly what I wanted to prove.

He says I have been *dodging the issue*. He *got that* from me. I *tried that on him, and it*

worked pretty well, and he thought it would work the other way. There is not a person in this house that will stand up and say I have been dodging the issue. I have not dodged it. The members of my brother's own church will say I stepped squarely to the center of the ring when the conflict was on, and my brother has remained out in the woods with his old musket because he knew it wouldn't shoot. That is the reason he tried to keep out of range.

He says he is going to buy some cattle from me. I am glad of that. (Laughter.) He said if he should tell me he would give me a team of horses and one hundred dollars, I think (I was looking over my manuscript and wasn't listening closely), for some cattle; and I delivered the cattle, and he gave me the team of horses, and I asked him for the hundred dollars, and he says I am not to have the hundred dollars, I am only to get the team of horses,—I would object to such a dealing as that. But I am at a loss to know what he is trying to illustrate. He should have told us. Now suppose he would come to me and say, I want to buy a certain number of cattle. (I am going to illustrate his position, now. He did not.) He says, How much will you take for them? I say, One hundred dollars. He says, All right; and he comes and gets the cattle and drives them home. He gives me a hundred dol-

lars; but I say, Hold on, that is not all, you must give me a hundred dollars more. He says, How is that? I was to pay you a hundred dollars. I say, That is only the first payment, you have got to make another one before the cattle are yours.—Would not my brother insist that he was fully entitled to the cattle? And yet when Paul says to the Jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," my brother insists that Paul deceived the poor trembling Jailer; he says, That isn't all, that is only the first step, there is another step. No man ever believed on God in the sense of faith as it is here used but God accepted him.

My brother has said conversion was **never** mentioned in the Bible except in connection with baptism. The fact is that in more than half the instances of conversion recorded in the Bible, baptism is not mentioned at all. Paul, who was in no respect inferior to the chiefest among the apostles, and who says, "I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God," says of baptism, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; and I baptized also the house of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other; for Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel." (I Cor. 1:14, 16, 17.) Had baptism been in order to remission of sins, do you think Paul would have thus spoken?

He says that *eis* sometimes means *in order to*, and "the professor will admit it." Why certainly. But what of that? He has to prove that it *always means in order to*. This is like his little argument on *for*. To show that *for* does not *necessarily mean in order to*, I illustrated by saying, "If you will stop at my office I will pay you *for* your work yesterday." With all the simplicity of a five-year-old child he replied by saying, If you come *for* your money you come expecting it. I am not required to prove that *eis* may not mean *in order to*. I am only required to prove that it does not *always* mean that. Let us notice this Greek preposition *eis*, *for*, as I have already remarked, my brother's whole system of theology depends upon it. It ought therefore to be definite and certain in its meaning, and to admit of no possible doubt. If my brother sustains his position, he must be able to show that in the passages in question, this preposition must and does mean *in order to*, and that it cannot possibly have any other meaning. But what are the facts? *Eis* is the most indefinite and uncertain of all the prepositions of the Greek language. It occurs 1,600 times in the New Testament. It is translated by 48 different words. *It is never once translated "in order to."* Only 134 times is it translated *for*, and only 23 of these could be interpreted to mean "in order to." Therefore,

based upon this preposition, which is the strongest argument my brother has for his creed, the best that can be claimed is that it is an *opinion*, with only one chance in about forty that it is true, and thirty-nine chances that it is false; but we have already shown by other arguments based upon these passages that his creed cannot be true, and if our time would permit we would show that this Greek preposition would not allow him even one chance in forty. And yet my brother says he does *not* hold an opinion, but only the Word of God as his rule of faith and practice! At the beginning of this discussion, I laid down as one rule, That where there is a possible opposite or contrary to a proposition, it is not *proven*, but only an *opinion*, and my brother accepted it. Here is not merely a *possible opposite*, but the evidence is against him in the ratio of forty to one. And yet my brother denies to his Quaker brother the right of his opinion, and to his Methodist and Presbyterian and Baptist brethren the right to their opinions!

