


Tant - Smith Debate

*Was Alexander Campbell Baptized
for the Remission of Sins?*

J. D. Tant
&
C. A. Smith




Thrasher Publications

Tant - Smith Debate

*Was Alexander Campbell Baptized
for the Remission of Sins?*

J. D. Tant
&
C. A. Smith



Thrasher Publications

Tant-Smith Debate

Copyright © 2001

Thrasher Publications

(a division of TNTJT Enterprises, LLC)

All Rights Reserved

E-mail: tnthrash@hiwaay.net

New Edition

Thrasher Publications

(a division of TNTJT Enterprises, LLC)

1705 Sandra Street S.W.

Decatur, AL 35601-5457

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of water baptism in God's plan has been a topic of much disagreement among people who claim to be followers of Jesus Christ. Hundreds of debates have been held on this issue in the United States, especially between representatives of various Baptist churches and the churches of Christ. The role of Alexander Campbell in the religious history of our country has also been the focus of considerable controversy.

This volume contains the text of a short written debate between C. A. Smith (Baptist) of Chickasha, Oklahoma, and J. D. Tant (Christian) of Brownsville, Texas. It began on March 7, 1935, and concluded on January 18, 1936. The proposition was: "I affirm that Matthias Luce did not baptize Alexander Campbell for (in order to) the remission of sins, according to history." C. A. Smith affirmed and J. D. Tant denied.

C. A. Smith was 47 years old at the time of this debate, and he had been a Baptist minister for 26 years. This was his 49th debate in behalf of the Baptist cause. In addition to J. D. Tant, his opponents had included such well-known debaters as Will M. Thompson, W. Curtis Porter, J. W. Chism, J. N. Cowan, and J. W. Crumley.

J. D. Tant's story is preserved in *J. D. Tant—Texas Preacher*, a biography written by his son Yater. At the time of this discussion he was 74 years old and had participated in more than 300 debates. In addition to the present debate, the *Tant-Harding Debate* and the *Tant-Frost Debate* are available from Thrasher Publications.

This debate was originally printed as the *Smith-Tant Debate on "Campbell's Baptism"*. It has been out of print for many years. That volume was scanned and processed using OCR software. In reviewing the manuscript, a number of errors were detected and corrected. The text was then re-formatted to the present form. The publisher hopes that the reader will find this volume to be interesting and worthwhile, while remembering that only the Scriptures are infallibly true and reliable.

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

--Thomas N. Thrasher

PROPOSITION

“I affirm that Matthias Luce did not baptize Alexander Campbell for (in order to) the remission of sins, according to history.”

Affirm: C. A. Smith

Deny: J. D. Tant

SMITH'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

DEFINITIONS: 1. I mean by “Matthias Luce,” a Baptist preacher who lived at the time Alexander Campbell lived, and not far from where Mr. Campbell lived, to whom Mr. Campbell made application for baptism—Mr. Campbell having only been sprinkled for baptism when an infant.

2. I mean that Mr. Luce did baptize Mr. Campbell, but the design of the act was not “*in order to obtain*” the remission of Mr. Campbell's sins; *that history does not show such a design!*

3. I mean by “Alexander Campbell,” as recorded in Vol. 10, page 649, *New Americanized Encyclopedia Britannica*, Twentieth Century Edition, which says: “Campbell, Alexander, Theologian, born in Ireland, September 12, 1788, died in Bethany, West Virginia, March 4, 1866. His father, Thomas, came to this country in 1807, and ministered to destitute congregations in Western Pennsylvania. Following his father in 1809 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Washington county Pennsylvania, but became dissatisfied with that sect and held that the Bible should be the sole creed. With his father, in 1810, he founded a new religious society at Brush Run, Penn. Believing in immersion they joined the Baptists and were immersed in 1812, but owing to the independence of their doctrines they were disfellowshipped in 1827. They then founded a sect of their own, which they called the ‘Disciples of Christ,’ better known as ‘Campbellites.’”

Henry Clay

In *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, Vol. 2, page 548, it is said of Mr. Campbell when he sailed for Europe: “Having received highly commendatory letters of introduction from Henry Clay and others, and being highly favored by the American Minister, Mr. Bancroft, and other persons of influence, he enjoyed unusual facilities, and everything he wished to see was opened to him in the city and in the country.” In a footnote the Henry Clay letter is printed, in which Mr. Clay says of him: “Mr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his piety and *as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States.*”

J. D. Tant

My opponent said of Mr. Campbell in our Oakland debate, near Springdale, Ark., June 28, 1933: “Campbell, I believe, was the greatest man since John died on the Isle of Patmos.”

Alexander Campbell is the man who started “a new party, one entirely new,” as he says on page 17 of his book on *Baptism*, which he claims more scriptural than all other parties. Mr. Campbell said in his *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 1, page 58: “We will attempt to show that there will be, or that there is now, a scheme of things presented” (by Mr. Campbell, of course) “in what is called the *Ancient Gospel*, which is long enough, broad enough, strong enough for the whole superstructure called the Millennial Church, and that it will alone be the *instrument of converting* the whole human race, and of *uniting* all Christians upon one and the same foundation.”

Why Debate This Question?

In our debate at the Oakland Baptist Church, near Springdale Ark. June 22-29, 1933, I asked Mr. Tant if he agreed with Elder Will M. Thompson when Mr. Thompson said in answer to a question of mine on the design of baptism: “Man must have faith in Christ which embraces the understanding of design or purpose, then and not till then is baptism valid.” Mr. Tant said, “Yes” he agrees with Mr. Thompson. Mr. Tant says in his book, *The Gospel X-Ray*, page 34: “A man must be baptized for the remission of sins.” Elder J. D. Tant's affirmative proposition at Oakland was: “Resolved, that the church of which I am a member, called by me and my brethren, ‘The Church of Christ,’ is Scriptural in origin, doctrine and practice, but apostatized, and was restored in the 19th century under Campbell, Scott and others.” My opponent's predicament is that, *if Mr. Campbell restored the church*, yet “faith in Christ” embraces faith in design of baptism; and *if I can prove that there was no such design expressed in the baptism of Mr. Campbell*, then a child of the devil restored the church!

Reasons

I shall give a number of reasons, as affirmative arguments, setting my proof that Matthias Luce did not baptize Alexander Campbell in order to obtain the remission of sins, according to history. We are not discussing the Bible, and only where history quotes passages of Scripture will I use the Bible. We are debating history now, as Mr. Campbell lived long after the Bible was completed. I want Mr. Tant to labor to disprove my arguments, taking up each argument in succession, and weigh each point connected with each argument. *The history which I shall use is the history of his own people, written by them, or at least quoted from their own writers, not their enemies!*

Affirmative Argument No. 1

My first witness is one J. D. Tant himself, and I suppose that he will accept himself as good authority!

(a) In our Oakland debate I presented the following question to Mr. Tant: “In *Campbellism—What Is It?* J. W. Chism says: ‘The God of Heaven has as clearly revealed this religious movement as he did the coming of Christ and approved of the work in the prophecies as he did of the coming of the Christ.’ He is speaking of the ‘Reformation, or Restoration movement’ under Alexander Campbell and his co-laborers. **Do you agree with Mr. Chism in the above expression?**” Mr. Tant's answer was, “Yes.”

(b) Then I asked Elder Tant the following question: “*J. W. Chism and Will M. Thompson both say that the exact date when the church was restored after she apostatized is A. D. 1827. Do you agree with this?*” Mr. Tant's answer was, “Yes.” On page 227 of Mr. Tant's book before quoted, he says that “**Salvation is the church.**” This being true from his point of view, and since Mr. A. Campbell was baptized by Mr. Luce June 12, 1812, and since “**the exact date when the**

church was restored after the apostasy was A. D. 1827," Mr. Tant declares, and since the right sort of baptism puts one "into the church where salvation is": then, beloved, Mr. Campbell could not have been baptized in order to obtain the remission of sins. You see, from Mr. Tant's view, that would have put Mr. Campbell into the church, but Tant says that after the church apostatized it was not restored until 1827. Now, if as Mr. Tant and Mr. Chism say, "The God of Heaven has clearly revealed this religious movement" under the Campbells, and fixed the date of restoration at 1827, then poor Campbell is a goner!

