

THE SMITH MILLER DEBATE
BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF
JESUS ONLY

PROPOSITIONS FOR DEBATE

Between Doctor W. S. Smith of Purcell, Okla. and E. H. Miller of LaGrange, Ga. Prop. No. 1. The Scriptures teach, that people should be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and none other.

AFF.—W. S. Smith
NEG.—E. H. Miller

Prop. No. 2. The Scriptures teach, people should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

AFF.—E. H. Miller
NEG.—W. S. Smith

AGREEMENT

1. Each one shall write four affirmative articles, none of which shall exceed fifteen hundred words, and a rejoinder not to exceed the hundred words. The rejoinder shall contain no new arguments.

2. Each one shall write four negative articles, none of which shall exceed fifteen hundred words. The fourth shall contain no new arguments.

3. Each one may ask his opponent five questions at the close of each of his affirmative articles and the first three of his negative articles.

1. Each question must be a Bible question and on the subject under consideration, and numbered so they may be answered by number.

5. Questions to be answered in our first article after receiving them.

8. We agree to make this a clean, honorable discussion, free from unkind remarks, offensive language, and everything unbecoming to a Christian.

7. We agree to have this discussion printed and made into a book, and have one thousand copies made, each bearing half of the expense and receiving half of the books. Each one being free to print more of these tooks at his own expense if he wishes to do so.

SIGNED—W. S. Smith
E. H. Miller

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

W. S. Smith

The scriptures teach, that people should be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and none other.

By scriptures, I mean the Bible, both the Old and New testaments. By teach, I mean command, example or necessary inference. By people, I mean those who have heard the gospel of Christ, believed it and desire to become Christians. By, should be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and none other, I mean that his name is the ONLY name into which they should be baptized, and not into the name of the Father nor into the name of the Holy Spirit nor into any other name under heaven given among men.

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Isa. 2: 2-3. Zion is the church of the firstborn. Heb. 12:22-23. Therefore the law was to go forth out of the church. But when was the church established? Was it on the day of Pentecost? Hear Isaiah again, "Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? Or shall a nation be bom at once? For as soon as Zion travailed she brought forth her children." Isa. 66:8. Did that take place on the day of Pentecost? Was that when the church was established?

Jesus said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Mt. 16:19 and 18:18. And Jesus "Said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day. And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you. But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Lk. 24:46-49. That tells us where the preaching in Jesus' name was to begin. But when did Jesus say it would begin? Jesus said, "When he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." Jno. 16:13. When did the spirit of truth come? "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven." Acts 2:1-5.

On the day of Pentecost the apostles received the power from on high the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the power to bind on earth and it was bound in heaven. The Spirit of truth came on that day to guide the apostles into all truth. The Spirit of truth guided Peter to preach What he preached on the day of Pentecost. When they said unto Peter and to the other apostles "Men and brethren, what shall we do?", the Spirit of truth guided Peter to say, "Repent and be baptized every one of you; in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." That command was in the name of Jesus Christ, and none other.

"They were baptized in (into) the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 8:16. They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus and none other. If THE NAME, means more than one name, then THE LORD means more than one lord. See Eph. 4:5. "And he commanded them to be baptized in THE NAME OF THE LORD." Acts 10:48. And none other. "When they heard this, they were baptized INTO THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS." Acts 19:5. Into the name of the Lord Jesus and none other.

Jesus chose Paul to bear his name before the Gentiles and the kings and the children of Israel. And he sent Ananias to him to tell him what he must do. Acts 9:16-18. And Ananias said, "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will and see that just one, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard. And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thou sins, calling on THE NAME OF THE LORD. Acts 22:14-16. The name of one Lord and none other. Paul said, "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." See Acts 26:16-20.

Paul said, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Ro. 1:16. Note, Paul said the gospel of Christ is THE power of God unto salvation, not a power, or PART of the power, but it is THE power of God unto salvation. That excludes every thing that is not included in the gospel of Christ. "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith." v. 17. God's righteousness is his commandments Ps. 119:172. Therefore all of God's commandments to Christians (the disciples of Christ in the gospel age) are revealed in the gospel of Christ. It gives us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. 2 Pet. 1:3.

"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." Rom. 6:3-4. We are baptized into Jesus Christ and none other. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3:27. Into Christ and none other. —1. Does baptism save people? —2. How did the apostles teach baptism? —3. Did Paul declare baptism in the name of any one but Jesus Christ?—4. Did Paul declare all of the counsel of God?—5. Is baptism included in Col. 3:17?

FIRST NEGATIVE

E. H. MILLER

Friends, Doctor Smith has affirmed, "The Scriptures teach, that people should be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and none other." By Scriptures he says, "I mean the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments. By teach, "I mean command example or necessary inference." Yet he gave no "Bible — command, example or necessary inference" teaching, "people should be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and none other." Doctor Smith why didn't you give us at least one Bible verse that so teaches?

In paragraph 1 Doctor Smith defines his proposition; I accept his definition, so come to paragraph 2.

In paragraph 2 we find some good verses on the establishment of the church but not one word in favor of his proposition; so we will pass on.

In paragraph 3, we read of Jesus giving Peter "the keys of the kingdom of heaven:" and of Peter's power to "bind—and—loose"; but we do not read where Peter bound baptism "into the name of Jesus Christ and none other." Neither do we find where Peter loosed baptism from being "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Mt. 28:19 Revised Version).

Doctor Smith gives Lk. 24:46-49 saying, "That tells us where the preaching in Jesus' name was to begin." Let him now tell us if he thinks that "in" in that statement means "into"; that "repentance" was preached "into" the name of Jesus; and that "remission of sins" was preached "into" the name of Jesus.

We now come to paragraph 4. After quoting Acts 2:38 Doctor Smith says, "That command was in the name of Jesus Christ, and none other." But it was not "into the name of Jesus Christ"! I have just checked over three dozen translations of Acts 2:38, and not one of them says "into the name". Everything Peter preached and all he commanded was "in the name of Jesus Christ"; but all he commanded was not "into the name of Jesus Christ"! Will Doctor Smith say, All Peter commanded was "into the name of Jesus Christ"?

Doctor Smith tells us in paragraph 5 after quoting Acts 8:16, "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus and none other." Does the Bible say so? No! They were baptized as Jesus commanded in Mt. 28:19 "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." So they were baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus" when they were baptized according to the command of the Lord Jesus "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." That is not into the name of the Son only! But Doctor Smith says, "If the name moans more than one name, then THE LORD means more than one Lord" Does Doctor Smith mean to tell us, that the name of the Father is also the name of the Son, and the name of the Holy Ghost? Please notice the following; 3 John 14 "Greet the friends by name." Did they

all have one name? Josh. 21:9 "These cities which are here mentioned by name." Were all those cities called by the same name? Deut. 18:20 The prophet—that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die." Did all the other gods have one and the same name? Deut. 7:22-24. "The Lord thy God will put out those nations— And he shall deliver their kings into thine hand and thou shalt destroy their name from under heaven:" Did those nations all have one name? And their kings all have one name? If "the name of other gods" means each god had a different name, then "the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" means each of the three mentioned had a different name, and baptism is to be "into" each one's name.

Doctor Smith gives Acts 10:48 as follows, "And he commanded them to be baptized in THE NAME OF THE LORD." Then he says, "And none other." Notice the verse says, "IN THE NAME OF THE LORD." Not "into"; out of over three dozen translations just checked, not one of them translates "into" in Acts 10:48.

Next, Doctor Smith gives Acts 19:5 "They were baptized INTO THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS." Then he adds, "Into the name of the Lord Jesus and none other." He has to add to, like the "FAITH ONLY" people; they read Gal. 3:24 "justified by faith." Then write a creed saying, "We are justified by faith only" and reject James 2:24 "By works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Doctor Smith, it seems, cannot see that when people are baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus" Acts 19:5 that they are also baptized "into the name of the Father—and of the Holy Ghost" Mt. 28:19. Why accept one verse and reject the other? Saying, "Into the name of the Lord Jesus and none other." Yes, why teach people, they should be baptized according to Acts 19:5 "and none other" and not according to Mt. 28:19 also?

We now come to paragraph 6 in which we read of Paul's conversion. Doctor Smith quotes from Acts 22:16 "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on THE NAME OF THE LORD." Then he adds, "The name of one Lord and none other." But friends, the Bible does not tell us Paul was baptized "into the name of Jesus Christ and none other." There is nothing recorded about Paul's conversion that will help Doctor Smith prove one thing about his proposition.

In paragraph 7 Doctor Smith gives Rom. 1:16, and says, "Note, Paul said the gospel of Christ is THE power of God unto salvation not a power, or part of the power, but it is THE power of God unto salvation. That excludes every thing that is not included in the gospel of Christ." How true he is! We agree on that statement; but the teaching of Doctor Smith's proposition "is not included in the gospel of Christ." For the gospel of Christ says, "Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Mt. 28:19 R. V.). And Doctor Smith's proposition says, "into the name of Jesus Christ and none other." So Doctor Smith's teaching "is not included in the gospel of Christ," but is EXCLUDED!

Doctor Smith in his last paragraph (8), quotes Rom. 6:3-4 and Gal.

3:27, and says "We are baptized into Jesus Christ and none other." But that doesn't have a thing to do with his proposition; he is not affirming we are to be baptized into the one body of Christ and none other. The Bible says we are "all baptized into one body," but it does not say baptized into one name, BUT "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST."

NOW TO HIS QUESTIONS

1. Does baptism save people? Answer, 1 Pet. 3:21 "Baptism doth also now save us."

2. How did the apostles teach baptism? Answer, They taught baptism as Jesus commanded, "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." (Mt. 28:19 R. V.) See also Heb. 2:1-3-?- Mk. 16:15-16-?-Mt. 28:19-20 & Lk. 24:46-49 & Acts 1:8 & John 14:26.

3. Did Paul declare baptism into the name of any one but Jesus Christ? Answer, Yes, for he declared all the counsel of God (Acts 20:27-30 & Gal. 1:6-9 & Mt. 16:15 & Mt. 28:19-20).

1. Did Paul declare all the counsel of God? Answer, Yes, see answer 3.

5. Is baptism included in Col. 3:17? Answer, Yes; therefore, we should baptize as Christ commanded (Mt. 28:19-20).

QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. Does the expression "in the name" and "into the name" mean the same thing in Mt. 28:19; Acts 2:38; Acts 8:16; Acts 10:48 and Acts 19:5?

2. Did the apostles always or ever baptize people like Jesus commanded in Mt. 28:19?

3. Is it safe today, for people to be baptized according to Mt. 28:19?

1. Is it necessary for the one doing the baptizing to say anything at that time?

5. If a man being baptized, understood he was being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, but thought he was also being baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, would he be baptized according to Mt. 28:19 and Acts 2:38?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

W. S. SMITH

In paragraph 1 of Miller's first negative he said I gave no Bible—"command, example or necessary inference" for my teaching. I prefer to let those who read this discussion be the judge of that instead of E. H. Miller. He accepts my definition. Thank you, Bro. Miller.

In paragraph 3 he finds the good verse I gave on the establishment of the church, but failed to find that the Lord's law went forth of Zion, the church, and went back before the Spirit came to get Mt. 28:19

to try to disprove what the Spirit taught on pentecost through the apostle Peter.

In paragraph 5 he wants me to tell if repentance and remission of sins were preached into the name of Jesus. Let me answer that by asking him two questions. Can one get into Christ without repentance? Does one receive remission of sins without being baptized into Christ? The preposition in is used in many different ways and has a number of different meanings. Webster gives one definition as being "into". I am sure that it is used that way in the Bible sometimes, but not every time that it is used. I cited Lk. 24:46-49 to show when and where the preaching of repentance and remission of sins began. The gospel of Christ, the perfect law of liberty, that has given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, according to the Bible, began on the day of Pentecost and came this way. Therefore Mt. 28:19 is too far back to be included in the gospel of Christ. Jesus said to the apostles, "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall lose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Mt. 18:18. The apostles never bound baptism on earth in the name of the Trinity, therefore it is not bound in heaven. They bound baptism on earth in or into the name of the Lord Jesus, and it is bound in heaven in the name of Jesus, not in the name of the trinity. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there in none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Therefore people should be baptized into his name and none other, since there is salvation in none other.

In Acts 8:16, the Bible says, "They baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus". (R. V.) Miller said, "They were baptized as Jesus commanded in Mt. 28:19, 'Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'." Which shall we believe, Miller or the Bible? I prefer the Bible. As to the scriptures cited and his comment on the Father, Son and Holy Spirit having different names, I say AMEN. But his statement, "And baptism is to be 'into' each one's name," is not in harmony with what the apostles taught. The name Jesus does not apply to God the Father nor to the Holy Spirit. The apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, never taught any one to be baptized in or into any other name than the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Acts 10:48, "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Verse 43. How did they receive remission of sins through his name? Let Paul open your eyes and turn you from darkness to light. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST HAVE PUT ON CHRIST." Gal. 3:26-27. Did Cornelius put on Christ? If he did, he was baptized INTO CHRIST according to Paul.