My brother asks, if I want to fellowship all Christians, why don't I go and join the Methodist church, etc. I answer, For the same reason that I don't join my brother's church,—because their platform is too narrow for all Christians to unite upon,— because they do not offer a practical and scriptural basis for the union of all

Christians. If I should join the Methodist church I could not fellowship my brother, and if I should join his church he would deny me the right to fellowship my Methodist and Quaker brethren.

My brother started out with a broad platform, but admitted last evening that it was a narrow platform; and said he was glad it was narrow, because "broad is the way that leadeth to destruction," and "narrow is the way which leadeth unto life." But the same Divine lips that have spoken these words said in almost the same breath, "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" I wonder whether my brother has discovered a difference between the members of his own denomination and other professed Christians. Has he discovered a difference between his own people, who were "immersed in order to the remission of their sins," and Baptists, who were baptized because their sins had already been remitted? If so, in whose favor was the difference? Has he discovered a difference between the members of his church who inseparably connect salvation with immersion in water, and the Quaker, who rejects water baptism entirely? If so, in whose favor?—No, my brother, the "narrow way" spoken of in the Bible is quite another way.

Referring to I Peter 111:21, my brother says

immersion in order to the remission of sins is in a figure likened unto the salvation of Noah and his household, wherein they were carried from a land of sinners into a land where there were no sinners,—that is, his church. But there are sinners there. My brother knows it, but doesn't like to admit it here. When we get off to ourselves, talking as brother ministers, he will tell me about some old sinners in his church that lie, and steal and won't pay their pastor. If he doesn't know any, I can tell him of some. (Laughter.) But Noah and his house were *pardoned* before the Ark; and so salvation here does not mean *rescue*, but *preserve*. Noah had been for many years before the flood a preacher. The building of the Ark and the entering into it were acts of obedience (of a good conscience) where those whose sins had already been pardoned were preserved. So baptism is the answer of a Christian's "good conscience," whereby we are (not pardoned but) preserved. Every act of obedience to God's commandments, as we understand them, is thus a saving—preserving—act. We become Christians by faith; we remain Christians by obedience.

I am sorry I cannot review the rest of my brother's argument, but my time is nearly gone, and I must conclude.

Now, my friends, I want to sum up briefly a part of the progress of this discussion.

1. My brother started out to defend the broad platform for all that love the Lord (See the tract called "Our Position," the most popular tract ever sent out by his church), but admits that it is a very narrow one for those "immersed in order to the remission of sins." Is there a difference between those who "love the Lord" and those who are "immersed in order to the remission of sins?" Then my brother has made a concession.

2. He asserts that they do not persecute on account of opinions held; but refuses to answer questions asked regarding men of the highest standing in his church, who were deprived of their positions and persecuted by his church until many of them were driven from it.

3. He asserts that God will not hear sinners, but admits that He does.

4. That we get our good consciences when we are immersed; and yet admits that it is our good consciences that *demand* baptism.

5. That his church was established by unpardoned sinners, if his creed be true.

6. That the founders of his church were converted under the plan of salvation that his creed denounces. If I have time I will read the account of Thomas Campbell's conversion. I have already read Alexander's.

7. He asserted in the beginning of this de-

bate that he would prove his church's position true; but admits, without any question, so far as I can remember, ten inconsistencies with itself.

8. He asserted that he would prove his position in perfect harmony with the Word of God, but questions only five of over fifty inconsistencies presented, and fails to reconcile a single one even of these.

9. He bases his chief argument on the proposition that the Greek *eis* means "in order to;" but admits that this preposition is translated in the Bible by more than forty different words, and not once translated "in order to." I am very sorry I cannot have another night to deal with the Greek preposition *eis*, for I have spent more time in preparing on that than any other part of my argument, and I have prepared a more complete exposition on it than any I have ever seen.