Affirmative Argument No. 2

My second witness is Alexander Campbell himself. If Mr. Tant will not accept himself as good authority, perhaps he will accept Mr. Campbell, since he is at least supposed to know, as he is the one we are debating about!

(a) In *Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, Vol. 3, pages 120-121, Mr. Campbell was in a dialogue with one Rufus, who had been baptized by the "Regular Baptists" on a profession "that he was forgiven six months before was immersed through faith in the blood of Jesus," but later he was re-immersed. Then Campbell to the contrary, assumes that "*the baptism administered by the Baptists introduced the subject of it into the kingdom of Christ.*" Again he says to Rufus: "God promised by Daniel, the prophet, that in the days of the Caesars ... *he would set up a kingdom on earth which would never be destroyed.*" That kingdom, on your hypothesis, has been *destroyed*. Again it is written: "*Upon this rock will I build my congregation, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.*" On your hypothesis, the gates of Hades have prevailed against it for more than thirteen hundred years.... Why, on all your definitions of the kingdom, *suppose*, as you do, that he that is not formally and understandingly immersed for the remission of his sins cannot enter into the kingdom; and it being a fact that before the year 1823, since the fifth century, baptism for the remission of sins was not preached, and not until the year 1827 were many immersed with this apprehension of the subject. The dilemma in which your assumption fairly places you is this; *either the promises of God have failed, or such persons as were baptized as you were the first time are in the kingdom!* Choose now for yourself." I quote from the *Grime-Allen Debate*, page 39.

(b) In Volume 2 of *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, page 217, Mr. Richardson quotes from Mr. Campbell: "We can sympathize with those who have this doctrine in their creeds unregarded and unheeded in its import and utility, for we exhibited it fully in our debate with Mr. McCalla in 1823, without feeling its importance and without beginning to practice upon its tendencies for some time afterward." So you see, though Mr. Campbell preached this doctrine, he says, in 1823; but did not begin to practice "baptism for remission" for some time afterwards!

(c) But turning to the *Campbell-McCalla Debate*, page 135, we read: "The blood of Christ, then, *really* cleanses us who believe from all sin. Behold the goodness of God in giving us a *formal* proof and token of it, by ordaining a baptism expressly '*for the remission of sins*'! The water of baptism, then, *formally* washes away our sins. The blood of Christ *really* washes away our sins. Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed, yet he had no *solemn pledge of the fact, no formal acquittal, no formal* purgation of his sins, until he washed them away in the water of baptism." That is the Baptist position; that "**Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed,**" and that in baptism we have, following the "real" cleansing at faith, only a "formal purgation of sins." *This is what Mr. Campbell preached almost 11½ years after Matthias Luce baptized him!* But we will pursue the evidence still further, letting Mr. Campbell tell how and

when he changed his position.

(d) Turning to the *Campbell-Rice Debate*, held in 1843, just 20 years after Mr. Campbell spoke the language as given from his debate with McCalla (page 472): “Some twenty years ago, when preparing for a debate with Mr. McCalla, I put myself under the special instruction of four Evangelists, and one Paul, of distinguished apostolic rank and dignity. I had some time before that discussion, been often impressed with such passages as Acts 2:38; **and that providential call to discuss the subject with Mr. McCalla, compelled me to decide the matter to my entire satisfaction. Believe me, sir, then I had forgotten my earlier readings upon the subject: and upon the simple testimony of the Book itself, I came to a conclusion alleged in that debate, and proved only by the Bible which now appears, from a thousand sources, to have been the catholic and truly ancient and primitive faith of the whole church. It was in this commonwealth that this doctrine was first promulgated in modern times: and, sir, it has now spread over this continent, and with singular success is now returning to Europe, and the land of our fathers.**” This shows that Mr. Campbell decided on “baptism for remission” when preparing for the McCalla debate in 1823; and thus in 1823 he “decided to his entire satisfaction,” this baptismal generation doctrine, **eleven and one half years after Mr. Luce baptized him!** Further down Mr. Campbell speaks of great numbers that had “gone down into the mystic waters of holy baptism for remission.” But they did not begin to practice upon this doctrine for some time later, as Mr. Campbell informed us above; and on page 273 he says: “Here is the Presbyterian church with its eighty ministers, and its eight thousand and less members, after the labors of more than half a century. In one third of that time the cause we plead, notwithstanding our feebleness, **and all the errors and accidents incident to a new commencement, without colleges and schools of learning, without the aids of hoary veterans in polity, prudence and sage experience—by the force of this simple story of God’s Messiah, and his love, depicted in this mighty Pentecostan gospel, and under the star of Jacob, led, guided, aided and blessed, from nothing have in less than twenty years, outnumbered this old, leaned, and well-disciplined host, some five to one.**” A few lines down he says: “The doctrine works well.” This shows that Mr. Campbell and his party made “a new commencement,” and had “come up from nothing in less than twenty years.” So it was some time after 1823 that they began to “baptize for remission of sin”!

(e) In *Millennial Harbinger*, New Series, Vol. 2, page 86, Mr. Campbell says: “I received a letter from Mason County, Kentucky, from one of my earliest friends and acquaintances in that State, a gentleman who heard with extraordinary attention my whole debate on baptism in 1823, **when its true meaning and design were for the first time promulgated in America.**” Quoted from Ray’s *Text-Book on Campbellism*, page 223. Still Mr. Campbell tells us that no one promulgated the doctrine in America until 1823, and he did it. So we are still 11½ years this side of Campbell’s Baptism, and I am proving it by Mr. Campbell himself!

(f) Turning to *The Christian Baptist*, edited by Alexander Campbell, he says: “In my debate with Mr. McCalla in Kentucky, 1823, on this topic, I contended that it was a divine institution designed for putting the legitimate subject of it in actual possession of the remission of his sins—that to every believing subject it did formally, and in fact, convey to him the forgiveness of sins. **It was with much hesitation I presented this view of the subject at that time, because of its perfect novelty. I was then assured of its truth, and, I think, presented sufficient evidence of its certainty.** But having thought still more closely upon the subject, and having been necessarily called to consider it more fully as an essential part of the Christian religion, I am still better prepared to develop its import, and to establish its utility and value in the Christian religion.”

Again Mr. Campbell tells us that in 1823 he was “assured of the truth” of “baptism for remission,” not back in June 1812!

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NO. 3

My third line of evidence will come from a number of books, to the effect that it was in 1827 that “baptism for the remission of sins” was first practiced by the Campbell Party: for which they were excluded from the Baptists, and became a separate people!

(a) In the *Religious Encyclopedia*, page 462, appears an article written by Alexander Campbell himself, under the heading of “DISCIPLES OF CHRIST, (Sometimes called *Campbellites*, or Reformers),” and he says of their origin: “The rise of this society, if we only look back to the drawing of the lines of demarcation between it and other professors, is of recent origin.” Then further on Mr. Campbell says: “After the Mahoning Association appointed Mr. Walter Scott an evangelist, in the year 1827 and when great numbers began to be immersed into Christ under his labors, and new churches began to be erected by him and other laborers in the field, did the Baptist Associations begin to declare non-fellowship with the Brethren of the reformation. Thus by constraint not of choice, they were obliged to form societies out of those communities that split upon the ground of adherence to the apostolic doctrine.” Note, will you, that it was not until “Walter Scott in 1827, began to immerse great numbers into Christ,” that Baptists disfellowshipped the Campbell party! Now, we have hit upon the trail that will soon locate for us just when, where and by whom “baptism for remission of sins” first was practiced by these people!