Acts 19:5, the Bible says, "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus," and it mentioned none other. Therefore I did not add to God's word when I said they were baptized into the name of the Lord

Jesus and none other. When one says they were baptized into the name of the Trinity they add to God's word and contradict what the apostles taught. I accept Acts 19:5 because it is the teaching of the apostles while they were guided by the Spirit of truth. I reject Mt. 28:19 because the Spirit of truth never guided the apostles to teach baptism in or into the name of the Trinity. Why did the apostles teach people to be baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus? "For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." "Neither is there salvation in any other." Acts 4:12, Acts 22:16, how did Paul call on the name of the Lord? By being baptized into his name. Gal. 3:27.

Bro. Miller agrees that my statement on Rom. 1:16 is true, but he says, "For the gospel of Christ says," then quotes Mt. 28:19, which is no part of the gospel of Christ. According to the prophets and Jesus, the greatest of all prophets, the gospel of Christ began to be preached in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost when the Spirit came to guide the apostles into all truth. Where did any of the apostles, including Paul ever teach baptism in or into the name of the Trinity? Bro. Miller we want scriptural proof instead of your statements.

'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. Rom. 6:3-4. Baptized into his death, was that his church? We are buried with him by baptism into death, not his church. We are baptized into his body, the church, when we are baptized into his name. "For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Bro. Miller and I have agreed that the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit is not Jesus. Now you fix it up with Peter and if you can get him to agree with you, I will go along with Peter.

QUESTIONS

1. Does baptism save? Answer, 1 Peter 3:21. Yes, see Acts 4:12.
2. Bro. Miller said they taught baptism into the name of the Trinity. He gave 6 or 7 passages but only one of their teaching, Heb. 2:1-3. Where did the apostles confirm Trinity baptism?
3. Yes, I believe he did, but Acts 20:27-30 and Gal. 1:6-9 say nothing about Trinity baptism. Mt. 28:19-20 and Mk. 16:15 are not Paul's teaching.
4. Yes, but he did not declare Trinity baptism.
5. Yes. Is the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit, Jesus?

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. No, not the same meaning. Mt. 28:19, Acts 8:16 and 19:5 mean into the name. Acts 2:38 and 10:48 have a wider range of meaning, including both in his name and into his name as in Col. 3:17.
2. Apostles never baptized in the name of the Trinity after Pentecost, according to the Bible.
3. It is not safe for people to be baptized in the name of the Trin-

ity because the apostles taught them to be baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus and the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit is not Jesus.

4. As a rule yes. There may be exceptions, but what is said should be in harmony with what the apostles taught. See Mt. 12:1-5.

5. No. One cannot be baptized into the name of the Trinity and the way the apostles taught it both at the same time.

QUESTIONS

1. Can one be baptized into the Lord Jesus and not be baptized into his name?

2. Were the people of Samaria baptized by the one Spirit into the one body, the church, when they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus?

3. Does one call on the name of the Lord by being baptized into his name? Acts 2:21, Rom. 10:13 and Acts 22:16.

4. Is salvation in the name of the Lord Jesus and none other? Acts 4:12.

5. If salvation is in his name and none other, and the apostles never commanded any one to be baptized into any other name, why should people be baptized into any other name or names?

SECOND NEGATIVE

E. H. MILLER

Doctor Smith says in paragraph 1, "I prefer to let those who read this discussion be the judge." Let him pick "the judge." But "the judge" can't find a Bible verse, given by Doctor Smith, to "reject Mt. 28:19", or saying, "Into the name of Jesus Christ and none other."

In paragraph 2, he finds fault with me for going to Christ's command before Pentecost. Christ is there telling the apostles what to do from Pentecost "unto the end of the world? If they didn't teach or practice what Christ commanded, can we trust in what they did teach and practice? Doctor Smith says, "But—the Lords law went forth of Zion—the Spirit taught on Pentecost through the apostle Peter." He doesn't seem to understand that Christ had taught the apostles his law before Pentecost, and the Spirit brought to their remembrance what Christ had taught, and they went forth from Zion teaching what Christ had taught them!

Before Pentecost, Jesus said, "Go ye into all the world and preach—but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power—Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.—Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (R. V. "into") 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 that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (Mk. 16:15, Lk. 24:46-49, Acts 1:8, Jn. 14:26, Mt. 28:19-20 & Jn 12:48). Thus we see, the apostles were to teach after Pentecost what Christ taught them before Pentecost, the plan of "SAL-

VATION; WHICH AT THE FIRST BEGAN TO BE SPOKEN BY THE LORD, AND WAS CONFIRMED UNTO US BY THEM THAT HEARD HIM" (Mt. 28:19-20, Mk. 16:16 & Heb. 2:1-2).

In paragraph 3 he dodges my question, and says, "Mt. 28:19 is too far back to be included in the gospel of Christ," and he goes 10 chapters farther back trying to prove it. Read Mk. 1:1-14, Lk. 19-22 & Mt. 11:2-5 "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ—Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel—John—sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that should come—Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John—the poor have the gospel preached to them."

in paragraph 4, he says, "Miller said, They were baptized as Jesus commanded in Mt. 28:19—Which shall we believe, Miller or the Bible?" Can't you "believe—the Bible" and that "They were baptized as Jesus commanded"? Doctor Smith says, "The apostles—never taught any one to be baptized in or into any other name than the name of the Lord Jesus." Didn't they teach or baptize "as Jesus commanded"? Acts 2:40 "With many other words did he testify and exhort," Doctor Smith, unless you can tell us what Peter taught in those "many other words," don't try to tell us what he didn't teach that Christ commanded; that, "The apostles—never taught any one to be "baptized as Jesus commanded". I would be ashamed to encourage people to disobey Christ, by teaching them the apostles never obeyed a command of Christ with which he connected salvation (Mt. 28:19 & Mk. 16:16). You say, "I reject Mt. 28:19"; Jesus said, "HE THAT REJECTETH ME, AND RECEIVETH NOT MY WORDS, HATH ONE THAT JUDGETH HIM:" (JN. 12:48). Do you reject that, too?

Paragraph 5, Doctor Smith gives Acts 10:48 to prove his proposition; but that verse says "IN", not "INTO". He also gives Gal. 3:26; Does "faith in Christ" mean faith into Christ? He can't prove either verse means "INTO". He gives Gal. 3:27 "BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST"; "INTO" here is a different word with a different meaning, so cannot take the place of "IN" in Acts 10:48 & Gal. 3:26. Cornelius put on Christ in baptism, but not by being "baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and none other."

Paragraph 6, Doctor Smith says, "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus," This "into" is the same word with the same meaning found in Mt. 28:19; so naturally, baptism "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" would be "into the name of the Lord Jesus" which is "the Son" in Mt. 28:19. Why believe one verse, and "reject Mt. 28:19"? He says, "I did not add to God's word when I said they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus and none other." Yes, for the Bible doesn't say "and none other." Mt. 28:19 gives two others; and it's just as bad to "Reject" as to "add to." He says, "I accept Acts 19:5—I reject Mt. 28:19—which is no part of the Gospel of Christ."

Doctor Smith says in paragraph 7, "The gospel of Christ began to be preached in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost—Bro. Miller we want scriptural proof instead of your statements." Did you give scripture,

showing where "the gospel of Christ began?" No! (Read paragraphs 4 & 5 of this negative for my proof).

Paragraph 8, "Baptized into his death, was this his church," No! He says, "Brother Miller and I have agreed that the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost is not Jesus. Now you fix it up with Peter and if you can get him to agree with you, I will go along with Peter." Peter denied Christ, Doctor Smith says, "I reject Mt. 28:19" the words of Christ. Which is worse? Peter repented of his mistake; Doctor Smith, will you "go along with Peter" and repent of yours? This negative shows the apostles taught the plan of "SALVATION" after Pentecost that Christ taught them before Pentecost (Mt. 28:19 —Mk. 16:16 —Heb. 2:1-3).

Did he forget paragraphs 4, 6, 8,10?

SMITH'S REPLY TO MILLER'S FIRST ANSWERS

2. He fails to see, Heb. 2:1-3 shows they taught what Jesus taught them.

3. He says, "Mt. 28:19-20 and Mk. 16:15 are not Paul's teaching." See paragraphs 3-4 (this negative); Jesus taught the apostles this way of salvation, and Paul taught we should not "neglect so great salvation" (Heb. 2:1-3).

2-4. He speaks of "Trinity," I didn't say "Trinity," but gave Bible proof Paul and others taught and practiced the baptism Jesus commanded (Mt. 28:19—Mk. 16:16—Heb. 2:1-3).

5. To my answer, "Yes; therefore we should be baptized as Christ commanded (Mt. 28:19)." He says, "Yes." Then he asked, "Is the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit, Jesus?" NO! So his "Yes." disproves his proposition!

SMITH'S ANSWERS TO PART OF MILLER'S FIRST QUESTIONS

1. See my second set of questions.
- 2, 3, 5. Not answered (Answer yes or no, or explain more fully if you wish)

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S SECOND SET OF QUESTIONS

1. No, Mt. 28:19-20, Eph. 4:5, Gal. 3:27.
2. Yes, "FOR BY ONE SPIRIT (Eph. 5:25-26, Jn. 6:63 "BY THE WORD—THE WORDS THAT I SPEAK UNTO YOU, THEY ARE SPIRIT") ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY —GO YE THEREFORE—BAPTIZING—INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON (Acts 8:16 "THE LORD JESUS") AND OF THE HOLY GHOST" (1 Cor. 12:13—Mt. 28:19-20).
3. "Calling" ("Invoking his name"), I understand, refers to confessing his name before baptism (Acts 8:37-38), or wearing his name after baptism (Acts 11:26 & 1 Pet. 4:14-16).
4. Yes, Jesus promised salvation to those baptized as he commanded. (Mt. 28:19 & Mk. 16:16).
5. (See answer 4), We can't obtain salvation in his name without being baptized as he commanded.

MILLER'S SECOND SET OF QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. Is baptism "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" in harmony with what Jesus taught in Mt. 28:19?
2. What does "in the name" mean in Acts 2:38; 10:48 & Co!. 3:17?
3. What does "into the name" mean in Mt. 28:19, Acts 8:16 & 19:5?
4. Did Jesus teach the apostles to baptize "in or into any other name than the name of the Lord Jesus" (quotation from paragraph 4, your last affirmative)?
5. Is some Bible teaching (not found after Acts 1) binding and some not binding?

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

W. S. SMITH

Jesus said to the apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Mt. 18:18. They bound baptism on earth in the name of the one Lord and none other. Acts 8:16.

Yes, Jesus taught the apostles EVERYTHING that he wanted them to teach to all nations, and the Holy Spirit brought it to their remembrance as Jesus said He would. Jno. 14:26. The Spirit guided them into all truth for all nations, Jno. 16:13. But He did not guide them to teach baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, therefore, Jesus did not teach them baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit for all nations.

In paragraph three, he tries to condemn me with Jno. 12:48, which was never spoken by Jesus to anyone but the Jews while they were under the law of Moses. Jesus had spoken to them many things concerning the law of Moses and taught them to observe the law of Moses. Mt. 23:1-3. Jesus said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Mt. 15:24. There is one scripture Miller gave that condemns his position, Heb. 2:1-2. Jesus spoke the great salvation to his apostles and it was CONFIRMED UNTO US BY THEM THAT HEARD HIM. Therefore, anything that was not confirmed unto us (the church) by them that heard him is no part of the great salvation for all nations.

In paragraph four he accuses me of dodging his question on Mt. 28:19, and never mentioned Mt. 18:18 which I gave as my proof. Who is dodging the issue? If he believed Mt. 18:18, he would not deny my proposition. That, like Heb. 2:1-4 condemns his teaching. "Read Mk. 1:1-4." We will read a little more of it than he did. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets." Is that the gospel of Jesus in fact, or in prophecy? A little from verse 14. "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel." What gospel? Was it the gospel that Paul preached, Rom. 1:16-17, or was it the gospel of the kingdom? Jesus said, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Lk. 24:47. Is that what Jesus preached to the poor? Mt. 11 and Lk. 7.

Acts 2:40, "With many other words did he testify and exhort," Why stop there:" did you want to change the meaning of it like you did in Mk. 1? What did he say with many other words? "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." He taught the law of pardon to the alien sinner: but it is not all given in Acts 2. See the prophecy in Isa. 28:9-16. "Here a little and there a little." You encourage people to disbelieve Mt. 18:18 and Jno. 16:13 when you teach them baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

God said he would give his people one way, Jer. 32:39. Paul said, "For as MANY OF YOU AS HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST HAVE PUT ON CHRIST." Gal. 3:27. Therefore, if Cornelius put on Christ, he was baptized into Christ, if he was baptized into Christ, he was baptized into his name, THE NAME OF THE LORD. The name, means one name, and the Lord, means one Lord. Will Miller deny that? Therefore, Cornelius was baptized into the name of the one Lord, Acts 10:48, "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." And none other. I just quoted the Bible and then stated the fact. But when you say they were baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, you deny what the Bible said. The same is true with Acts 19:5. "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." According to the Bible they were not baptized into any other name," therefore, none other is no addition. When you say, "They were baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, you add two other names and deny what the Bible says.