10. He asserts that *eis* following *baptizo*, Acts 11:38, and Mark 1:4, 'means, and must mean, "in order to;" but admits that it never means this where it follows the same Greek word anywhere else in the Word of God. I will change that, because I intended to present that tonight. But he would admit that there is no other place where *eis* occurs in the Bible following *baptizo* that it can mean "in order to."

11. He asserts that the Bible is their only rule of faith and practice; but admits that they

have a creed that cannot be worded in Bible language.

12. That Jesus Christ is their only creed, but admits that they refuse fellowship to thirty millions in the United States alone who profess to believe on Him.

13. That they make Christian Character their only test of fellowship; but admits that they make an opinion, which ninety-seven per cent of the professed Christians of the world do not accept, their test.

14. That faith should precede repentance; but admits that he can nowhere find it so in the Word of God, but that the reverse is always found there.

15. That John's baptism was "in order to the remission of sins;" but that Christ was baptized of John in Jordan in order to fulfil all righteousness, and not in order to the remission of sins.

My brother quotes from a letter I had written him during his revival efforts here, in which letter I had wished him success, and expressed a hope that many souls might be saved. I fail to see any relation between this and the matter he has undertaken to prove. It has no more to do with the question under discussion than does my tract on the Presbyterian Church, from which he also read. He was simply biding for sympathy there. That is all. There is no argument in it.

However, I am very glad to have those tracts read. But my brother seems to think that my hoping that souls may be saved under his preaching was inconsistent with my position on this question. How so? I believe that every one that comes forward on his invitation, and says, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," (if that answer comes from the heart of faith) is saved then and there; but that he is saved "by grace through faith," and not by baptism, for it is written, "He that believeth, HATH everlasting life." I think they are saved *before* they go down into the water, and could I not consistently wish my brother success?

Now let me quote from his letter to me. In his first letter in our correspondence, he says, Come and sit patiently and listen to my preaching, and "you will have a better understanding of the plan of salvation." This is written in the characteristic spirit of the ministers of this denomination. They assume that they are the only people that know the Word of God. But, "*veni, vidi, (and who will deny me the right to add) vicii*"—*I came, I saw,—I conquered*. In answer to his invitation I enrolled under his instruction for a term. I paid the tuition, and it is pretty high. But he refused to give the course of instruction he *had* agreed to give. For two nights, —half the term,—he evaded it; and when I asked

him for one or two nights more that he might fulfill his obligation, he refused. I asked him, according to the agreement, to show that the Word of God teaches "immersion in order to the remission of sins," and after searching the Bible through in vain for his doctrine, he tells me to walk out three miles and ask the German Lutheran minister about it, and then go and see the Methodist minister, and then call on the pastor of the Presbyterian church, and to consult with the Catholic priest. But do any of these teach my brother's doctrine?—That is the way he has answered me. He said he would read it from the Word of God. But he should not be blamed for not doing it;—it isn't there. He said he would have the writers of the Bible teach it to me; but when he introduced them, they generally talked upon some other subject, and when they did speak upon this subject they invariably condemned it instead of teaching it. But the fault is not with my brother. It is with the creed he has undertaken to prove. No man can find a thing where it is not. No man on earth can prove that the Word of God teaches "immersion in order to the remission of sins." The proposition admits of an opposite, and is therefore at best only an opinion, with the overwhelming evidence against it.

Now, my friends, I want to read to you the account of the conversion of Thomas Campbell. I

want to show to you that my statement is true. I read from Gates' history of "The Disciples of Christ." "Very early in life Thomas passed through a deep religious experience, which set at rest his fears of the Divine displeasure and gave him assurance of salvation and acceptance with God. His religious experience conformed to the theological teaching which he met and accepted in attendance at Presbyterian churches. It was of that serious Calvinistic sort which laid particular emphasis upon the Divine activity in conversion. The spiritual monitions attending his conversion were such as not only to give him assurances of salvation, but to lay upon him the duty of consecrating himself to the ministry of the gospel. The moment of his conversion was also the moment of his dedication to the ministry." And that was many years before he was baptized "in order to the remission of his sins."