(b) December 23-28, 1920, I met Elder Will M. Thompson (and I have now held five debates with him, and he is one of the greatest debaters of the Campbell Party!) at Odessa, near Gotebo, Oklahoma, and he affirmed the following proposition: “Resolved that the church of which I, Will M. Thompson, am a member, known by me and my brethren as the Church of Christ, is the Church of Jesus Christ, being identical in origin, doctrine, name and practice with the church of the New Testament: and during the Dark Ages the Church was in an apostate state on earth, and the work of Campbell, Scott and others was a restoration work which was a fulfillment of prophecy.” During that debate I asked Mr. Thompson the following question: “Who was the first person in modern times that was baptized for the exact same purpose for which you baptize: ‘for (in order to) remission of sins’ and just what date was it performed?” Answer: “Campbell was the first that I know of, baptized by Elder Luce.” I pinned Mr. Thompson down so closely on this that he promised to bring out a booklet in which he was going to prove the Campbell Baptism matter. I never could get him to bring out the booklet; and during my rounds I met up with Elder E. M. Borden, and he told me that Mr. Thompson came to him for information, and that he told him that there was no such history! In my third debate with Mr. Thompson, at Steedman, Oklahoma, Nov. 10, 1926, I asked him the following question: “When, and by whom, was the right sort of baptism first practiced in modern times?” Answer: “According to history Mr. Amend was baptized by Walter Scott.” In my fifth debate with Mr. Thompson, at Tuttle, March 14-18, 1932; again I pressed him with the Campbell Baptism matter, and Mr. Thompson said that he had not at that time found the history showing that Mr. Campbell was “baptized for remission of sins.” Recently I wrote him a letter asking him if he had as yet located that history, and he is as silent as the grave! Notice, please, that Mr. Thompson did locate “Mr. Amend, baptized by Walter Scott”; which took place in 1827, not June 12, 1812.

(c) On page 36, of the *One Hundredth Anniversary of the Disciples of Christ*, published by the “Christian Church” wing of the Campbell Party—they held this when the movement first

took shape, I mean a hundred years after 1809, when the Campbells first set up a movement, the "Progressives" celebrated the hundredth anniversary—we read: "Walter Scott was the first man in modern times to give to anxious inquirers the answer that Peter gave on Pentecost: 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' It was Walter Scott that discovered the place and function of baptism in the Christian system. He learned and taught that baptism is the culminating act in conversion; that baptism is the remitting ordinance. In baptism the penitent believer received the assurance of the remission of his sins. **That discovery marked an epoch in the history of the Reformation.**"

(d) Since it was Mr. Scott that "learned and taught baptism in order to obtain remission of sins"; just where, when, and how did he learn it? Up to 1827, we read in Vol. 2, page 206, of *Memoirs of Campbell*: "Various satisfactory evidences of a true faith were still required before admission to baptism, which was looked upon as a means of admission into the Church—a **command to be obeyed by those who were already saved**. No special promises were connected with it, and it was very unusual to hear this subject presented at all, except when some one was about to be baptized." *That was the state of things from 1812, when Matthias Luce baptized Alexander Campbell, until 1827, 15 ½ years!* We read on page 207: "Mr. Scott, Elder Bentley and some of the prominent preachers, **were indeed aware that Mr. Campbell had spoken of it at the McCalla debate (1823) as a pledge of pardon**, but in this point of view it was, as yet, contemplated only theoretically, *none of them having so understood it when they were baptized*, and being yet unable properly and practically to realize or appreciate its importance in this respect." You note that *Mr. Scott heard Mr. Campbell present his views at the McCalla debate. So, he got it from Campbell!*

(e) We come now to give the history of this matter, it being a Mr. Amend baptized by Walter Scott. On page 209 of the before-quoted *Memoirs*, we read where Mr. Scott was encouraged "to make the experiment" in preaching this baptismal remission doctrine! His first efforts were a failure; but he finally got up courage to try it again! So he went to New Lisbon, Ohio, and tried it again, preaching upon Acts 2:38. He made his application, and gave an invitation, and urged sinners "to come forward and be baptized for remission of sins." Mr. Amend responded and on page 212 we read: "There being, therefore, no ground for objection and no reason for delay, Mr. Scott, taking the confession of the candidate, baptized him in the presence of a large concourse 'for remission of sins,' thus annexing to the usual formula the words of Peter, Acts 2:38, explanatory of the purpose of the institution. The people were filled with bewilderment at the strange truths brought to their ears, and now exemplified before their eyes in the baptism of a penitent **for a purpose which now, on the 18th of November, 1827 for the first time since the primitive ages was fully and practically realized.**"

(f) Alexander Campbell heard of the success of Walter Scott in this matter, and he concluded to send his father, Thomas Campbell, over to investigate it fearing that Scott would overstep his bounds. Page 219: "He saw at once that what he and his son Alexander had plainly taught was **now reduced to practice.**" Thomas Campbell wrote his son from the scene itself, and said, "I must confess that in respect of the direct exhibition and application of it for that blessed purpose, *I am at present, for the first time, upon the ground where the thing has appeared to be practically exhibited to the proper purpose.*" Note please that Thomas Campbell said that in 1827 when he was then "upon the ground" where "baptism for remission" was "practically exhibited to the proper purpose"! Thomas Campbell continues: "Mr. Scott has made a bold push to accomplish this object, by simply and boldly stating the ancient gospel and

insisting upon it: and then by putting the question generally and particularly to males and females, old and young—will you come to Christ and be baptized for the remission of your sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit?” On page 218 we read that after Mr. Scott put in motion “the ancient gospel” of “baptism for remission of sins,” that immediately “all the leading preachers of the Association, as well as others of the Christian connection, hastened to adopt that primitive order of the different parts of the gospel which was then no less a novelty.” He continues: “Everywhere the confusion which had involved the subject of conversion was removed; the **mourning bench was abandoned**: an intelligent obedience was substituted for visionary theories, and a divine assurance replaced delusive frames and feelings.” When was the “mourning bench” abandoned and “intelligent obedience” by being baptized, substituted? Why, sir, it was immediately following, and in Walter Scott's revival at New Lisbon in November 1827, not back in 1812; when Alexander Campbell was baptized by Matthias Luce!

(g) In conclusion, I turn to the *Life of Walter Scott*, page 107, and read: “This event, which forms an era in the religious history of times, took place on Nov. 18, 1827, and Mr. Amend was, beyond all question, the first person in modern times who received the ordinance of baptism in perfect accordance with apostolic teaching and usage.” Quoted from *Campbellism—What Is It?* by J. W. Chism, page 208. Mr. Chism says on page 209: “This shows for itself that this was acknowledged by them (the Campbells) to be the **beginning of the practice of the gospel of the Son of God.**” When, according to Chism, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, was the beginning of this “baptism for remission” in modern times? Why, sir, it was in 1827, when Walter Scott baptized William Amend!

J. W. Crumley

At Odessa, near Gotebo, Oklahoma, in May 1918, I held a debate with Mr. Crumley, who was then (now dead) a leading defender of the Campbell party, and he affirmed the following proposition: “the Scriptures and History teach that the Church of Christ ceased to exist on earth as an organized body, and was restored as such by Campbell, Scott and others in the beginning of the 19th century.” I pressed Crumley on Campbell's Baptism not being “in order to remission”; and forced him to sign the following:

Statement

“Matthias Luce said that he baptized Alexander Campbell into Jesus Christ; and thus Campbell was baptized in order to remission of sins. Walter Scott was also baptized for the same purpose.”

Signed:

J. W. CRUMLEY.

“Rowe Book of The Reformation”

Eld. J. D. Tant also said in our Oakland debate that this proof is “**in the Rowe book of the Reformation.**” I am now ready for the proof, Mr. Tant. Get down to your knitting.

Question

Mr. Tant, when you said at Oakland that the exact date when the church was restored after she apostatized was 1827, if you did not refer to the practice of “baptism in order to remission” beginning when Mr. Amend was baptized by Walter Scott, just what did you mean?

TANT'S FIRST NEGATIVE

I cannot tell the reason Smith wants to debate this proposition. Personally, I am not interested in it. A man can hear, believe and obey the gospel and go to heaven if he never hears tell of Alexander Campbell. My salvation depends upon Christ and obedience to his word, not on Campbell or any other man.

As to what Henry Clay, W. M. Thompson, or J. D. Tant or any other man may say of Campbell, that has nothing to do with the point at issue. Does history teach that Alexander Campbell was baptized for the remission of sins?

1. Matthias Luce was a Primitive Baptist preacher, and in faith and practice was not in accord with any Missionary Baptist nor Landmark Baptist church. (Represented by Smith and others).

2. It was the faith and practice of the Primitive Baptist church in those days of Matthias Luce to baptize no one until he related an experience of grace, and was voted on by the Primitive Baptist church.

3. Alexander Campbell refused to accept this kind of baptism, which was Baptist baptism, and stipulated with Luce that he must be baptized on a simple confession of faith that Jesus Christ was the Son of God.

4. Luce refused to baptize him upon this confession, but after further discussion said that such was contrary to Baptist doctrine but he believed it to be the teaching of the Bible, and stated, "I will baptize you and run the risk of censure of the Baptist church."