Isa. 2:2-3, Mt. 16:19, 18:18, Jno. 14:26, 16:13, Lk. 24:46-49, Acts 2 and 11:15 prove conclusively that the law of Christ to His church began to be preached in his name in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. When did Peter deny Christ? Was it after Jesus gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven? When the Spirit came to guide him into all truth was when he had the power to bind on earth and it was bound in heaven. Now just give me one passage where Peter or any of the apostles taught baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and I will accept it, but your statement without proof is not sufficient. The reason I reject the King James translation of Mt. 28:19 is that none of the apostles ever taught it that way. Heb. 2:1-4 is conclusive proof that your position is wrong and that Jesus did not teach the apostles what you say he did.

Paul declared all the counsel of God. Where did he declare baptism into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit? If you fail to give the passage where Paul declared it, some of the readers may say that you misrepresented Paul. Heb. 2:1-3 does not tell where Paul confirmed it. Is some of the counsel of God that Paul declared not recorded in the Bible? "Whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." See Eph. 3:4-6. The YES to your answer was yours not mine, then I asked. "Is the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit, Jesus?" you say "No", therefore, your answer was wrong. You say, "2,

3, 5, not answered." The readers of this debate can see that I did answer them. Read our agreement again.

MY QUESTIONS ANSWERED?

1. "No", correct, but Mt. 28:19 is no proof.

2. "Yes," true "BY ONE SPIRIT" but not INTO one Spirit as he implied. BY does not mean INTO. "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus" not into the name of the Father and of the Spirit as he would have you believe.

3. Notice his answer, "Confessing his name before baptism, or wearing his name after baptism." Ananias said, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Present tense, not before or after baptism, but while he was being baptized. Like the people of Samaria, he was baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus.

i. "Yes", true. Acts 4:12. Therefore, baptism should be in His name and none other.

S. Your answer to 4 does not answer 5. Mt. 18:18 and what the apostles taught on baptism. They taught baptism into the name of Jesus and none other.

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. "Is baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in harmony with what Jesus taught in Mt. 28:19?" NO. According to Eusebius Pamphili Jesus said, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations in my name", not one word about baptism in that verse. That agrees with everything that the apostles taught. The King James translation contradicts everything that the apostles taught on the name.

2. "What does 'in the name' mean in Acts 2:38, 10:48, & Col. 3:17?" Just what it says.

3. "What does 'into the name' mean in Mt. 28:19, Acts 8:16 & 19:5?" Just what it says.

1. "Did Jesus teach the apostles to baptize 'in or into any other name than the name of the Lord Jesus?" NO.

5. "Is some Bible teaching (not found after Acts 1) binding and some not binding?" If I understand your question, NO. Mt. 18:18, Lk. 24:46-49, Jno. 16:13, and Acts 2.

QUESTIONS FOR MILLER

1. Where did Paul declare baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit?

2. Did Paul teach baptism into the name of Jesus and none other?

3. How many ways did the apostles teach baptism?

4. Does baptism save in one name or three?

5. How did the apostles bind baptism on earth?

THIRD NEGATIVE

E. H. MILLER

I was surprised to find Doctor Smith replied very little to my last negative; but he is in the affirmative, so is to affirm as he thinks best.

In paragraph 1, Doctor Smith says, "The apostles—bound baptism on earth in the name of the one Lord and none other. Acts 8:16." That verse, nor any other Bible verse teaches that. They taught what Jesus commanded Mt. 28:19-20, Mk. 16:16 & Heb. 2:1-3.

In paragraph 2, he rejects Mt. 28:19, because he can't find an apostle repeating it; yet he gives other verses he claims binding, not repeated by apostles. Is nothing binding, if not repeated after Acts 1? If not, Why does Doctor Smith use so much of it?

In paragraph 3, he seems to reject Jn. 12:48 with all other sayings of Jesus not repeated by an apostle. The way he has it, the Jews who lived and died from then till Acts, will be judged by the words of Jesus (not the law). All after that, can reject all the words of Jesus not repeated by an apostle. He says Heb. 2 condemns me; "Anything that was not confirmed by them that heard him is no part of the great salvation." I might add, anything not "FIRST—SPOKEN BY THE LORD" is no part of the "GREAT SALVATION" according to Heb. 2; and the Lord never spake of baptism "into the name of Jesus Christ and none other." But, "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST." That was written by an apostle after the baptisms of Acts 2.

He still dodges my question, spoken of in paragraph 4; he can't answer. I showed Jesus commanded Mt. 28:19-20, and they taught (made binding) what Jesus commanded (paragraph 3, 2nd negative). He tries to make "As it is written in the prophets," mean the gospel was written there (instead of prophesied there). By inserting "." instead of "," he makes it look fairly good. The gospel was not preached by the prophets; but by Jesus and the apostles (Heb. 2). By Jesus first, then by the apostles to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

Paragraph 5 is pitiful, he thinks (?) "Save yourselves from this untoward generation" the "MANY OTHER WORDS" Peter did "TESTIFY AND EXHORT," Then he accepts my teaching of Acts 2:40, by saying, "He taught the law of pardon to the alien sinner; but it is not all given in Acts 2." Thank you Doctor Smith! Peter "taught the law of pardon" given by Jesus (Mt. 28:19, Mk. 16:16 & Heb. 2:1-3). I don't "REJECT" Christ's teaching like Doctor Smith; I accept MT. 18:18 and 28:19.

Paragraph 6, "The name, means one name," "THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST" doesn't mean one name; Jesus taught baptism "INTO THE NAME OF" each. Mt. 10:48 is included in Mt. 28:19; I accept, Doctor Smith says, "I reject."

In paragraph 7, Doctor Smith wants to know "where any of the apostles taught" Mt. 28:19. The apostle Matthew, there wrote how all the apostles were to baptize. But Doctor Smith says, "I reject the King James transition of Mt. 28:19." Ait translations of the Bible teach it the same way ("FATHER—SON—HOLY GHOST"); Doctor Smith can't find one translation of the New Testament, or a copy from which we get translations, that doesn't include the three. Doctor Smith admitted, "the law of pardon—is not all given in Acts 2." Heb. 2 shows they taught salvation first "spoken by the Lord" (Mt. 28:19 & Mk. 16:16). All translations of the Bible condemn Doctor Smith in Mt. 28:19, so he says, "I reject Mt. 28:19".

The first of paragraph 8 is answered already. Doctor Smith says, "The YES to your answer was yours not mine," Wrong, he said "Yes." to my answer, "Yes; therefore we should baptize as Christ commanded (Mt. 28:19)." No quotation marks around his "Yes."

In answer 2, I didn't imply INTO one Spirit. Read again: I showed Baptism by the Spirit, means by the words of Jesus (1 Cor. 12:15, Jn. 6:65, Eph. 5:25-26 & Mt. 28:19).

Replying to my third answer, he has "calling on the name of the Lord.' present tense," That helps me, not him; for, "be baptized" is future tense. Paul said then ("present tense") "invoking his name," later (future tense) "BE BAPTIZED." One thing sure, "calling on the name of the Lord" is not BEING BAPTIZED (present tense), as Doctor Smith implies; but wouldn't help him if it was.

He says, "The readers of this debate can see that I did answer." I here give my questions, and his reply (not answers), for the readers to see.

2. "Did the apostles always or ever baptize people like Jesus commanded in Mt. 28:19?" REPLY, "The apostles never baptized in the name of the Trinity after Pentecost, according to the Bible." That doesn't say, if they ever did or not; and I didn't ask about "the Trinity."

3. "Is it safe today, for people to be baptized according to Mt. 28:19?" REPLY, "It is not safe for people to be baptized in the name of the Trinity because the apostles taught them to be baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus and the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit is not Jesus." That doesn't answer my question; "Trinity" is not in Mt. 28:19. I want an answer!

5. "If a man being baptized, understood he was being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, but thought he was also being baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; Would he be baptized according to Mt. 28:19 and Acts 2:38?" REPLY, "No. One cannot be baptized into the name of the Trinity and the way the apostles taught it both at the same time." He uses "Trinity" again, but I guess his "No" means you can't obey both Bible verses, but if you did, it wouldn't be according to both verses.

SMITH'S ANSWERS TO MILLER'S SECOND SET OF QUESTIONS

1. He's already said, "I reject Mt. 28:19"; now he tells us why "Eusebius" an uninspired man (lived 260-364) didn't quote it as found in any Bible; therefore, that part of the Bible is not true (Mk. 7:7). "Eusebius" never wrote, or translated the Bible. I have just checked 39 translations, or revisions of the New Testament (8 of them older than the King James translation), and they all have what Doctor Smith says, "I reject." And as far as I know all the Greek copies we have to translate from have it.

2. & 3. More dodging; he uses Acts 10:48, etc., to prove his proposition; yet has admitted "IN" doesn't mean the same as "INTO." He should tell us what "IN" and "INTO" the name means.

1. He rejects all translations of the New Testament, and Greek Testaments from which we get our translations.

5. He teaches, you can't commit adultery in heart (Mt. 5), and rejects all Christ taught, that's not repeated after Acts 1.

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S THIRD SET OF QUESTIONS

1. Where did Paul declare baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? In the same verse Paul declared baptism "into the name of Jesus." Can you find it?

2. "Did Paul teach baptism into the name of Jesus and none other?" No! He taught what Jesus commanded (Mt. 28:19, Mk. 16:16 & Heb. 2:1-4).

3. "How many ways did the apostles teach baptism?" "IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST" which was "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST," (Acts 10:48 & Mt. 28:19). Thus, one way.

4. "Does baptism save in one name or three?" "IN" one name, and "INTO" three (see 3).

5. "How did the apostles bind baptism on earth?" As Jesus commanded (Mt. 28:19-20).

MILLER'S THIRD SET OF QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. Are we to just obey the Bible from Acts 2, and "reject" the rest?

2. You say, "I reject Mt. 28:19"; why hasn't the infidel as much right to "reject" all the Bible?

3. You accept "Eusebius," and say, "I reject Mt. 28:19"; Is "Eusebius" a translation of "scripture—given by inspiration of God." (2 Tim. 3:16?)

4. What does the words "IN" and "INTO" as asked in 2nd set of questions (2 & 5), and as used in your affirmative, mean?

5. You say, "both in his name and into his name." What is the meaning of "IN HIS NAME" & "INTO HIS NAME," what do those expressions mean?

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

W. S. SMITH

"Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Mat. 18:18. They bound baptism on earth in the name of the one Lord and none other. Acts 8:16. Miller said, "That verse, nor any other Bible verse teaches that." It says, "They were baptized in (or into) the name of the Lord Jesus." It mentions none other. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Is the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit given among men under heaven? If Bro. Miller believed Acts 4:12, he would not say that Acts 8:16 teaches baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. I do not reject any of the Lord's teaching (knowingly) from the first of Genesis to the last of Revelation. I do not accept, use or teach any scripture as commands to the people of God in this age that was not taught by the apostles after they received baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Is Mt. 23:1-2 the words of Jesus? Did he command the Jews to observe the law of Moses? Did you see his comment on Mt. 15:24? Neither did I. You might ADD many things to Heb. 2:3, but you had better not ADD to it. Rev. 22:18. Yes, Mt. 28:19 was written after the baptism of Acts 2, so was Mt. 23:1-2, does that make them commands to the church? Was the gospel that Christ preached to the poor, repentance and remission of sins in his own name that began in Jerusalem? Peter preached the law of pardon on the day of Pentecost, but he did not preach baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Baptized in one name and none other," Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Is that the way Bro. Miller teaches salvation or does he teach it in three names? Is that accepting or rejecting Acts 4:12?

Miller said, "Mt. 28:19. The apostle Matthew there wrote how all the apostles were to baptize." That statement cannot be true, because we have no record of any apostle ever baptizing into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. I do not reject Mt. 28:19. I do reject translations of it and many other passages which make them contradict what the Holy Spirit taught through the apostles. "The first of paragraph 8 answered"? Paul declared all the counsel of God. Where did he declare baptism into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit? You did not give the passage, and you never will give it, for there is no such passage. Paul said, "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." Did you see what Miller said about Eph. 3:4-6? Neither did I; he failed to say it. Why?

The "yes" not being in quotation marks is my mistake; but I believe that the readers can see who was wrong. Baptism into the name of Jesus is by the Spirit and by the WORD, but it is not into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is into the name of JESUS; "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name

under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Miller said, "One thing sure, 'calling on the name of the Lord' is not BEING BAPTIZED (present tense)." Ananias said, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, CALLING ON THE NAME OF THE LORD." Was that present tense, while he was being baptized, or was it three days before he was baptized when he confessed the Lord? Was it some time after he was baptized while he was wearing the Lord's name?

Miller said, "I didn't ask about 'the Trinity!.'" "Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost." Webster. There is no record any where in the Bible where any apostle ever baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Therefore it is not safe to baptize that way today. One cannot be baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost and like Peter commanded in Acts 2:38 both at the same time. Miller said, "I guess his 'no' means you can't obey both Bible verses." Can you obey Mt. 23:1-3 and Acts 2:38 both at the same time?