Again, I invite my brother in all kindness, and I invite his members, out upon the broad gospel platform of salvation. You can hold your peculiar views, but do not refuse fellowship to men just as honest, and just as intelligent, and just as precious in the eyes of God, because they do not accept them. If you want to be baptized in order to the remission of sins, follow the bidding of your conscience. I will give you a better definition for Christian than "immersed believer." I

believe a Christian is one that fears God and obeys Him as he understands Him. I believe that no one will ever be lost, will ever miss heaven, who follows God as closely as he can—just as my child, if he would try to come to me, when I call him, and through weakness staggers and falls, I would not leave him there, I would go and get him. When God says, He that believeth shall be saved, fear not to trust His words. If you believe in baptism in order to the remission of sins, hold that as your individual opinion, but do not condemn, unchurch, or disfellowship those who hold opinions differing from yours. When you say “Christian character is the only test of fellowship,” *make* that the only test, instead of some very doubtful and unprovable opinion. When you say, “The Bible is our only rule of faith or practice,” let it be so, but let every one interpret it for himself.

My brother deceives himself when he says I would not admit into the church people who do not believe as I do. If there were a Roman Catholic here, and he had no church in this neighborhood, and he should ask to worship in the church of which I am a member, and the church would refuse him admission on account of his honest opinions, I would walk out with him. I will never knowingly hold connection with any church that will refuse fellowship to a single child of God.

STATE OF KANSAS, }
 } ss.

SHAWNEE COUNTY.

WILLIAM M. DAY, of lawful age, being first duly sworn, on oath doth say that he is a shorthand reporter and that as such reporter ho reported in shorthand the proceedings of a certain debate between Mr. Neil Overman and Mr. O. B. Whitaker, in the opera house at Lincoln, Kansas, on the evenings of January 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th, 1906; that he has transcribed his shorthand notes, and that the above and foregoing (save these citations of scripture which appear in parentheses, the same having been afterwards inserted) is a true, full and correct report of such proceedings to the best of his knowledge and ability.

WILLIAM M. DAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of January, A. D., 1906.

[SEAL.]

GEO. N. HOLMES,
Notary Public, Shawnee County, Kansas.
My commission expires January 18, 1907.

HERBERT BROWN

"Among the many things which interest me, I place that *masterpiece*, Herbert Brown, at the center, circumference, top and bottom I have not at any time read a book with such undivided attention and interest."—DR. J. F. BURNETT, Secy., American Christian Convention.

"This highly entertaining and deeply religious story by the president of Kansas Christian College ought to be in the home of every wide awake Christian. There is not a dull page from start to finish. The story of love is wholesome, and the author's well-known love of humor is constantly sparking throughout the whole book."—CAYLYLE SUMMERBELL, Pres., Palmer College.

"It is just the kind of book our readers will be glad to know."—REV. JOSEPH DAWSON, Ph. D., Literary Editor, The Baltimore Methodist.

"A powerful novel, by Dr. O. B. Whitaker, which we commend to our readers. It is not only a story of absorbing interest, but is a wonderful lesson of the evils of sectarianism and intemperance."—HERALD OF GOSPEL LIBERTY.

"The picture is drawn with terrible fidelity."—CHURCH STANDARD.

"The book is full of tersely expressed wisdom and true and undefiled religion."—SYLVAN GROVE NEWS.

"Dr. Whitaker has the spirit of romance, and tells the story in splendid English. *Herbert Brown* is a genuine hero, and that redeems any book—to have in it a genuine hero."—THE CHRISTIAN SUN.

Large, clear type, new plates, extra paper, 814 pages.
Paper, 50c; cloth, 81.00; mottled leather, 82.00 —
Postage, 10c. Cloth and leather bound books are
illustrated with six full-page illustrations from actual
life (two of them being scenes in Chicago saloons);
guilt top, gold side and back stamp, — a beauty.

Don't fail to order a copy of Herbert Brown

M. A. DONOHUE & CO.,
CHICAGO

Order of O. B. Whitaker, Lincoln, Kan.