5. When Campbell was baptized there was no Baptist church there, no experience of grace, no Baptist vote. But he was baptized on the same confession that was made to Phillip as recorded in Acts 8:37.

6. Alexander Campbell was never a Baptist nor was he ever a member of any Baptist church.

Proof: Dr. W. A. Jarrell, in his book, *The Gospel in Water*, page 62, says: "The Campbells, therefore, never were Baptists, nor members of any Baptist church." On page 63 he says: "Never let it again be said that the Campbells or any Campbellite, were ever any part of any Baptist or New Testament church."

Dr. J. R. Graves, the most noted Southern Baptist, says: "According to all the principles that characterize Baptists neither Alexander nor his father were scripturally baptized. Alexander had stipulated with Elder Luce that the ceremony should be performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament and that the candidate should be admitted upon the simple confession that Jesus was the Son of God. Elder Luce had indeed at first objected to this change as being contrary to Baptist usage, but finally consented, remarking he believed they were scriptural." Graves' *Trilemma*, pages 192-193.

So we see that Dr. Jarrell and Dr. Graves, two of the oldest historians of that period, both say that Campbell was not a Baptist and had no connected with any Baptist church, and did not have Baptist baptism. Graves claims their baptism was unscriptural because it was performed precisely after "Apostolic pattern." If you will turn to apostolic pattern you will find that Jesus preached salvation on faith and baptism (Mark 16:16). You will also find that Peter preached

remission of sins upon repentance and baptism (Acts 2:38). And Ananias in Acts 22:16 predicated washing away sins on baptism. These are apostolic patterns which Campbell followed and which Graves says are unscriptural.

I only present the above as preliminary to bring me to the main issue.

1. I beg to state that all scholars of the church of Christ for the first hundred years after Christ, who wrote on baptism, represented it as for the remission of sins. Alexander Campbell was familiar with these writings. (Proof I'll give later). I now skip 1200 years of scholarship which is not germane to the subject and affirm that all schools and creeds for the two hundred years immediately before Campbell taught baptism for the remission of sins.

Now if these two propositions can be sustained, and they can, and we can find that Campbell was familiar with all their teaching on baptism as being a condition of salvation, as well as the same being taught in the Bible, it looks like he would be silly to turn away from all Bible pattern and all history to get Baptist baptism which is no where taught in the Bible.

Let us follow history. Barnabas, Paul's companion, whom Dr. Graves says was like Paul, sound in the faith, in his Catholic epistle chapter eleven, speaking of baptism, says: "Blessed are they who putting trust in the cross, descend into the water. Why do they go into the water? That we go down into the water full of sin and pollution, but come up again, bring forth fruit having in our hearts the fear and hope which are in Jesus by the Spirit." No Baptist will take that kind of a man but the early church did.

In the second century, Hermas in his book of *Similitudes*, chapter 16, speaking of baptism, says: "And I said to him, I have even now heard from certain teachers that there is no other repentance besides that of baptism when we go down into the water and receive the forgiveness of sins"! This shows that these writers in the second century who Graves claims were sound in the faith, taught baptism as a condition of salvation.

Tertullian wrote in the third century condemning baptism, as they were baptizing children for remission of sins. "Let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need this guildless age to make haste to the forgiveness of sins." In his work, page 74. At that time they were baptizing children for the remission of sins. He condemned it and demanded that children wait till they were older.

Origin says: "The baptism of the church is given for the remission of sins."

Not one of the apostolic fathers but who taught baptism was for the remission of sins. Campbell was familiar with all their teaching.

Passing over 1200 years, what did the people teach before there was any Baptist church?

Beginning with the Episcopalians, founded in 1521, we find them plainly teaching baptism as condition of salvation. *Common prayer*, p. 165.

The Presbyterians, started in 1537, taught that baptism is a sign and a seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of remission of sins. *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, Chapter 28, Sec. 1.

The Methodist church started in 1729. Their *Discipline* on page 105 teaches baptism for the remission of sins. John Wesley, in his notes on New Testament, teaches it even stronger than does the *Discipline*.

The Baptists, who formulated their creed in 1611, chapter 30, sec. 1, teach that baptism

engrafts into Christ, into remission of sins, and of his giving up to God through Jesus Christ to live and walk in a new life.

With all the creeds for four hundred years before Campbell, including Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Wesley, teaching that baptism was for the remission of sins, with Hermas, Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen during the first four hundred years after Christ teaching the same thing, Campbell, being familiar with all their writings and seeking for the truth, and refusing to accept Baptist baptism which was because of remission of sins, would have been a fool to go against the Bible and all modern and ancient history who taught baptism for the remission of sins.

What was he baptized for? It seems Campbell ought to know, so we call him on the stand.

I note in Dr. Richardson's *Memoirs of Campbell*, pp. 397-398, the following historical statement: "In his remarks he had quoted, among other scriptures, the command of Peter to the believers on the day of Pentecost: 'Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,' and had dwelt at length upon the gracious promises of God to all who should obey him. When he had concluded James Hanen, who with his wife, had also concluded to be baptized, took his child from its mother's arms, and requested her to walk aside. He asked her what she thought of the declaration of Peter, 'You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,' and how she understood it. Mrs. Hanen, being well acquainted with the scriptures, soon gave a satisfactory reply, and both were accordingly, baptized along with the rest, consisting of Alexander Campbell and his wife, his father and mother, and his sister—in all seven persons. Alexander had stipulated with Elder Luce that the ceremony should be performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament and as there was no account of any of the first converts being called upon to give what is called 'a religious experience,' this modern custom should be omitted, and that the candidates should be admitted on the simple confession that 'Jesus is the Son of God.' These points he had fully discussed with Elder Luce during the evening spent in his house when he first went up to request his attendance and they had arranged as he desired. Elder Luce had indeed, at first, objected to these changes as being contrary to Baptist usage, but finally consented, remarking that he believed they were right, and he would run the risk of censure. There were not, therefore, upon this occasion, any of the usual forms of receiving persons into the church upon a detailed account of religious feelings and impressions. There was indeed no Baptist church-meeting to which any such experiences could have been related. Elders Luce and Spear, with Elder David Jones of Eastern Pennsylvania, being the only Baptists known to have been present. All were therefore, admitted to immersion upon making the simple confession of Christ required of converts in apostolic times. The meeting, it is related, continued about seven hours."

WHAT DID
CAMPBELL BELIEVE
THE PATTERN
WAS?

From the above statement I glean: (1) Baptist usage at that time required a candidate to relate an experience of grace and be voted upon to be baptized. Campbell refused to submit to Baptist baptism. (2) At the first Luce refused to baptize him contrary to Baptist doctrine. (3) After further discussion Luce stated, "I believe your idea is scriptural, but it is contrary to Baptist doctrine, but if you so desire I'll baptize you and run the risk of being censured by the Baptist church." (4) In Campbell's talk before baptism he quoted Acts 2:38 to sustain his act. Acts 2:38 says, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins," and if Campbell was not going to be baptized for remission of sins as Smith claims why did he quote Acts 2:38 to prove baptism was for remission of sins? (5) Campbell demanded of Luce that he should be baptized precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament, and had so stipulated with Luce the night before. (6) He refused to be baptized according to Baptist doctrine of relating an experience and

of being baptized into the Baptist church. (7) Dr. Graves and Dr. Jarrell say he was not baptized into the Baptist church, was not baptized by Baptist authority, was never a Baptist, was never a member of any Baptist church. But both claim that his baptism was precisely after the pattern given in the New Testament.

This forces us to go back and find out the New Testament pattern of baptism. As Graves and Jarrell both claim Campbell had that kind, which they claim is not according to Baptist doctrine (and they are correct), I now turn to the Bible to find the New Testament pattern.

In the commission of the New Testament pattern Christ said: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mark 16:16). Jarrell and Graves, noted Baptist scholars said Campbell had that, but it was not Baptist doctrine. True. Paul said: “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ” (Gal. 3:27). That is New Testament pattern but is not Baptist doctrine. The eunuch said: “I believe Jesus is the Son of God.” On that confession Phillip went down into the water and baptized him (Acts 8:37-38). Why did he baptize him? Jesus had said: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mark 16:16). Phillip baptized him that he might be saved. Graves said that was according to New Testament pattern but not Baptist doctrine.