"Eusebius an uninspired man." Do you know of any translators who were not uninspired men? (Mk. 7:7). Is the doctrine that the apostles taught, the commandments of men? Did you see verse 9? Do you reject the command to be baptized into one name to keep the tradition of baptizing into three names? "He teaches you can't commit adultery in heart, (Mt. 5)". Why such a statement? It has nothing to do with the subject we are discussing and I do not teach such. Did Paul declare baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in Acts 19:5? "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." Did Paul baptize them? He taught them how to be baptized and laid his hands on them. No baptism there in three names. You were mistaken in the verse; try it again. Paul taught baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus in Acts 19:1-5 and they were baptized into his name and none other. That is the way Paul confirmed it unto us. Heb. 2:3. Miller was wrong again. One way for baptism, into one name and into three names. One way? Baptism saves "IN one name and INTO three." (Miller). The Bible says, "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. How did the apostles bind baptism on earth? Miller said, "As Jesus commanded (Mt. 28:19-20)." Where did they bind it that way? There is no record in the Bible where any apostle ever taught baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. "Are we to just obey the Bible from Acts 2, and 'reject' the rest?" No. Do not reject any of the Bible that is the Word of God. Do not accept anything as the law of Christ to His church which was not taught by the apostles after they received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Jno. 16:13.

2. "You say, I reject Mt. 28:19; why hasn't the infidel as much right to 'reject' all the Bible?" You misquote me; I do not reject Mt. 28:19; I only reject the translations of it that make it contradict what the Lord and his apostles taught. The infidel like all others who will

not receive the love of the truth that they might be saved. "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a He; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2:10-12.

3. "You accept Eusebius' and say, I reject Mt. 28:19'. Is "Eusebius' a translation of scripture—given by inspiration of God. (2 Tim. 3:16)?" I accept Mt. 28:19 the way Eusebius translated it, because it agrees with what the Lord and his apostles taught. Eusebius was a man, not scripture. See. 2 Tim. 2:15 and do not wrest 2 Tim. 3:16 to your own destruction.

1. "What does the words 'IN' and 'INTO' as asked in the 2nd set of questions (2 & 3) and as used in your affirmative mean?" Just what they say, not his name and two more. See Webster.

5. "You say 'both in his name and into his name,'" what is the meaning of 'IN HIS NAME' and 'INTO HIS NAME'. What do those expressions mean?" Answered in 4.

QUESTIONS

1. How did the apostles bind things on earth, by teaching them or by saying nothing about them?

2. Did the apostles bind some things on earth that are not recorded in the Bible?

3. How may we know what the apostles bound on earth?

4. Did Paul declare the counsel of God by teaching it?

5. What is the difference in John's baptism and Christian baptism?

FOURTH NEGATIVE

E. H. MILLER

Doctor Smith begins, "Verily I say unto you—whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." I don't find where they ever loosed Mt. 28:19, which is according to Acts 4:12 & 8:16; but Doctor Smith said, "I reject Mt. 28:19".

Jesus taught people under Moses' law to obey it (Mt. 23:1-3); in Mt. 5:27-28 Jesus is contrasting His law with Moses' law: Doctor Smith accepts 27, but rejects 28 because no apostle repeated it after Acts 2. Jesus didn't preach to all nations, neither did the apostles under the first commission; but Jesus taught the apostles His law, and instructed them in the great commission to teach it to all nations as the way of salvation (Mk. 16:16; Mt. 28:19; Heb. 2:1-3 & 12:1-2). The baptism in Mt. 28:19 is the one Christ is the author of; if Peter never baptized "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST:" he never baptized "IN THE NAME OF JESUS" ("by the authority of the Lord," Thayer). Baptism "IN THE NAME OF JESUS" is "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST:" I accept both, Doctor Smith said, "I reject Mt. 28:19". "That statement cannot be true, because we have no record of any apostle ever baptizing into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit." Do you "have—record of

any apostle ever baptizing" "into the name of Jesus Christ and none other?" NO!

In Eph. 3:4-6, something was "revealed unto his apostles;" WHAT WAS IT? "AH things—whatsoever I have said unto you" (Mk. 16:16; Lk. 24:45-49; John 14:26 and Mt. 28:19-20). Doctor Smith asked, "When did Paul declare baptism into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit?" ANSWER, When he declared the "salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord," (Mk. 16:16; Mt. 28:19 & Heb. 2:1-3). "Baptized" "BY ONE SPIRIT" (1 Cor. 12:13), is "the washing of water BY THE WORD" (Eph. 5:26). "THE WORDS" Jesus spake "ARE SPIRIT" (Jn. 6:63); so baptism by the Spirit is by (according to) the words of Jesus. (Mt. 28:19).

Doctor Smith does "REJECT MT. 28:19" in all Bibles (translated and untranslated); and accepts a man's quotation of it, in a book he doesn't have, and perhaps couldn't read if he did. He quotes a Roman Catholic's quotation, where EUSEBIUS left out "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" in a quotation of Mt. 28:19. But I can use EUSEBIUS, too! For James Hastings's Encyclopedia says, "Eusebius quotes Mt. 28:19—Four times in the ordinary text;" So "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" is in four quotation of Mt. 28:19 by Eusebius. All translated Bibles disprove his proposition; so no wonder he said, "I REJECT MT. 28:19".

Doctor Smith said, "Miller said—'Matthew—wrote how all the apostles were to baptize.' That statement cannot be true, because we have no record of any apostle ever baptizing into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit." Does he reject Jn. 3:5, "because we have no record of any apostle ever" saying "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,"? Doctor Smith seems to want to look unto the apostles as "the author and finisher of our faith." (Heb. 12:1).

Doctor Smith said, "I reject Mt. 28:19" (as found in all Bibles), but he accepts Eusebius Pamphilus's quotation of it in some book (not Bible), that leaves out "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST;" and rejects the four times Eusebius quotes that verse, including "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST." Will Doctor Smith reject Mt. 28:20 as quoted in Bible and by Eusebius, and say, That statement cannot be true, because we have no record of any apostle ever teaching and doing as Jesus commanded in Mt. 18:15-22?

Webster's definition of "Trinity" (a word I haven't used) doesn't answer the questions he's refused to answer. He asked, "Can you obey Mt. 23:1-3 and Acts 2:38 both at the same time?" No, all that was not given for all nations, like the baptism in Mk. 16:16; Mt. 28:19 and Acts 2:38. Baptism into the name of the three, will certainly be "IN" and "INTO" the name of Jesus (one of the three). You can't obey Acts 2:38, and "reject Mt. 28:19".

Doctor Smith asked, "Do you know of any translators who were not uninspired men?" No, but "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" is

in Mt. 28:19 in all untranslated Bibles, therefore in all translated Bibles! Speaking of Mk. 7, he asked, "Did you see verse 9?" Yes, and it sure hit Doctor Smith, who said, "I REJECT MT. 28:19" "ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS PAMPHILI" (Christ, "YE HOLD THE TRADITION OF MEN—YE REJECT THE COMMANDMENT OF GOD," Mk. 7:7-9). You can't baptize into the name of Father and Son, without baptizing into the name of Jesus. I accept all of Mt. 28:19 & 5:28; Doctor Smith said, "Bible teaching (not found after Acts 1)—not binding"; "I do not accept—any scripture as commands in this age that was not taught by the apostles." Heb. 2:3 proves apostles confirmed Mk. 16:16 & Mt. 28:19. Doctor Smith asked, "Where did they bind it that way?" Just answered; they didn't loose what Jesus bound, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved—go ye therefore—baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost—salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard them;". That disproves Doctor Smith's statement, "There is no record where any apostle ever taught baptism into the name of the Father". Yes, the Bible says, "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON" but it doesn't say, "INTO THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST AND NONE OTHER", as Doctor Smith is affirming.

DOCTOR SMITH'S ANSWERS TO PART OF MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. This answer, and paragraph 1, forbids accepting Jn. 3:3-5; Mt. 5:28; 6:19; 18:14-20 & 24:5.

2. He cries out, "You misquote me, I do not reject Mt. 28:19; I only reject the translations of it." In his second affirmative he said, "Mt. 28:19 is too far back to be included in the gospel of Christ." "I reject Mt. 28:19 because the Spirit of truth never guided the apostles to teach baptism into the name of the Trinity." You see, Doctor Smith falsely accused me," will he confess his mistake?

3. He said, "I accept Mt. 28:19 the way Eusebius translated it," Eusebius didn't translate Mt. 28:19; just quoted it! and in four of his quotations, he quotes, "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" therein.

1. "IN" and "INTO"—Mean "Just what they say, not his name and two more." Isn't that a wonderful answer to, "What does 'in the name'—Acts 2:38; 10:48—'into the name'—Mt. 28:19, Acts 8:16—and as used in your affirmative mean?" He refused to answer in second set of questions, and third set also!

5. "Just what they say," I'm surprised at Doctor Smith! Refusing to answer two out of five questions in each set I've asked. He says, "See Webster." WHY? If "IN" and "INTO" mean "just what they say"; I guess all other words do, too! So a child in the second grade should know as much about what words mean as Webster, or any school Professor.

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S QUESTIONS

1. "How did the apostles bind things on earth, by teaching them or by saying nothing about them?"—By teaching them, Mk. 16:15-16; Mt. 28:19 & Heb. 2:1-3.

2. "Did the apostles bind some things on earth that are not recorded in the Bible?"—NO!

3. "How may we know what the apostles bound on earth?"—By studying their writings, AND what Jesus taught them (Mt. 28:19-20).

4. "Did Paul declare the counsel of God by teaching it?"—Yes, but if "all the counsel of God" could be learned from what is recorded of Paul's teaching to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:16-27), we wouldn't need the rest of his teachings, Christ's, or the other apostles' teachings. Thus we know from Acts 20, Paul taught the Ephesian elders something not recorded in his teaching to them, but in other recorded teachings; his, Christ's or of the other apostles (Heb. 2:1-3).

5. "What is the difference in John's baptism and Christian baptism?"—"John's baptism" is mentioned in the Bible; infant baptism and "Christian baptism" is not.

REJOINDER

W. S. SMITH

My statement, "Mt. 28:19 is too far back to be included in the gospel of Christ that began in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost," is not a denial nor an acceptance of that passage. I have neither the space nor the liberty (according to our agreement) to answer the new arguments that Miller has used in his fourth negative on Mt. 5:27-28, Thayer, James Hastings Encyclopedia, Jno. 3:5, et al. Articles one and two of our agreement take care of them and show that Miller is wrong. Why did Miller wait until his last negative to mention Eph. 3:4-6 and then apply it to the apostles instead of the Gentiles to whom Paul was writing? "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ."

Jesus said to his apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Mt. 18:18. They bound baptism on earth in or into the NAME OF THE LORD JESUS. Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:1-5 and 22:16. Therefore it is bound that way in heaven. They never bound it on earth in any NAME BUT THE NAME OF JESUS and that is the way it is bound in heaven. Jesus said to them, "When he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." Jno. 16:13. The spirit guided them to teach baptism into the NAME OF THE LORD JESUS. Acts 19:5, 22:16, Rom. 6:3, and 1 Cor. 6:11. It never guided them to baptize or teach baptism into any other NAME BUT THAT OF JESUS, therefore the Spirit of truth teaches people to be baptized into the NAME OF JESUS AND NONE OTHER.

Paul declared all the counsel of God, Acts 20:27. There is not a place on record where Paul declared baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; therefore it is no part of the counsel of God. Acts 2:38, 10:43 and 1 Cor. 6:11 teach that we receive the remission of sins through THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS; not through his name and two more. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. "Baptism doth also now save us." 1 Pet. 3:21. Since THE NAME OF JESUS IS THE ONLY NAME UNDER HEAVEN GIVEN AMONG MEN WHEREBY WE MUST BE SAVED, THE SCRIPTURES

TEACH THAT PEOPLE SHOULD BE BAPTIZED INTO THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS AND NONE OTHER.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

E. H. MILLER

The Scriptures teach, people should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

By "Scriptures," I mean the word of God. By "teach", I mean there is a Bible statement, command, example or necessary inference for such. By "people" I mean lost men, women, boys and girls out of Christ. By "should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ," I mean His name is the only name in which they should be baptized. By "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." I mean "into the name of the Father—Son and—Holy Ghost" and none other.

Instead of spending so much time explaining what Bible verses mean, I prefer to just quote at present (without comment), Bible verses in different versions or translations. The first verse is Acts 2:38; quoted from the KINGS JAMES, AMERICAN STANDARD, REVISED STANDARD, and REVISED VERSION. All four say, "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ".