But why did Campbell go to Matthias Luce to be baptized? What was he baptized for? Let Campbell tell. In his talk just before his baptism which was contrary to Baptist doctrine, he quoted Acts 2:38 in defence of his action.

As Campbell was versed in church history which for four hundred after Christ taught baptism for the remission of sins, and as he was acquainted with all church creeds and reformers like Luther, Calvin, and Wesley who all taught baptism for the remission of sins, and as he wanted to follow the Bible pattern, and quoted Acts 2:38 as the pattern he must follow, I then turn to Acts 2:38 and find that Peter told the people to be baptized for the remission of sins.

In as much as Graves and Jarrell both deny Campbell having Baptist baptism, or ever being a member of any Baptist church, and in much as both claim that Campbell demanded baptism according to New Testament pattern, and in as much as Campbell quoted Acts 2:38 as the New Testament pattern he wanted to follow, and in as much as said pattern said baptism was for the remission of sins, no man on earth who makes any pretense to honesty can claim that Campbell was not baptized for the remission of sins.

More than a hundred times have I heard Baptists in debate claim Campbell had Baptist baptism and was excluded from the Baptist church. They made themselves a set of ignorant or willful liars and have no regard for the truth, but follow their father, the devil, who was a liar from the beginning.

But this is not all; we will let Campbell answer for himself. In *Millennial Harbinger*, New Series, Vol. 2, p. 467, Campbell referring to his baptism says: “That faith, repentance, baptism, remission, and many other words in the New Testament are perfectly understood and believed and taught I can not doubt; but that the proper application and application of any one of these is the restoration of the original gospel, is, with me, a assumption. Still, if I were to select any one event which has lately transpired as the restoration of the gospel, should not find it in the year of 1823 or 1827.” These are the dates that Baptists claim Campbell to teach baptism for remission of sins. “I would pitch upon the time when, and the place where” (Referring to his own baptism) “a penitent sinner made the apostolic confession of faith in order to remission, and was immersed on that confession alone—not for any particular purpose, as the personal remission of sins, but

for all the blessings of the Christian covenant. The very confession of Peter, on which Christ built the church, and on which, and for which he lost his life, is truly the Christian confession and the true gospel. If any one can tell me who first promulgated this doctrine and received persons into the church upon this truly primitive and apostolic plan, and then taught the disciples all that Christ commanded, I will think favorably of his pretensions to the peculiar honor of restoring the original gospel. This might lead us back to almost the beginning of the present century. For my own part I was immersed on that very confession and for that grand object by special covenant and stipulation with the Baptist who immersed me: and for adhering to this confession alone we have been separated from that community. They often baptize into the penitent's own experience."

We note in this that Campbell dates his work before 1823 and 1827, back almost to the beginning of the century, 1812, when he was not only baptized for the remission of sins, but for all other blessings connected with the Christian covenant, which comes to any man making the scriptural confession that Peter made (Matt. 16:18), and being baptized for the remission of sins. (Acts 2:38).

See pg. 23

David Lipscomb, in commenting on this statement of Campbell's says in *Gospel Advocate*, Jan. 20, 1898: "This makes the case a little stronger than we had contended, in so far as Brother Campbell's own baptism is concerned, for it shows he was baptized upon the proper confession not only for the remission of sins, but, as he states, for all the blessings of the Christian covenant. So we see his grasp of the truth at the time he was baptized was greater and reached farther than we have ever contended in this paper that one should understand in order to valid baptism. In fact Brother Campbell understood the design of baptism at the time he was baptized by Mr. Luce—even greater than he contended was necessary in order to scriptural baptism."

Again in *Millennial Harbinger*, 1831, p. 481, Mr. Richardson asked Campbell: "Were you not baptized by a Regular Baptist and in a Regular Baptist way?" Campbell said: "I was immersed by a Regular Baptist but not in a Regular Baptist way. I stipulated with Matthias Luce that I should be immersed on the profession of the one fact or proposition that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God. When I solicited his attendance with me on that occasion he replied that it was not usual for Baptists to immerse simply on that profession but he believed it to be scriptural. Fearing, however to be called to account for it by some of his brethren he solicited the attendance of Henry Spears."

Campbell claimed he was immersed on the simple confession that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that he had never baptized any one only on that confession.

So far we have learned: (1) Luce did not get authority from the Baptist church to baptize Campbell. (2) Luce agreed that Campbell's baptism was scriptural but was not according to Baptist practice. (3) If Campbell's baptism was scriptural, yet not according to Baptist practice, it follows that Baptist baptism is not scriptural. (4) Baptists teach that he that believeth and is saved may be baptized if voted upon and accepted. Christ taught: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). (5) Luce, Graves, Jarrell and Campbell all deny Campbell's having Baptist baptisms. The Bible teaches the baptism the Baptists do not have and Campbell demanded, "baptism for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). (6) Campbell claims that his baptism dates before 1823 or 1827, about the beginning of that century. (7) We turn back to June 12, 1812, and find Campbell and six others went to Matthias Luce and demanded baptism of him on the simple confession that all my brethren make and J. R. Graves said it was stipulated that it must be performed precisely as the New Testament pattern. (8) Campbell himself said he was not

baptized for remission of sins only, but for all other blessings that come to man in the Christian covenant that follow a man's obedience. (9) Campbell states that his baptism must be according to New Testament pattern and not according to Baptist usage. (10) When Campbell refused to accept Baptist baptism because of remission of sins, or to get into the Baptist church, and demanded baptism after the New Testament pattern, he had before him the scholarship of the world who for the four hundred years after Christ without exception taught baptism was for the remission of sins. He was also familiar with the writings of Luther, Calvin, John Wesley, and all reformers without exception who taught baptism was for the remission of sins. He also had the New Testament before him and demanded baptism for the remission of sins according to New Testament pattern, and before going down into the water he quoted Acts 2:38 which says to be baptized for the remission of sins, and Campbell could not have followed the New Testament pattern had he not been baptized for remission of sins.



SMITH'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I wrote my first affirmative on March the 7th, 1935, and mailed it to friend Tant on the 8th. On August the 28th, just five months and 20 days later, Mr. Tant mailed me his first negative! I wrote him, however to take plenty of time to get up his history. Having not heard from Mr. Tant, under date of April the 24th I wrote him as follows: “My dear friend Tant: On March 8, 1935, I sent you my first article in our written debate on ‘Campbell's Baptism.’ To this good day, more than a month and a half later, I have not heard a word from you! Of course, I wanted you to take time to get up your history; but I have about concluded that you have no ‘facts’ on your side, and cannot answer my ‘sledge-hammer blows,’ and have decided that your best way out would be to never make an effort! A number feel as I do about it. Please write me a card at least, and let me know what you have done, and whether I may expect you to take up your side of the debate.” On April 27, Mr. Tant mailed me a letter as follows: “My Dear Smith: Your card came today and you are on my reply like you are the Bible, terrible wrong. Glad you informed me you made some sledge hammer blows. I had not detected them, and will re-read your article. When your article came, my daughter was here from Memphis, Tenn. (went home last week) with a sick child, which took up much time. Then a call to Ardmore, Oklahoma, to talk at the burial of Bro. J. W. Chism, and then a call to New Orleans and to Wellington, Texas, for meetings, has kept me from replying to your article. But have examined history and find enough to make your article look like 30 cents, and have packed all in my grip, and will start to Arkansas Monday for a tent meeting, and during the time I hope to get up a reply and have it type-written and mailed to you, and hope it will not so completely upset you that you will not make the next reply. So don't get impatient in waiting a little longer.” So the gentleman has evidently taken plenty of time to get up his negative proof; if there is any to be had! Mr. Tant has agreed to not introduce any new matter in his next article which ends the debate. *So you have all that he can give on his side of the question, except to sum up, which he has already done!* Friend Tant relates in his letter that

the Chism funeral delayed his reply. **But J. W. Chism died on February 16, and was buried on February 18, and I did not mail my first article until March 8, eighteen days after Mr. Chism was buried!** So you see how the gentleman gets mixed. He is much nearer the truth concerning the Chism funeral hindering him in his reply than he is in the historical facts concerning Mr. Campbell's baptism! You have his "facts," and judge ye, if he made my article "look like 30 cents"!

A Request Unheeded

In my first affirmative I made the following request of Elder J. D. Tant: "I shall give a number of reasons, as affirmative arguments, setting forth my proof that Matthias Luce did not baptize Alexander Campbell in order to obtain the remission of sins ... I want Mr. Tant to labor to disprove my arguments, taking up each argument in succession, and weigh each point connected with each argument." Instead of doing as I requested, and as all rules of honorable debate demand that he do: **He just simply ignored every argument and every point in each argument. Brushed them all aside, bringing a line of rebuttal arguments with no reply to a single historical quotation I made—and that is debating!** So, according to his agreement he cannot answer now! He wrote the following agreement under date of March the 2nd, 1935: "You can write your manuscript and mail it to me, I'll answer—mail to you. You write a second and I'll reply putting in no new matter, and then you will have it."

Why This Debate?

Mr. Tant has informed us that he has no interest whatever in this debate: that he can go to heaven without ever hearing of Alexander Campbell! But Mr. Tant cannot go to heaven without being in the Church: this he has affirmed constantly! In our Oakland debate, Mr. Tant affirmed that "That Church of Christ apostatized, and was restored in the 19th century under Campbell, Scott and others." So now it matters not with J. D. Tant, whether Alexander Campbell went to heaven or to hell, just so he got the church back so that Tant can get in it in order to go to heaven!

A Question!

In our Oakland debate, I asked Mr. Tant the following question: "If Christians composing the church of Christ apostatize, and die in that condition, will they go to hell?" His reply was "yes." So the church of Christ apostatized and went to hell; and but for Mr. Campbell, according to Tant, there would be no church of Christ on the earth; and Mr. Tant says that one cannot go to heaven without being in the church! So "poor J. D. Tant," if there had been no Alexander Campbell; and "poor Alexander Campbell," if he was not "baptized in order to obtain remission of sins"!

TANT AFFIRMED A FALSEHOOD!

Mr. Tant now informs us that what he said in the Oakland debate has nothing to do with the facts as to Campbell's baptism! If not, then Mr. Tant affirmed a falsehood at Oakland. He said at Oakland that God's Bible foretold of Alexander Campbell's work; and by the mouth of Daniel fixed the date when the church would fall and when she would be restored again. In Tant's arguments he ran the dates from B. C. 473 to A. D. 1827, 2300 years. J. D. Tant now says that the church was "Restored" back in 1812, with seven members, all baptized by Matthias Luce "in order to obtain the remission of sins." Well, if this is correct Tant affirmed a falsehood at Oakland, and J. W. Chism in his 1827 date is wrong; and "Daniel the prophet missed the mark," Ha. Ha, Ha! But, beloved, if Mr. Campbell was not a lost sinner and restored the church;

Matthias Luce was the devil who administered the ordinance of heaven to get Mr. Campbell and his party into the church, and into salvation, according to Tant's theory of salvation! Was Matthias Luce already saved? No, not if Tant has told the truth; and not if "faith in Christ embraces design of baptism," as Mr. Tant has affirmed! If it takes faith in to put one into the Church where salvation only is obtained, as Tant affirms, and if Elder Luce did not have "faith in design" when he was baptized, then Matthias Luce was a lost sinner, according to Tant's doctrine! If Matthias Luce was already saved, and if one must be in the church, as Tant teaches, to be saved, then the church was here and Matthias Luce and all his brethren of the Baptist faith were in it. Then that would cut the Campbells out of "Restoring the Church" in the 19th century; for Matthias Luce was a Baptist minister, a very old man; baptized and ordained back in the 18th century. If he and his Baptist brethren were in the church back in the 18th century, then contrary to Tant's theory of salvation, "Faith in design of baptism," is not necessary; and that would put all Baptists into the Church—this Tant denies with all his soul! So *this puts things in a pretty mess!!!*

"Luce Was A Child of the Devil"

I asked Tant the following question at Oakland: "In your judgment was Mr. Luce, who baptized Alexander Campbell, a Christian at the time he baptized Mr. Campbell?" Mr. Tant had signed an agreement to answer each question 'yes' or 'no.' This one he tried to dodge! Why did he try to dodge it? Well, it looked bad to say that Mr. Luce, a child of the devil, administered Christian Baptism to get the church back on earth! So Elder Tant wrote his answer down, in open violation of our signed agreement, "I don't know." I immediately arose to a point of order, and demanded the selection of the third moderator, if the two presiding ones could not reach an agreement. Mr. Tant said: "I do not know whether Old Brother Luce was a Christian or not." I said: "The question only calls for your opinion on the matter." Mr. Tant replied, "I have no opinion in the matter. Matthias Luce was just a poor old ignorant country Baptist preacher." I replied: "You do have an opinion, and you are going to rub this out and write 'yes' or 'no.' I know that your opinion is that he was a child of the devil, and you are going to put it on paper. You have already signed a question in which you say one cannot become a Christian, or be saved, unless at the time of his baptism he believed that baptism was necessary to his salvation or remission of sins." When Mr. Tant saw that he was caught, and during the recess hour he took the paper and erased his "I don't know" out and wrote "no." So, according to Tant, God did not have a child on earth that he could send Mr. Campbell to in order to get Christian Baptism; and he had to send him to one of the devil's goats to get his own church back on earth! You see, if Tant should admit that Elder Luce was saved, or Regenerated, that would say that the church of Christ was on earth, and need not be restored; for Tant says that one cannot be saved out of the church!

"Campbellism—What Is It?"

Elder J. W. Chism is the author of a book under the above title, and on preface page 3, he says: "If we can find in the prophecies that God has as clearly revealed this religious movement as he did the coming of the Christ and approved of the work in the prophecies as he did of the coming of the Christ, will it not then be an evidence that this work, which is so commonly called 'Campbellism,' is not 'Campbellism' but the gospel of Christ restored?" He says on page 1: "There is a religious people in the United States of America and other parts of the Christian world who claim to be the people of God, and who are called by other religious teachers by the name 'Campbellite': and since these people make such claim—to be the people of God—I desire to examine their claims and the claims of other religious teachers with fairness and candor, and

see if the name 'Campbellite' is a right name for them."

On page 108 Mr. Chism says: "We place the beginning of the twenty three hundred days here at B. C. 473." On page 208, Mr. Chism runs out the 2300 days to Nov. 18, 1827, when Walter Scott baptized Mr. Amend, as the gospel then "Restored" "baptism for remission of sins." This position Tant first took at Oakland, but upon his theory, "Faith in design of baptism," I ran him away from it, and drove him back to 1812 when Campbell was baptized—to keep out of the awful predicament that a child of the devil restored the Church"; and then was forced to admit that a child of the devil did restore the church, one Matthias Luce, by baptizing Alexander Campbell and six others on June 12, 1812! Since Tant admitted that he believed Chism's 1827 theory; and to make Daniel miss it 15 years makes Chism admit that the folk known as Campbellites are rightly named! To admit that folk can be saved by baptism without understanding the design of it would not do; for then Luce and all Baptists will "slip into the kingdom," and will admit that the church "did not apostatize," and knocks Campbellism into a "cocked hat"!

T. R. Burnett

Mr. Burnett was a Campbellite preacher in Texas, but he did not believe that faith in design of baptism was necessary to remission, and would take baptism administered by Baptists and others, just so it was immersion on a profession of faith. On page 32 of *J. N. Hall's Campbellite Catechism* is published an article from the *Gospel Advocate*, Dec. 2, 1897, written by T. R. Burnett: "Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott, and John Smith and Jacob Creath and all the pioneers were immersed before they learned that baptism was for remission of sins. Walter Scott baptized William Amend on Nov. 18, 1827, 'for the remission of sins,' and he was the first person in modern times so baptized. This was fifteen years after the baptism of Alexander Campbell and his father, Thomas Campbell, which occurred at Brush Run in 1812. Neither one of those gentlemen had baptized a believer in order to obtain remission of sins during those fifteen years."

see pg. 16

"Faith In Design"

The Campbellites were having it hot and heavy among themselves in those days, and A. McGary and T. B. Wilkinson had it over and under with Burnett; and Joe S. Warlick, J. W. Chism, J. D. Tant and C. R. Nichol were on McGary's side. Wilkinson wrote a poem on T. R. Burnett, "Shaking goats out of the Baptist Goat-pen," without baptizing them over without "wetting his skin"! To this Burnett wrote the following, as published in Hall's book:

But that's a fib, a fad, a fake
None from the Baptist fold he'll take,
Or shake from out the Baptist pen,
Except they have been born again.