Since Doctor Smith agrees, people are to "BE BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST," as just read from the Bible, and I am affirming, I see no need of giving more Bible proof of that at present; so will pass to the next part of my proposition. Let us read many versions or translations of Mt. 28:19—

REVISED VERSION

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost:"

AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:"

"AN IMPROVED EDITION" by the "AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY"

"Baptizing (immersing) them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:"

WORRELL'S TRANSLATION

"Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:"

THE LIVING ORACLES TRANSLATION

"Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:"

JULIA SMITHS TRANSLATION

"TRANSLATED LITERALLY FROM THE ORIGINAL TONGUE"

"Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

THE EMPHASIZES BIBLE

"Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

J. W. HANSON'S TRANSLATION

Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

AMERICAN BIBLE UNION VERSION

"Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

BROTHER BENJAMIN WILSON'S TRANSLATION

"Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

GEORGE NOYE'S TRANSLATION

Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

CUNNINGTONS TRANSLATION

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

MONTGOMERY'S TRANSLATION

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

CONCORDANT VERSION

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

WILLIAMS' TRANSLATION

Baptize them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit:"

WEYMOUTH'S TRANSLATION

"Baptize them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

ALFORD'S TRANSLATION

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"

I have now read from more than one dozen translations of "THE SCRIPTURES" that "PEOPLE SHOULD 'BE BAPTIZED' INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST:" (or "HOLY SPIRIT"), the part of my affirmative that Doctor Smith denies. As a matter of fact, all Bibles (translated or untranslated) refer to "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" in Mt. 28:19. Here are a few more —

DARBY'S NEW TRANSLATION FROM THE GREEK ORIGINAL

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

NEW WORLD TRANSLATION OF THE CHRISTIAN

GREEK SCRIPTURES

"The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

J. B. PHILLIPS' TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Spirit;"

GOODSPEED'S TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit;"

MOFFATT'S TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit;"

FERRAR FENTON'S TRANSLATION

The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

GEORGE LAMSA'S TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

REVISED STANDARD VERSION

The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

WILLIAM BALLANTINE'S TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

HOKE'S TRANSLATION

The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;"

JOHN WESLEY'S TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"

THE REVISED CHALLONER-RHEIMS VERSION

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

YOUNG'S LITERAL TRANSLATION

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"

WYCLIFFE'S TRANSLATION—1380

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"

JOHN PURVEY'S REVISED VERSION—1388

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"

TYNDALE'S TRANSLATION—1526

"The name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost;"

COVERDALES TRANSLATION—1535

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"

CRANMER'S TRANSLATION—1539

"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"

GENEVA VERSION—1557

"The name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

RHEIMS VERSION—1582

"The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

Notice, those last seven versions are older than the King James version, and include the first to ever be written in English. Thus I have given more than three dozen translations or versions of the New Testament that refer to "THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST" in Mt. 28:19. Doctor Smith doesn't seem to want to accept the "modern translations;" so I also gave the oldest, yea, the "most ancient translations" into English.

We will now notice the untranslated. The following HEAVY CAPITAL LETTER WORDS are Greek words found in the Greek Text of "Westcott and Hort", "Stevens," and "Griesbach" in Mt. 28:19. The English words in small letters under the Greek words, are those found in Wilson's Greek-English Interlinear New Testament.

"BAPTIZONTES AUTOUS EIS TO ONOMA TOU PATROS KAI TOU
 "Immersing them into the name of the Father and of the
 UIOU KAI TOU AGIOU PNEUMATOS"
 Son and of the Holy Spirit."

If Doctor Smith rejects the more than three dozen translations of Mt. 28:19 which I have given, let him find one; yes, just one Bible that

doesn't have "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" in Mt. 28:19. If he rejects the translation of the GREEK MANUSCRIPTS by Brother Benjamin Wilson in his GREEK-ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT as quoted by me), let him give us a translation of the Greek words found in Mt. 28:19 that he will accept.

My proposition is proven, so I see no need of saying more until I hear more from Doctor Smith; so will close with the following questions.

QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. What Bible (translated or untranslated) renders Mt. 28:19 acceptable to you?
2. What Bible is in existence that renders Mt. 28:19 in such a way that any one could have ever obeyed it and pleased God?
3. If people are baptized according to the words of Jesus (Mt. 28:19), will they be saved according to the words of Jesus (Mk. 16:16)?
 - I. I asked, "What does 'in the name' mean in—Acts 10:48?" You said, "See Webster." Webster says, "By the authority of;" Thayer says, "By the authority of the Lord, Acts 10:48." Are Webster and Thayer correct on this question?

FIRST NEGATIVE

W. S. SMITH

Miller said in his supposed explanation of his proposition, "By should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, I mean his name is the only name in which they should be baptized." He gave four translations of Acts 2:38; but he did not tell what he meant by, "In the name of Jesus Christ." But regardless of what he means by, "In the name of Jesus," he said, "I mean his name is THE ONLY NAME IN WHICH THEY SHOULD BE BAPTIZED." Then he gave a number of translations of Mt. 28:19 that says, "Baptizing them IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." Are they all three, Jesus Only?

Miller says, "Doctor Smith doesn't seem to want to accept the 'modern translations' so I also gave the oldest, yea, the 'most ancient translations' into English. "What was the most ancient he gave? 1380, about a thousand years after the development of baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Then he goes to the Greek, saying, "We will now notice the untranslated" and mentions Westcott and Hort, Stevens, and Griesbach, in Mt. 28:19. He quotes from the Emphatic Diaglott. look in the first part of it under the heading "History of the Greek text," and you will find that the first edition of the New Testament printed in Greek and Latin was completed Jan. 10, 1514, more than a thousand years after the development of Trinity baptism. Note also that it was taken from different MSS of the Greek and Latin texts. Was Matthew's original text written in Greek?

If Jesus is the author of Mt. 28:19 (R. V.) the way Miller would have it read, it would make every one of his apostles traitors; for there

is no record in the Bible where any apostle ever taught or practiced baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Jesus, in Mt. 16:19, 18:18 and Jno. 16:13 teaches that the Holy Spirit through the apostles would teach all of the gospel truth to all nations. They never taught baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; therefore it is no part of the gospel truth.

Jesus said to the apostles, "When he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." When he came he guided the apostles to teach baptism into the name of Jesus and none other. WHY? Because baptism saves us. 1 Pet. 3:21. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. "My proposition is proven." (Miller). How is it proven? He has not given one passage where any apostle ever baptized or taught baptism "Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Every one of his proof texts on this part of his proposition, translated or untranslated, are more than a thousand years since the development of baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

In Miller's last negative he said, "James Hastings Encyclopedia says, 'Eusebius quotes Mt. 28:19—four times in the ordinary text' so 'Father—Son and Holy Ghost' is in four quotation of Mt. 28:19 by Eusebius." Amen. Bro. Miller why did you not give us the vol. and page where Hastings gave that quotation? Why did you not tell us that in vol 2, p. 380, Hastings said that Eusebius cited Mt. 28:19 twenty-one times, and that the first 17 times it was "Go ye therefore and teach all nations in my name," and that the last four times it was "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit?" Why did you not tell us why Eusebius made the change. And why did you not tell us that on the same page Mr. Hastings gave three reasons why the baptismal formula of Mt. 28:19 could not be the language of the Son of God?

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. What Bible (translated or untranslated) renders Mt. 28:19 acceptable to you? Answer. None that I know of.
2. What Bible is in existence that renders Mt. 28:19 in such a way that any one could have ever obeyed it and pleased God? Answer. None. It is evident that the original MSS was changed before it was ever put into a book. Anything that would make the Son of God contradict himself would not please God.
3. If people are baptized according to the words of Jesus (Mt. 28:19), will they be saved according to the words of Jesus (Mk. 16:16). Answer. YES. The words of Jesus in Mt. 28:19 were, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations IN MY NAME." The apostles obeyed that command and taught baptism INTO THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS AND NONE OTHER. Acts 8:16, and 19:5.
 - i. I asked, "What does 'in the name' mean in Acts 10:48, You said, 'see Webster,' Webster says 'by the authority of, Thayer says, 'by the authority of the Lord,' Acts 10:48. Are Webster and Thayer correct

on this questions?" Answer. Yes, like Webster is correct on sprinkling for baptism. Webster and Thayer define words according to their common usage by the people. According to the Son of God, "In His Name" does not mean by his authority. But when we do anything "In his name." we had better be sure that we have His Authority or it will not be pleasing to God. Some of the Jews at Ephesus tried doing things in Jesus name without His authority and the results were not very gratifying to them. Acts 19:13-17. If "In Jesus name" means by his authority, every deceiver that comes in Jesus name, comes by his authority; and Jesus said, "MANY SHALL COME IN MY NAME saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." Mt. 24:5.

QUESTIONS FOR MILLER

1. If the baptismal formula in Mt. 28:19 is the language of Jesus as you claim it is, to whom was he speaking?
2. If it was to the eleven apostles only, when a man says, "By the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, I baptize thee into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit," is his statement true or false?
3. When one is baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, if it saves him, is he saved in one name or three?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

E. H. MILLER

I am surprised at Doctor Smith; he said, "Miller said—'By should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, I mean his name is the only name in which they should be baptized.'—But he did not tell what he meant by, 'In the name of Jesus Christ.'" I fed him out of his own spoon! In defining his proposition, he said, "I mean that his name is the ONLY name into which they should be baptized," "but he did not tell what he meant by, 'Into the name of Jesus Christ.'" I asked him, "What does 'in the name' (and) 'into the name' mean? He answered, "Just what is says." (His answer to my second set of questions). I guess I can agree with Doctor Smith on one point, I "mean by, 'in the name of Jesus Christ'—'Just what it says."

Acts 2:38 & Col. 3:17 is, "IN (Greek, "EN") the name." We are not to baptize, or do any thing "EN" the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; but Mt. 28:19 teaches baptism "INTO (Greek, "EIS") the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost:" (Revised Version).

Doctor Smith seems to want to make us think there were no Greek New Testaments before "Jan. 10, 1514," but I quoted an English translation, published in 1380! This English translation was WRITTEN, not "PRINTED." There were written Greek New Testaments over 1000 years before "1514", and they all had "Father—Son and—Holy Ghost" in Mt. 28:19; so "the 'most ancient translations' into English" were not "about a thousand years after the development of baptism in (into) the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." As Doctor Smith would have us believe! Why, his own witness that died over 1600 years ago, quoted Father, Son and Holy Ghost in Mt. 28:19, over 1100 years before 1514.

Doctor Smith said, "He has not given one passage where any apostle ever baptized or taught baptism 'Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'" I quoted a passage where Jesus commanded baptism "Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." (Mt. 28:19 & Heb. 12:2). The copies of the New Testament (translated & untranslated) that I quoted from harmonize with those over 1000 years older than the ones I quoted. Doctor Smith's own witness quoted a copy over 1600 years ago, so "Father—Son and—Holy Ghost" was in Mt. 28:19 before the year 340.

In regards to "the apostles—never taught baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit;" They didn't have to repeat elsewhere what they recorded in the gospels that Jesus taught as his law, such as Jn. 3:5; Mt. 18:15-22 & 28:18-20 & 5:28.

Where did the Spirit of truth guide "the apostles to teach baptism into the name of Jesus and none other.?" NO WHERE! Jesus taught the apostles "great salvation" which Paul said "was confirmed unto us by them" (Mk. 16:16, Mt. 28:19-20 and Heb. 2:1-3). According to Mt. and Mk. Jesus promised, "HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED" "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST" "SHALL BE SAVED;" that baptism is "IN THE NAME OF (Webster, "BY THE AUTHORITY OF") THE LORD." (Thayer, "BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORD, ACTS 10:48"). The baptism spoken of in Mt. & Mk. is "IN THE NAME OF ("BY THE AUTHORITY OF") JESUS CHRIST;" baptism not "INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST" is not "IN THE NAME OF ("BY THE AUTHORITY OF") JESUS CHRIST." Therefore, it would not be according to Mt. 28:19-20, Mk. 16:16, Heb. 2:1-4, Heb. 12:1-2 and Acts 4:12.

Doctor Smith said, "Father—Son and Holy Ghost' is in four questions of Mt. 28:19 by Eusebius." But it was "the last four times." Well, that was over 1600 years ago, and still in my favour. Doctor Smith would have you think, "Mr. Hastings gave three reasons why the baptismal formula of Mt. 28:19 could not be the language of the Son of God;" but I here quote from page 381, "Baptism in the trine name—from the beginning it was unquestionably practiced by all Christians, and it is urged that this would not be so if it had not been instituted by Christ." You see, Doctor Smith was wrong in saying, the oldest English translation quoted by me, was "1360, about a thousand years after the development of baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." Hastings didn't say, "Mt. 28:19 could not be the language of the Son of God" but he did say, "from the beginning it was unquestionably practiced by all Christians."

When I baptize a person, I say, "'IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS,' I now baptize you 'INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST:'" You will notice, all but four words of that statement is quoted from the Bible; so I am affirming, "The Scriptures teach, people should 'BE BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST,'

and INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST." You will notice, all but six words of my affirmative is quoted from the Bible; so the only way Doctor Smith can even try to disprove it, is say, "I reject Mt. 28:19 because the Spirit of truth never guided the apostles to teach baptism into the name of the Trinity." Yes, HE REJECTS THE PART OF THE BIBLE that contains the last half of my proposition; so why offer more? He may say, "I reject" that too.

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S QUESTIONS

1. "If the baptismal formula in Mt. 28:19 is the language of Jesus as you claim it is, to whom was he speaking?"—The apostles.
2. "If it was to the eleven apostles only, when a man says, 'By the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, I baptize thee into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,' is his statement true or false?" — True, Mt. 28:19-20 & Heb. 2:1-3.
3. "When one is baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, if it saves him, is he saved in one name or three?" —IN (Greek, "EN", Acts 4:12 & 10:48) one name, which brings him INTO (Greek, "EIS," Mt. 28:19) contact and relationship with the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; thus INTO the name of the three.

QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. Is there a Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't teach baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in Mt. 28:19?
2. If there is a Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't include the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in the baptism in Mt. 28:19, which one is it?
3. What Bible (translated or untranslated) fails to teach what I am affirming?
4. If you were convinced that Jesus said in Mt. 28:19, "BAPTIZING THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST" would you accept my proposition as proven?
5. If salvation is by baptism IN (Greek, "EN") THE NAME OF JESUS ONLY; and that puts us INTO (Greek, "EIS") THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST, will that be salvation by baptism "IN" (Greek, "EN") one name or three?

SECOND NEGATIVE

W. S. SMITH

Mt. 24:5 and Acts 19:13-17 prove conclusively that, "In Jesus' name" does not mean "by His authority." Did you see what Miller said about them? Neither did I. Why did he not notice them. "Acts 2:38 and Col. 3:17 is "IN (Greek EN) the name," (Miller). The Greek preposition EN is not in Acts 2:38, according to the Emphatic Diaglott, Miller's witness. "In the name" that preposition in comes from the Greek preposition

EPI. Thayer says, "Epi, b. after verbs which include another verb signifying motion, or transfer, or entrance into. d. as eis." (Thayer p. 234). "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into ALL TRUTH." Jno. 16:13. If Miller believed that statement, he would not go back to Matthew to try to disprove what the apostles taught after the Spirit came and guided them INTO ALL TRUTH.

Heb. 12:2, "Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith." But not before He endured the cross and sat down at the right hand of His Father. Our faith is revealed in the gospel of Christ. Rom. 1:16:17. Jesus is the author of the law of faith as taught by the apostles when they were guided by the Spirit of truth. They never taught trinity baptism, therefore Jesus is not the author of it. The only way to learn what the law of faith teaches is to come to where the apostles taught it to the church when they were guided by the Spirit of truth. Mt. 18:15-18 is no part of the law of Christ to His church. Does Miller think that he has the power to bind on earth with the assurance that it will be bound in heaven? "Where did the Spirit of truth guide the apostles to teach baptism into the name of Jesus and none other? No Where." (Miller) The Bible says, "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 19:5, and it gave none other name. Shall we believe the Bible or Miller?

'Baptism not INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST' is not 'IN THE NAME OF (BY THE AUTHORITY OF) JESUS CHRIST.'" (Miller) If that statement is true, Jesus is not the author of baptism as taught and practiced by the apostles, for they never baptized into the name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost, according to the Bible, and many of the encyclopedias witness that fact. Miller wrests what Hastings said by quoting some and leaving out some. Quoting from vol. 2, p. 381, Miller said, "Baptism in the trine name— . Why did he do that? Hastings said, "Baptism in the trine name was not instituted by Christ, it shows that from the beginning it (baptism) was unquestionably practiced by all christians." What shows that? The evidence in Acts. Why did Miller leave that part out? Was trine baptism practiced by all christians from the beginning? No, it was a later development. Hastings says, "The obvious explanation of the silence of the N. T. on the trine name and the use of another formula in Acts and Paul, is that this other formula was the earlier and the trine formula a later addition." (Hasting Ency. vol. 2, p. 380) "The early church always baptized IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS, until the development of the Trinity, afterward they were baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." (Canny Ency. p. 53) "Every where in the oldest sources it is stated that baptism takes place, IN THE NAME OF JESUS". (Ency. Britannica vol. 3; p. 82) "Until the third century baptism IN THE NAME OF CHRIST ONLY was so widespread that Pope Stephen in opposition to St. Cyprian, said that baptism IN THE NAME OF CHRIST WAS VALID." (Ency. Britannica vol. 3, p. 365). When Trinity baptism was first developed the popes did not agree on it.

"Hasting didn't say 'Mt. 28:19 could not be the language of the Son of God.'" (Miller). Hastings gave three reasons why it could not be

the language of Christ. "Its trustworthiness is IMPUGNED on the grounds of textual criticism, literary criticism and historical criticism." (Hastings Ency. vol. 2, p. 380). Then summarizing, Hastings says, "The cumulative evidence of these three lines of criticism is thus distinctly against the view that Mt. 28:19 represent the ipsissima verba (own words) of Christ in instituting Christian baptism." It is evident that Eusebius cited Mt. 28:19 at the first just like Matthew wrote it. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations in my name." That agrees with everything that the apostles taught. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," contradicts everything that the apostles taught on the name. Hastings shows in vol. 2, p. 380 that it is doubtful that Eusebius ever quoted it in the traditional form at all. It is evident that Mt. 28:19 was changed after Matthew wrote it.

If Jesus is the author of the baptismal formula in Mt. 28:19, he never commanded it to anyone but the eleven apostles and they never obeyed it nor commanded anyone else to be baptized that way. Therefore when a man says, "By the authority of Jesus Christ I baptize you into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, his statement is false. No one has the authority from Christ directly or indirectly to baptize into the name of the Trinity. Jesus gave the apostles the authority to baptize into His name, "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Thayer says, "En 1. Of place proper; a. In the interior of some whole, within the limits of some space." (p. 209). Jesus said to the apostles, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name." Jno. 16:24 They had been asking by his authority about three years, Mt. 6:9-13, but not in his name. Does that sound like "in his name means by his authority"? Will Miller fix that up for us, or will he treat it like he did Mt. 24:5 and Acts 19:13-17 by ignoring it?

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. "Is there a Bible in existence, (translated or untranslated) that doesn't teach baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in Mt. 28:19" I do not know of any.
2. "If there is a Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't include the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in the baptism in Mt. 28:19, which one is it?" None.
3. "What Bible (Translated or untranslated) fails to teach what I am affirming?" All of them. You deny what the apostles taught.
4. "If you were convinced that Jesus said in Mt. 28:19 'BAPTIZING THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST' would you accept my proposition as proven?" NO. Your proposition denies the authority of the Father.
5. "If salvation is by baptism IN (Greek EN) THE NAME OF JESUS ONLY and that puts us INTO (GREEK EIS) THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST, will that be salvation by baptism IN (Greek EN) one name or three?" Neither. You suppose a proposition that cannot exist.

QUESTIONS FOR MILLER

1. In what language was Matthew first written?
2. What copies of the N. T. did you quote from that were untranslated?
3. The baptism in Acts 19:5 was not Greek EN the name of Jesus nor into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. By whose authority was it given?
4. Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." If Peter had the authority to give that command, were those who obeyed him baptized by the authority of Peter?
5. Did the Father have the authority to forgive their sins?

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

E. H. MILLER .

Friends, now you can see why Doctor Smith said, "I reject Mt 28:19"; for in answering my questions, he said, "I do not know of any Bible in existence, (translated or untranslated) that doesn't teach baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in Mt. 28:19"; and there isn't "a Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't include the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in the baptism in Mt. 28:19". Yes, he said, There are "NONE". He agrees "THE SCRIPTURES TEACH PEOPLE SHOULD BE BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST". He also agrees, "THE SCRIPTURES (every Bible he knows of) TEACH PEOPLE SHOULD BE BAPTIZED—INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST IN MT. 28:19". That is all I am affirming! So he agrees I've proved what I'm affirming.

Since Doctor Smith agrees THERE ISN'T A BIBLE IN EXISTENCE THAT DOESN'T TEACH THE TWO THINGS IM AFFIRMING; I see no need of spending more time at present affirming my proposition. He agrees the Scriptures I use teach the two things I'm affirming, but he rejects part of the Scripture in all Bibles today. Instead of denying the Scriptures I use teach what I'm affirming, he denies part of the Scripture and what "In the name of Jesus Christ" means. If Mt. 28:19 cannot be found in any Bible teaching the right thing, how can I know any verse of scripture teaches the right thing?

If Doctor Smith thinks he knows what "in the name of Jesus Christ" means he won't tell us! He even failed to answer part of my question on this as he promised to do, "Questions to be answered." He can't quote one Bible that he will accept on Mat. 28:19; and he can't quote any standard book on the meaning of words etc. that he will accept the definition or meaning of "in the name of Jesus Christ (or "the Lord")" from, as in Acts 2:38 & 10:48. He says, "In Jesus' name' does not mean 'by His authority' ". He has to say, STAND ASIDE MR. WEBSTER, STAND ASIDE MR. THAYER AND LET THE GREAT DOCTOR SMITH PASS BY; I don't know what it means, but it doesn't mean "BY THE AUTHORITY OF" like both of you say.

Doctor Smith thinks he has Bible to prove Thayer wrong in saying "BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORD, ACTS 10:48." He even tries to get Thayer to help him prove Thayer wrong, quoting (page 234), "SIGNIFYING MOTION, OR TRANSFER, OR ENTRANCE INTO—ON, TO, ETC., MT. 5:15." Thayer is there defining "EPI" ("ON") in Mt. 5:45; on page 232 he defines "IN my name"—"APPROPRIATING TO THEMSELVES THE NAME OF MESSIAH WHICH BELONGS TO ME, MT. 24:5; Mk. 13:6; Lk. 21:8." Here Weymouth's Translation reads "MANY WILL COME ASSUMING MY NAME AND SAYING I AM CHRIST." The context shows that is the meaning in those verses, and not the same as in Acts 2:38 & 10:48.

Doctor Smith gives Acts 19:13-17 to prove "IN JESUS' NAME" doesn't mean "BY HIS AUTHORITY." Thayer says, "TO NAME THE NAME OF JESUS OVER ONE,—Acts 19:13." (Page 234). So Doctor Smith's calling, THE NAME OF JESUS OVER ONE" in baptism doesn't make that baptism "IN (Greek, "EN", not "EPI") THE NAME OF JESUS" (Thayer, page 94 "BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORD, ACTS 10:48." "The Greek preposition EN is—in Acts 2:38"; 10:48 and Col. 3:17 in the "New Testament in the original Greek—Wescott—and—Hort," and means "BY THE AUTHORITY OF." Doctor Smith's quotation of Thayer's definition of "EPI" in another verse gets him no where! "EN" & "EPI" in these different verses have different meanings as the context and Thayer show.

Jesus gave the TRUTH to the apostles Jn. 17:8 & 17; the Spirit guided the apostles and brought all things Jesus taught them to their remembrance (Mk. 16:16 & Mt. 28:19; Jn. 16:13; 14:26—Heb. 2:1-4 & 12:1-2). Doctor Smith denies the Spirit taught the apostles what Jesus was the author of "before he sat down at the right hand of His Father." But Jesus said, "Go—baptizing them into 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" (Mt. 28:19-20). Jn. 14:26 "The Holy Ghost—shall teach you all things—whatsoever I have said unto you."

Doctor Smith claims I left out part of "Hastings". I showed part was left out (to save words) that didn't change the meaning; but he left out some that changed meaning. He said, Hastings said, 'Baptism in the trine name was not instituted by Christ,' Friends, Hastings didn't say that. I might say, "Even if Doctor Smith killed a man, he didn't intend to." Then some one may say, "Miller said, 'Doctor Smith killed a man,' That would be a false statement. They changed my statement when they left off "Even if", etc. And that is just what Doctor Smith did with Hastings as I will now prove. Notice he left off the first part, "Even if—that" and tried to make you think Hastings said, "Baptism in the trine name was not instituted by Christ," instead of questioning that statement. The following from Hastings (376-381) has what Doctor Smith gave CAPITALIZED; and what he left out, in small letters—"Even if the evidence in Acts be admitted to prove that BAPTISM IN THE TRINE NAME WAS NOT INSTITUTED BY CHRIST, IT (Miller, "the evidence") SHOWS THAT FROM THE BEGINNING IT (Smith, "baptism". Miller, "baptism in the trine name") WAS UNQUESTIONABLY

PRACTICED BY ALL CHRISTIANS, and it is urged that this would not be so if it (Miller), "baptism in the trine name" had not been instituted by Christ.—There is no real ground for doubting the authenticity of Mt. 28:19 as part of Matthew's Gospel—In all extent MSS and versions the text is found in the traditional form." "Before the close of the first century the trinitarian formula had come into use, as attested in Mt. 28:19;" (Encyclopedia of Religion by Vergilus Fern.)

John 16:24 is not given by Thayer for "BY THE AUTHORITY OF;" Williams' Translation reads, "You have not asked for any thing as bearers of my name." As yet they had not regarded Jesus as the mediator through whom they must approach God. Thus we see, "IN MY NAME" can be used at least three ways—1. "BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORD, Acts 10:48." 2. "APPROPRIATING TO THEMSELVES THE NAME OF MESSIAH WHICH BELONGS TO ME, Mt. 24:5;" "AS-SUMING MY NAME AND SAYING I AM CHRIST." 3. "AS BEARERS OF MY NAME" ("CHRISTIANS").