In Mark Sixteen the Savior said
To all on earth for whom he bled:
"Believe, baptize (the words he gave),
And you from sin and death I'll save."

If Jesus here the truth hath told,
All such are in the blessed fold
But hobby scribes won't shake or grip

Unless they'll take a second dip.
Not faith in Christ as God's own Son,
And buried with the Holy one
Is quite enough, it will not do;
They must have faith in water, too.
Ho, every Adam's son and daughter
Come, put your faith in gospel water!

Nor does this end the bold digression;
You needs must have a new confession.
The old's too short by half a line;
It don't embrace "faith in design."

Say, bard, when did your church begin,
And from the first where has it been?
Did Campbell build it on the rock
And is he daddy of the flock?

How long's your line? Threescore and ten
And there it strikes the old goat-pen,
Where you must either shake or break;
And that's what makes your hobby quake.

It once began at Pentecost,
But soon in fog and sin was lost;
And now it's short (the figures vary);
It runs from Campbell to McGary.

Ah, that is bad, that you can't trace
A track of your baptismal grace,
By light of star or moon or sun,
Beyond the goats at old Brush Run.

You can't go round, you won't go through;
And now you don't know what to do.
The goats were out, and put us in;
And that's the place where we began.

I know old Daniel once did say
The kingdom shall not pass away;
But he was not a prophet true,
And could not see the ages through.

? Appears he is saying such is what the Foundation's stone would lead to.

'Twas our new hob., "faith in design,"
That broke the church succession line;
And, in our mad sectarian spasm,
We've made an awful, bloody Chasm.

And in that gulf, forever doomed,
The hobby crowd is now entombed,
No more to sing in loud laudation
The glories of the Firm Foundation.

Here's Jackson, Jones, and Charlie Nichol,
And "Weeping Joe" in the sad pickle;
And Durst and Swinney, Tant and Chism
All buried in this bloody chasm.

This is the rock, as all admit,
On which the Rebaptismal boat was split;
Not one of all the mighty host
But here hath yielded up the ghost!

The question true they could not meet,
Though many times it did repeat,
At noon and night and early morn:
"Where was the church when C. was Born?"

Here lies the last of poor old hob,
He undertook too big a job:
He tried to kick the Baptists out,
And that's what brought this end about.

For then he could no further go,
Than Campbell's day, and could not show
A church or people in the line
That understood the one design.

Ho, every Adam's son and daughter
That makes an idol of the water.
Come back into the good old way
That leads to heaven and endless day!

So you see that for years and years, the Campbellites themselves have been in a fight among themselves as to whether one must have "faith in design" when baptized in order to valid baptism; and such as J. D. Tant among them were having a hard go of it trying to show "faith in water too," was necessary! If not, Baptists are "in the kingdom," and Tant, it seems, had rather go to hell himself than to admit this!

David Lipscomb

Tant quotes from Mr. Lipscomb, where he commented in the *Gospel Advocate*, Jan. 20, 1898, on a citation from Alexander Campbell, where Campbell said in *Millennial Harbinger*, something about some one "about the beginning of the present century" made the apostolic confession, and was immersed,

“Not For Personal Remission of Sins,”

“but for all the blessings of the Christian covenant.” I know that Tant is a big dodger, so I put Campbell's words in the above heading, to bring out, and to show that when Campbell was baptized, it was not “for remission.” Yet, Mr. Campbell did not say that this party was himself, but doubtless he wanted to make the impression on his followers that he was so baptized—for he was being probed from every angle on “faith in design of baptism.” Then Mr. Campbell goes on and says: “For my own part I was immersed on that very confession and for that grand object by special covenant and stipulation with the Baptist who immersed me.” But he had also quoted: “The very confession of Peter, on which Christ built his church.” That Campbell got Matthias Luce to immerse him on the “confession of the Ethiopian eunuch,” the *Memoirs of Campbell* state and it was not until Alexander Campbell brought out his edition of the New Testament, called *Living Oracles*, in which he discarded the 37th verse of the 8th chapter of Acts did Mr. Campbell change passages to “Peter's Confession.” in Matthew 16:16. On page 23 of Tant's book, *Gospel X-Ray*, Mr. Tant says: “The Apostles were saved long before Pentecost.” Then Peter must have been saved before he made the confession, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Was Peter saved before he made that Confession, Mr. Tant? He had been baptized before, had he not? Mr. Campbell, by force of scholarship, was forced to drop Acts 8:37 for he listed it in the back of his Testament under the heading of “Spurious readings.” Tant said at Oakland that Campbell put the verse in a footnote, and I took the book and exposed him on it, and he just turned pale, and dropped it like it was hot!

The Truth of the Matter

The truth of the matter is, that Mr. Campbell got Brother Luce to consider the fact that there was no church present in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, and that he wanted to be baptized like that, and finally got Luce to agree to that. This is all right when a missionary is sent out into destitution, to baptize without the voice of a church, but when other brethren are present they should be consulted, as in Acts 10:47. But not a word did Campbell say to Bro. Luce about being “baptized in order to remission,” but he and his Brush Run church did the very next year (1813), write out a “confession of faith,” upon which they were admitted into the Red Stone Baptist Association. But David Lipscomb, as published in the *Firm Foundation*, Jan. 11, 1898, did say of Campbell: “Now, Mr. Campbell did not understand baptism was for remission of sins at that time, nor for ten or twelve years afterwards. He stumbled on it in quoting the passage, Acts 2:38, in debate with Walker in 1820, but did not understand it. In the McCalla debate, 1823, he presented baptism and remission just as the Baptists do now. They are really forgiven when they believe, formally forgiven in baptism” (*Hall's Catechism*, page 33). Turn back to my first affirmative, and read quotation from page 135, *Campbell-McCalla Debate*, and see that Lipscomb told the truth. If Tant and Lipscomb, in the quotations and comments thereon which they give, told the truth; then Lipscomb and Campbell lied in the two quotations which I gave. If Campbell did not lie, on page 135 of his debate with McCalla, and he wrote every word of it, even McCalla's part (from notes which he took of McCalla), will you, Mr. Tant, please explain why he did not say that sins are in fact washed away, instead of saying: “Paul's sins were really washed away when he believed ... formally forgiven in baptism”? Since Campbell said this 11½ years after Matthias Luce baptized him, then he told Matthias Luce that he was a Christian, and had been forgiven, and had the actual forgiveness of sins, but he wanted to do it “formally,” as all Baptists do today! If not he contradicted himself—he believed it!

Still no
note in Acts 10:47

Daniel's 2300 Days

I knocked Chism and Tant “sky high” on this prophecy, but we must now hear Alexander Campbell on it. In *Millennial Harbinger* for 1832, he says: “Now this question is of peculiar easy solution, for no event in history is more notorious than the battle at the rive Grandicus, in which Alexander the Great, the first king of the Grecian Empire, triumphed over Darius and, broke to pieces the Medo-Persian dynasty. Now we cannot date the Grecian Empire under the symbol of the ‘goat,’ (which, by the way, was the ensign armorial of the Macedonian people), more correctly than from the invasion of Asia by Alexander and his all-conquering army, in the year before Christ 334. Here, then, we are compelled, by force of historic facts, to date the vision under consideration. From this date we compute the 2300 days. And what is the result? *The time of the end will be in the year of our Lord 1966—one hundred and twenty-three years yet distant.* If, then, the Millerites, and all who agree with them in their times and seasons, seek to rid themselves of all the previous difficulties by taking the date of the vision proper, to which the 2300 days belong, if they prefer this horn of the dilemma, it is not as evident as demonstration that they have wholly mistaken the *dates*, (to say nothing more), and that which they are now expecting in 1843, can not occur till 1966.” I just wanted to show how the founder of the Campbellite church differs from the children of his “New Party,” Elders J. W. Chism, Will M. Thompson and J. D. Tant!