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S QUESTIONS

1. Greek, or no one knows.
2. "NEW TESTAMENT IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK" ((First affirmative).
3. It was Greek EIS as in Mt. 28:19; so by Christ's authority "they were all baptized INTO the name of the Lord Jesus" (R. V.). They were baptized INTO the name of the Lord while being baptized "INTO the name of the Father—and of the Holy Ghost." Which was "IN (Greek "EN") the name of ("By the Authority of") Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38 & 10:48).
4. Peter didn't have the authority to change the way Jesus said "BAPTIZING THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST." This is the only way Jesus gave AUTHORITY for anyone to be baptized, from then on; so Peter said, "Be baptized every one of you IN THE NAME OF ("BY THE AUTHORITY OF") Jesus Christ." Peter had authority to tell them to be baptized by Christ's authority; they were not baptized by Peter's authority, but by the authority Peter told them to be baptized by, "BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORD" (Thayer).
5. Through Christ to whom He gave "ALL AUTHORITY."

QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. Does Acts 2:38 teach "people should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ"?
2. Does Mt. 28:19 (as found in all Bibles) teach "people should be baptized—into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."?
3. What book says, Matthew didn't write "Father—Son and—Holy Ghost" in Mt. 28:19?
4. After what year did "the development of the Trinity," after which "they were baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost" as quoted by you, take place?

5. You say, "Jesus gave the apostles the authority to baptize into His name." What Bible verse so teaches?

THIRD NEGATIVE

W. S. SMITH

Friends, I said, I reject the modern translation of Mt. 28:19. I do not reject Mt. 28:19 the way it was first given. "So he agrees I've proved what I'm affirming" (Miller). I do not agree that he has proven any part of his proposition. It contradicts the apostles' teaching. "If Doctor Smith thinks he knows what 'in the name of Jesus Christ' means he won't tell us," (Miller). See my second and third affirmatives. In the name of Jesus Christ, as used by the apostle when they commanded people to be baptized in His name, means into His name, Acts 2:38, 8:16, (R. V.). Article six of our agreement answers Miller's ridicule in paragraph three and proves him wrong.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in (G. epi) the name of Jesus Christ." Acts. 2:38. "For many shall come in (G. epi) my name saying, I am Christ." Will they come by His authority? Miller says, "Weymouth's translation reads 'many will come assuming my name and saying I am Christ.'" They assume His name or come in His name as Jesus said, but not by His authority, therefore in His name does not mean by His authority. "The Greek preposition EN is in Acts 2:38," (Miller). Friends, if you have a Greek N.T. or a Greek interlinear you can see for yourselves. It is not in the Emphatic Diaglott, and it says "Original Greek Text." Thayer, in defining EPI, cites Acts 2:38 as one place where it is used. "Heb. 8:10, After verbs which include another verb signifying motion, or transfer, or entrance into." (Thayer). That describes Acts 2:38 perfectly, entrance into Jesus Christ.

To name the name of Jesus over one, sc. that help may come to him from that name. Acts 19:13." (Thayer). Why did those Jews do that? Because they had seen Paul perform miracles in Jesus' name. They used the same name that Paul used, without his authority. Therefore, in his name does not mean by his authority. "When he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." Jno. 16:13. He did not guide them to teach baptism into the name of the Trinity, therefore it is not truth.

Miller says that I left off the first part of what Hastings said. I began at the same place he began to show you what he did. He wrests the truth by quoting some and leaving out some. "The following from Hastings (376-381)", (Miller). First he quotes from p. 381, then 376, then 379. In each place he leaves out enough to change its meaning. Beginning where he stopped on 381, "Against this it is alleged that the last conclusion is unwarranted, and that some of the evidence in the Epistles, properly regarded tells against rather than for the traditional view." Then to 376, "There is no real ground for doubting the authenticity of Mt. 28:19 as a part of Matthew's Gospel", (Miller stopped there) "IN ITS FINAL FORM. BUT THIS IS FAR FROM SETTling ITS HISTORICITY AS A WORD OF JESUS HIMSELF." Then to p. 379, "In all extant MSS and versions the text is found in the traditional

form." (Miller stopped). "Though it must be remembered that the best manuscripts both of the African Old Latin and of the Old Syriac versions are DEFECTIVE AT THIS POINT." At what point? Mt. 28:19 (Defective, 1. incomplete, Webster). That implies that the baptismal formula is not in Mt. 28:19 in the BEST MANUSCRIPTS. "The formula used was 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ' or some synonymous phrase; there is no evidence for the use of the trine name." (Hastings p. 384). The evidence in Acts does prove that baptism in the trine name was not instituted by Christ. It shows that baptism was practiced by all Christians from the beginning. It does not show that baptism in the trine name was ever practiced by anyone at any time.

Ferm is against him. Note, "Had come into use", therefore not in use from the beginning, as Ferm's preceding statement shows. "Jno. 16:24, is not given by Thayer for 'by the authority of' . . . (Miller). Jesus said, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in (G. EN) my name." "In (G. EN) Jesus name means by his authority," (Miller). They had been asking by his authority about three years, Mt. 6:9-13, but not in His name. Therefore in Jesus' name does not mean by his authority.

The Father has authority in baptism. Col. 1:12-14. The law of the Lord, the Gospel of Christ, had its beginning on Pentecost. Mt. 18:18, Lk. 24:45-49, Acts 1 and 2, and 11:15. It gives all things that pertain unto life and godliness. Rom. 1:16-17, 2 Pet. 1:3. Paul declared all the counsel of God, Acts 20:27. Paul did not declare trinity baptism. Therefore it is not the counsel of God. Paul taught baptism into the name of the Lord. Acts 19:1-5, into Christ, Rom. 6:3, Gal. 3:27. We understand what Paul taught by reading it. Eph. 3:4-10. "The apostles bound things on earth by teaching them." (Miller) They never taught trinity baptism. Therefore it is not bound on earth, nor in heaven. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." 1 Cor. 1:17. Therefore Paul knew nothing of the command to baptize in Mt. 28:19.

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S QUESTIONS???

1. "Greek, or no one knows." "Matthew was originally written in Aramaic." (N. T. Literature, by T. Henshaw, p. 111)
2. "NEW TESTAMENT IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK." Matthew was translated into Greek. He never saw a testament UNTRANSLATED.
3. "By Christ's authority" In his second affirmative he said, "Baptism not 'into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' is not 'in the name of (By the authority of) Jesus Christ.'" Now he says, "By Christ's authority." Miller vs. Miller.
4. "Peter didn't have the authority to change the way Jesus said 'BAPTIZING THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST!'" (Miller). Jesus said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Shall we believe the Lord or Miller? Jesus said, "When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." He never guided Peter to teach trinity baptism. Therefore it is not truth.
5. "Through Christ to whom he gave 'ALL AUTHORITY.'" Christ

is at the right hand of his father: the Father is above all. Eph. 4:6. He did not put himself under his Son. 1 Cor. 15:27.

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. "Does Acts 2:38 teach 'people should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ?' Yes, into his name, by the authority of the Father, Son, Holy Spirit, and the apostles. Jno. 16:13, Acts 8:16.

2. "Does Mt. 28:19 (as found in all Bibles) teach 'people should be baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost?' I do not know what all Bible teach, and I do not know of any Bible that puts Mt. 28:19 into the law of Christ to His church.

3. "What book says Matthew didn't write 'Father, Son and Holy Ghost' in Mt. 28:19?" The Bible says it by what it teaches. "When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." He did not guide the apostles to teach trinity baptism. Therefore Matthew did not write it, as he was guided by the same Spirit.

1. "After what year did 'the development of the Trinity', after which 'they were baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost' as quoted by you, take place?" I do not know what year, but according to the Bible and history it was never practiced by the apostles.

5. "You say, 'Jesus gave the apostles the authority to baptize into his name.' What Bible verse so teaches?" Jno. 16:13, Acts 2:38, 8:16 and many others.

QUESTIONS FOR MILLER

1. How are people delivered from Satan's kingdom and put into Christ's kingdom?

2. Does anyone have the authority to do that except Christ?

3. Where do you find the evidence in Acts that baptism in the trine name was practiced by all christians from the beginning?

1. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman." Jno. 15:1. Does the vine have more authority than the husbandman?

5. Did God and the Holy Spirit exercise any authority in the baptism of Cornelius in Acts 10 and 11:12-18?

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

E. H. MILLER

Doctor Smith's second affirmative, "I reject Mt. 28:19 because the Spirit of truth never guided the apostles to teach baptism in or into the name of the Trinity." First negative, "What Bible (translated or untranslated) renders Mt. 28:19 acceptable to you?—None that I know of." So he rejects Mt. 28:19 in every "Bible (translated or untranslated)" that he knows of.

Doctor Smith never has told us what "IN THE NAME OF" means in Acts 10:48; he disobeyed article 5; my reminding him of this has nothing to do with "article six." I proved IN CHRIST'S NAME has different meanings. Why didn't he answer those arguments? He said, "Heb. 8:10—entrance into." (Thayer). That describes Acts 2:38 per-

fectly," Why quote Thayer on another verse than the one he is talking about? Thayer didn't give that for Acts 2:38; but he did give "in his Messianic authority, Acts 2:38"—"by the authority of the Lord, Acts 10:48." Doctor Smith rejects Thayer on those verses, trying to apply Thayer's Heb. 8:10 definition to Acts 2:38.

"Those Jews—used the same name that Paul used, without his authority." Doctor Smith does likewise; naming the name of Jesus over one doesn't make it "in his Messianic authority, Acts 2:38." I proved by Thayer the meaning was different in those places.

Hastings didn't say and teach what Doctor Smith claimed; (Read my last affirmative on this.) My quotation gives enough for you to see the meaning is not as Doctor Smith taught; I challenge him to show one meaning I changed, as I showed he did. He says, "Beginning where he stopped on 381, 'Against this it is alleged that the conclusion is unwarranted,' Webster, 'Alleged—without proof.'" The part Doctor Smith quotes is against him; there is NO "PROOF" that what Doctor Smith rejects is "UNWARRANTED." Doctor Smith refers to "There is no real ground for doubting the authenticity of Mt. 28:19 IN ITS FINAL FORM." Yet he says, "I reject Mt. 28:19" and will not accept it in any "Bible (translated or untranslated)." He quotes, "Though it must be remembered that the best manuscripts both of the African Old Latin and of the Old Syriac versions are DEFECTIVE AT THIS POINT." The Apostles didn't give those "MANUSCRIPTS:" they are "DEFECTIVE" copies made by some one else. Doctor Smith says, "That implies that the baptismal formula is not in Mt. 28:19 in the BEST MANUSCRIPTS." He kicks himself by quoting "Defective—incomplete," "THE BEST MANUSCRIPTS both of the Old Latin and—Syriac versions are DEFECTIVE ('incomplete')." I'll stay with the ones that are complete!

Doctor Smith says, "Ferm is against him." No, Ferm says, "Before the close of the first century the trinitarian formula had come into use, as attested in Mt. 28:19." That shows Mt. 28:19 in use in "the first century"—"come into use" between the years 1 & 100 (the year 33). Hastings, "FROM THE BEGINNING IT ('BAPTISM IN THE TRINE NAME') WAS UNQUESTIONABLY PRACTICED BY ALL CHRISTIANS."

Doctor Smith, "The Father has authority in baptism." Does he reject Mt. 28:19-20; Mk. 16:16; Heb. 2:1-3 & 12:1-2? He says, "Paul did not declare trinity baptism." Paul taught the same baptism Peter taught (Thayer, "By the authority of the Lord, Acts 10:48."); Mt. 28:19; Mk. 16:16; Heb. 2:3. "Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved—How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? Which having at the first been spoken through the Lord," The way I was saved was first spoken through the Lord as stated by Paul.

"The apostles bound things on earth by teaching them." Yes, and they taught what Jesus said teach (Mt. 28:19-20). "THE BEGINNER and finisher of our faith" (Heb. 12:2 margin). Therefore Paul knew of

the command to baptize in Mt. 28:19. Doctor Smith thinks (?) 1 Cor. 1:17 proves "Paul knew nothing of the command to baptize in Mt. 28:19." Paul said, "Jesus the BEGINNER and finisher of OUR faith" "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord"?

A. Greek Testament with English notes, published by Harper & Brothers, says, "It is also stated that Matthew wrote originally in Hebrew—it is equally, or rather more, certain that THE PRESENT GOSPEL IS ALSO THE PRODUCTION OF ST. MATTHEW." So another tells us Mt. 28:19 in "THE PRESENT GOSPEL IN GREEK" IS "THE PRODUCTION OF ST. MATTHEW." English notes in Alford's Greek Testament, "The early Church held that Matthew originally drew up his Gospel in Hebrew. Possibly they were deceived by the existence at that time of a "Gospel according to the Hebrews,"—But any how, internal evidence is clear against our present Greek text being a mere translation—the phenomena of the Gospel itself are strongly against the idea that it was written originally in any other language than that in which we now possess it: viz. in Greek:" That takes care of his reply to my first two answers of last questions. There is a good chance that EUSEBIUS LEFT "FATHER—SON AND—HOLY GHOST" OUT OF HIS FIRST QUOTATIONS BECAUSE HE WAS "DECEIVED BY THE EXISTENCE AT THAT TIME OF A "GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS" "SOME AT LEAST OF THE FATHERS MIS-TOOK THE APOCRYPHAL 'GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS' FOR THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW:" (Alford). This debate is getting easier all along.

LOOK AT HIS REPLY TO ANSWER 3, "In the name of ('by the authority of) Jesus Christ.' Now he says, 'By Christ's authority.' Miller vs. Miller." Can't Doctor Smith see if we are baptized "Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" "by the authority of Jesus Christ" or "By Christ's authority" it will be the same thing?

4. Jesus gave PETER AUTHORITY to baptize "INTO the name of the FATHER and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." "And HE COMMANDED them to be baptized in the name of (Thayer, "by the authority of") Jesus Christ."

5. "The Father—did not put himself under the Son." No, but He gave Him "ALL AUTHORITY" (1 Cor. 15:27—Mt. 28:18-20).

SMITH'S ANSWERS TO LAST QUESTIONS

1. He agrees "people should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" as I am affirming; and in his second negative said, "I do not know of any Bible in existence, (translated or untranslated) that doesn't teach baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Now, that is all I'm affirming!

2. "I do not know of any Bible that puts Mt. 28:19 into the law of Christ to His church." WHERE IS IT PUT?

3. He can't find a man made book saying Matthew didn't write it, so TRIES to prove it by the Bible. Shame on preachers that "REJECT" part of the Bible, trying to get one verse contradicting another.

4. He doesn't know how far back this goes; the Bible nor history deny the apostles baptized this way. "The Trinity" was before the Apostles.

5. "Many others." Two more are, "Be baptized in the name of (Thayer, "By the authority of") Jesus Christ—into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 10:48—Mt. 28:19).

MILLER'S ANSWERS TO SMITH'S QUESTIONS

1. By being baptized as Christ commanded.

2. The Father translates those into the kingdom that are baptized "by the authority of" His Son.

3. Acts 10:48—Mt. 28:19? Be baptized in the name of (Thayer, "By the authority of") Jesus Christ—into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." To be by His authority is to be as He commanded.

4. John 15:1—Mt. 28:18—1 Cor. 15:27.

5. "Be baptized in the name of (Thayer, "By the authority of") Jesus Christ" (Acts 10:48). Not "God and the Holy Spirit—authority."

QUESTIONS FOR DOCTOR SMITH

1. What is the answer to questions 1, 2, 3, (first negative); 2, 3, (second negative) and 4, 5, (third negative)? NO ONE CAN FIND THE ANSWERS IN THE DEBATE YET.

2. Do you "reject Mt. 28:19" in all Bibles you have or can get?

3. If people are baptized according to Mk. 16:16—Mt. 28:19 as taught in all Bibles you have or can get, and do all else the Bible commands them, will they be saved?

4. If "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" are Christ's WORDS, do THEY teach people should be baptized that way?

FOURTH NEGATIVE

W. S. SMITH

Miller continues to misquote me. I said, "I reject Mt. 28:19 (K. V.)" I do not reject Mt. 28:19 the way Matthew wrote it. I reject the modern translations of it because Jesus said, "When he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." He never guided the apostles to use trinity baptism, therefore it is not the Lord's truth I told what "In the name of" means in my second affirmative and third negative. Thayer, defining epi, cites Acts 2:38 as one place it is used. He gave Heb. 8:10 as an example. He was not defining epi when he said "by the authority of."

"Hastings didn't say and teach what Doctor Smith claimed," (Miller) "The formula used was 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, or some synonymous phrase; there is no evidence for the use of the trine name.'" (Hastings, Vol. 2, p. 384) Miller has never given one example where any apostle baptized in the trine name. "I challenge him to show one meaning I changed." (Miller). I showed four in my third negative. There are three times that many in his fourth affirmative. I have not space to quote all of them. "He says, 'Beginning where he stopped on 381,

"Against this it is alleged that the last conclusion is unwarranted," Webster, "Alleged—without proof". (Miller). He gave part of my statement and part of Webster's definition and put it all within quotation marks as my statement. I asked him to correct it and he refused. Miller changed Ferm's meaning by leaving out the first part of his statement. "That shows Mt. 28:19 in use in the first century '—come into use' between the years 1 & 100 (the year 33)," (Miller). "Every where in the oldest sources it is stated that baptism takes place IN THE NAME OF JESUS." (Ency. Britanica, vol. 3, p. 82). The apostles baptized into the name of Jesus and none other. The BEST MANUSCRIPTS teach baptism that way, but Miller cannot use them. They prove his proposition wrong.

The great salvation "began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." They never confirmed unto us trinity baptism, therefore it was not spoken by the Lord. "When ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." Eph 3:4, We can read where Paul taught baptism into the name of Jesus, but we cannot read where he taught baptism into the trine name. "Baptism not 'into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' is not 'in the name of (by the authority of) Jesus Christ," (Miller). The baptism in Acts 19:5 is not into the trine name. Yet Miller says "By Christ's authority". Miller vs. Miller. "They were baptized into the name of the Lord while being baptized INTO the name of the Father—and of the Holy Ghost". (Miller). They were not baptized into the trine name. "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4: 12. Saved by Jesus' name and none other; baptized into His name and none other. Shall we believe Peter and Paul or Miller?

Note what Miller says about Alford's notes on the Greek Testament Who was Henry Alford? "He was born in 1810 and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1832 he was ORDAINED A PRIEST IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND." Miller prefers the evidence of a priest that was nearly 1800 years since the early church to that of the early church which knew Matthew and spoke the same Hebrew language he spake. Speaking of the Church's evidence, Alford said, "This evidence was unanimous." Not so with those who lived 1800 years later. Eusebius was not deceived. "He did not regard the gospel of the Hebrews as the original Hebrew gospel of Matthew." History of Eusebius, vol. 2, p. 98. Eusebius, like Hastings, knew and used the best MSS of Matthew, the one that condemns Millers' proposition and agrees with what the apostles taught. "He agrees 'people should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ' as I am affirming, (Miller). Is that misrepresenting the truth? I do not agree that baptism in the name of Jesus is being baptized into the trine name, and that is what Miller is affirming. "Shame on preachers that REJECT part of the Bible trying to get one verse contradicting another," (Miller). Thou are the man that rejects what the apostles taught, trying to make one verse that contradicts their teaching, prove that they taught something they did not teach, and you go back behind the law of Christ to get it.

The law of Christ for all nations began on Pentecost. Mt. 18:18, Lk. 24:45-49, Jno. 16:13, Acts 1 and 2 and 11:15. He wrests Acts 2:38 by teaching that Peter baptized into the name of the Trinity. What did he do with the others? He let them alone. What else could he do, and stay with his proposition? Did you notice what Miller said about Rom. 1:16-17 and 2 Pet. 1:3-4 in his affirmative? No, he let them alone. They teach that the gospel of Christ that began on Pentecost, gives us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. But it does not give us trinity baptism, therefore it does not pertain unto life or godliness. We are baptized into Christ, Rom. 6:3, Gal. 3:27. Did you see how Miller made those two passages read into the trine name? Neither did I. WHY? Paul declared all the counsel of God. Acts 20:27. We cannot read where Paul declared baptism in the trine name, therefore it is not the counsel of God.

The command to baptize in Mt. 28:19 (K. V.) is given with as much force as the command to teach. Christ is not the author of that, because Paul said, "Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel," 1 Cor. 1:17. Paul did not preach trinity baptism. Therefore it is no part of the gospel of Christ. "Jno. 16:24 is not given by Thayer for 'BY THE AUTHORITY OF'" (Miller). Why? It is "In (G. EN) my name." Miller said that means by his authority. Is that Miller vs. Miller? "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name." They had been asking by his authority about three years but not in his name. What did Miller say about Mt. 6:9-13? NOTHING. Was that by Christ's authority? It was not in his name. Therefore in his name does not mean by his authority. Mt. 24:5, Jno. 16:24, Acts 8:16, 19:5, verses 13-17 and many others prove conclusively that in Jesus' name does not mean by his authority. We cannot read one place where any apostle ever taught baptism in the trine name; nor into any name except Jesus. The Bible and history both teach conclusively that the apostles always baptized in or into the name of Jesus and none other, in spite of Miller's strong effort to prove the opposite.

"The father—hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." Col. 1:13. The Father is above all. Eph. 4:6. Therefore he has authority in baptism. Did God have the authority to baptize them with the Holy Spirit? Did the Spirit have the authority to tell Peter what to do and say? Did Peter have the authority to command them to be baptized? If he did, when they were baptized, it was by the authority of the Father, Son, Holy Spirit and Peter.

MILLER'S QUESTIONS

1. "What is the answer to questions 1, 2, 3, (first negative; 2,3, (second negative) and 4, 5, (third negative)?" The answers I gave.
2. "Do you reject Mt. 28:19? in all Bibles you have or can get? No, I reject only the translations that contradict what the apostles taught.
3. "If people are baptized according to Mk. 16:16—Mt. 28:19 as taught in all Bibles you have or can get, and do all else the Bible com-

mands them, will they be saved? People cannot obey baptism in the trine name and what the apostles taught both at the same time.

1. "If 'baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' are Christ's words, do they teach people should be baptized that way?" NO. If they are His words, he never spoke them to any one except the eleven apostles and they never obeyed them, therefore they cannot be His words.

REJOINDER

E. H. MILLER

Doctor Smith says, "Miller continues to misquote me. I said, 'I reject Mt. 28:19 (K. V).'

" He is mistaken as you can see in his second affirmative; but (K. V.)" wouldn't help anyway, as the following will prove.

I proved my proposition in my first affirmative, by Acts 2:38 "BE BAPTIZED EVERY ONE OF YOU IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST", and many translations of Mt. 28:19 "BAPTIZING ("IMMERSING") THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST ("HOLY SPIRIT")". Doctor Smith accepts Acts 2:38, but says, "Mt. 28:19 is too far back to be included in the gospel of Christ." I asked, "If there is a Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't include the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in the baptism of Mt. 28:19, which one is it?" He answered, "None."

I asked, "Is there a Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't teach baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in Mt. 28:19?" He answered, "I do not know of any." Yet he said, "I reject Mt. 28:19 because the Spirit of truth never guided the apostles to teach baptism in or into the name of the Trinity." Later he said, "The reason I reject the King James Translation of Mt. 28:19 is that none of the apostles ever taught it that way." I asked, "What Bible (translated or untranslated) renders Mt. 28:19 acceptable to you?" He answered, "None that I know of."SO HE REJECTS MT.28:19 IN EVERY BIBLE HE KNOWS OF!

I asked, "If you were convinced that Jesus said in Mt. 28:19 'BAPTIZING THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST' would you accept my proposition as proven?" He answered, "NO." If the Scriptures do not teach what they say, what do they teach?

I asked, "If 'baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' are Christ's WORDS, do THEY teach people should be baptized that way?" He answered, "NO". So he denies the Scriptures teach what they say, EVEN IF JESUS IS THE ONE THAT SAID IT! Remember his confession in a question and answer above, "I do not know of any" "Bible in existence (translated or untranslated) that doesn't teach baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of

the Holy Ghost" in Mt. 28:19. I can't prove my proposition to a man that denies the Bible teaches what he admits it teaches.

I asked, "What Bible is in existence that renders Mt. 28:19 in such a way that any one could have ever obeyed it and pleased God?" He answered, "None." We learn from these answers, Doctor Smith doesn't believe people could ever obey the Bible and please God.



ORDER THE FOLLOWING BOOKS AND TRACTS, ETC. FROM

E. H. MILLER

P. O. Box 538

LAGRANGE, GEORGIA

"Tommy and His Mother"	25c
"Tom's Call To Preach"	25c
"John's Troubles"	25c
"Which Church Is Right?"	5c
"Which C. of C. Is Right?"	5c
	\$2.00 per 100; \$8.00 per 1000
"Are Classes and Women Teachers Scriptural?" (Miller's Questions—Norton Dye's Answers)	5c
"Written Statements by Norton Dye" (for cups)—100	\$1.00
"Honest Confessions by S. S. and Cups Preachers"	5c
"Proof Cups and Classes Are Not Scriptural"	25c
"A Reply to M. L. Lemley On 'This Cup Of the Lord' "	5c
" 'The Cup of the Lord' What Is It?—A Friendly Discussion Between E. H. Miller and M. L. Lemley"	25c
"Steps Into Christ"—1000	\$6.00
"Personal Workers' Reference List"—1000	\$8.00
"At Last! The True Facts About The Church of Christ"—1000	\$8.00
"The Smith-Miller Debate" (Baptism In The Name Of Jesus Only)	25c