"Church Succession"

The Lumenbug Letter Did the church of Jesus Christ our Lord die out and pass into hades as J. D. Tant, Will M. Thompson and J. W. Chism teach? In 1837, Mr. Campbell, in his *Harbinger*, in reply to a sister who had been much wrought up, said: “In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans, and therefore no Christians in the world except” (as Tant says) “ourselves, or such as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against his church! This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects. But who is a Christian? I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will.” Again Mr. Campbell says: “I cannot, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their knowledge or consent, as aliens from Christ and well-grounded hope of heaven.” Again Mr. Campbell says: “Should I find a Pedobaptist more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually minded and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise” (like Tant), “I would be” (like Tant) “a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians.” Again Mr. Campbell says: “And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedobaptist more spiritually minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, than one who precisely acquires with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach” (**baptism for remission!**) “doubtless the former, rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian. So I judge, and so I feel.” J. D. Tant and his brand of “Pharisees among Christians,” as Mr. Campbell calls them, has been preaching all over the country that Alexander Campbell, the founder of their Church, taught “faith in design” as necessary to a Christian; which he perhaps did on some occasions, but

not so here!

“Blasted Nut Baptism”

That Campbell taught immersion necessary to salvation in some instances is proved by the following from page 521 of *The Christian Baptist*: “Knowing that the efficacy of this blood is to be communicated to our consciences in the way which God has pleased to appoint, we ‘stagger not at the promises of God’ but flee to the sacred ordinance which brings the blood of Jesus in contact with our consciences. Without knowing and believing this, immersion is as empty as a blasted nut. The shell is there, but the kernel is wanting.” This would be better proof for Tant than anything he has cited! Campbell said the above in 1829. In Vol. 2, page 217, of *Memoirs of A. Campbell*, he is quoted as saying, in substance: “I put baptism for remission of sins in my creed in 1823, but did not begin to practice it for some time afterward.” This I quoted fully in my first affirmative. So this “blasted nut” doctrine puts Campbell in hell, but Mr. Campbell “blasted” his own “blasted nut” doctrine! In 1843, in his debate with Mr. Rice, Mr. Campbell (page 519) says: “I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case.” So here Mr. Campbell not only “blasted” his “nut” doctrine but actually “blasted” baptism itself! In speaking of the “sects,” on page 16 of his book on *Baptism*, Mr. Campbell says: “Among them all, we thank the grace of God that there are many who believe in, and love the Savior, and that, though we may not have Christian churches, we have many Christians.”

Campbell “Explains!”

In the year that Mr. Campbell wrote his “blasted nut” article on Feb. 2, 1829, he also wrote on April 12th, an article on “The Three Kingdoms.” These he specifies as: (1) The Jewish Kingdom, (2) The Kingdom of Favor, (3) The Kingdom of Glory. He says: “The nature of the kingdom of God amongst the Jews is very different from the nature of the kingdom of God amongst the Christians, and both are different from the kingdom of Glory.” Again he says, “I have discovered that the objections offered against the scriptural design and import of Christian immersion are based upon a misapprehension of the nature and privileges of these three kingdoms.” Again he says: “They cannot enjoy the blessings of the second kingdom: in other words, they can not have and enjoy that light, peace, liberty, and love, which are the natural privileges of all who intelligently enter the kingdom of favor. But the objector means, *can* they enter into the third kingdom, or kingdom of glory?” In answer thereto Mr. Campbell says: “I doubt not but many Pedobaptists of all sects will be admitted into the kingdom of glory. Indeed all they who obey Jesus Christ, through faith in his blood, according to their knowledge, I am of the opinion will be introduced into that kingdom. But when we talk of the forgiveness of sins which comes to Christians through immersion, we have no regard to any other than the second kingdom, or the kingdom of favor. I repeat it again—there are three kingdoms: the Kingdom of Law, the Kingdom of Favor, and the Kingdom of Glory; each has a different constitution, different subjects, privileges and terms of admission.” So to get into heaven itself, Mr. Campbell explains, is by other principles than to get into the church on earth. That

“The Design of Christian Immersion”

is necessary to “enjoy that light, peace, liberty, and love,” here on earth; but mistakes as to the mode and design of Christian Baptism will not cut one out of the “admission into the everlasting kingdom.”

“The Church Fathers”

Mr. Tant makes the bold and false statement that “all scholars of the church of Christ for the

first four hundred years after Christ, who wrote on baptism represented it as being for the remission of sins." I challenge Mr. Tant to show any "history of the Church of Christ" covering the first four centuries, except that that has been under the control, and therefore colored by the Roman Catholic Church! The true church of Christ could not keep records through the dark ages, and therefore all previous "History of the Church" was colored to suit Catholicism! There is at the most but a few fragments of the history written by the true church herself before we reach the 12th century! The true church must depend on the enemy for the history the rest of the way back! **But her sacred footprints can be traced in every century by the history kept by her enemy.** If by no other means, she can be traced by the trail of blood which was drained from her two hundred million martyrs killed by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy!

Baptist "Trail of Blood" Argument

Rome's Design of Baptism

At our Springdale debate, I pressed upon Mr. Tant that he advocated the very plan of Rome herself, as to the design of baptism and plan of salvation. He admitted it, and said: "The Catholics got their plan of salvation from the Bible, and you Baptists did not." So, admittedly, he stands with the Catholics on the plan of salvation! *Our Sunday Visitor*, a Roman Catholic paper, issue of Nov. 4, 1923, says: "Baptism removes the sins committed prior to its reception." In *Roman Catholic Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, they say: "Baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation." The council of Trent says: "Whosoever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or that the grace in which we are justified is only the favor of God, or that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, as if they are only external signs of grace and regeneration, received by faith, let him be accursed."

Tant did not understand why Catholics baptize

Barnabas

This book, quoted by Mr. Tant, has been much in dispute. Some think that the Barnabas mentioned in the Bible wrote it, and others do not. The *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, page 134, says that notwithstanding the ancient writers attribute it to him, "**The internal evidence is now generally agreed as conclusive against this opinion.**"

Hermas

Mr. Tant quotes from him: "And I said to him, I have even now heard from certain teachers that there is no other repentance besides that of baptism when we go down into the water and receive the forgiveness of sins!" Hermas does not say that he approves of the doctrine! **This proves, if it proves anything, that some believed the doctrine and some did not.** Paul speaking of Romanism, the system of iniquity, says in 2 Thess. 2:7: "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." I challenge Mr. Tant to deny that this Scripture has reference to Romanism. Watch him skip this, just as he has my other arguments! **He will not answer.** Yes, when we get to the 2nd century, and take up the "Fathers," we run into "**unreliable authorities,**" and "There is no dependence to be put in them, for any of their opinions" (Alexander Campbell, page 422, *Campbell-Rice Debate*). Mr. Campbell says of Origen, that he was "**so great a visionary.**" Origen taught that "Infant Baptism is an Apostolic Tradition." This is another of Mr. Tant's witnesses!

Tertullian

Mr. Tant quotes from this "father" also. But Tertullian said: "We are not washed that we may cease to sin, but because we have ceased: since we have already been bathed in heart." Does Mr. Tant believe that one is bathed in heart by the blood of Christ which alone can really "**wash**

away sins” before the body is bathed in water? No!! So why quote Tertullian? Mr. Tant, the Daddy of your “New Party” says that all the “Fathers” were unreliable as to their opinions. So why quote them? They could not have a thing to do in praying or disproving Campbell's Baptism! But Tant had no history to disprove my proposition, hence he had to lug in everything at his command for “Filler”! *Hard pressed!*

“Baptists”

On page 66 of Tant's book, *The Gospel X-Ray*, he says: “In 1742 others became dissatisfied and started the Baptist church.” Further down he says that in 1812, all Baptists were “Primitive Baptists,” that “there was no missionary Baptist church on earth at that time.” But page 85, *Davis' History of Welch Baptists*, says that in 1654 the Welch Baptists met at Swansea, and “From the messengers at Llantirsaint, also the proposal to revive the ancient order of things came the preceding year; that is to encourage the support of the missionary cause.” On page 31 we read: “Wm. Thomas was appointed home missionary for six months,” for which he received a salary! Here is an active missionary Baptist church 88 years before J. D. Tant says that there was any kind of a Baptist church on earth! On page 967, Vol. 1, of *Johnson's New Universal Cyclopedia*, we read: “Dr. John Clark, born in Bedfordshire, England, Oct. 8, 1609, emigrated to Massachusetts, but was driven to Rhode Island in 1638, and in the same year founded the first Baptist church at Newport.” So this Baptist church was founded 104 years before J. D. Tant says there was any Baptist church on earth! **Can we trust Tant for facts?** On page 196, *The First Baptist Church in America*, by Graves & Adlam, we have the following from the articles of faith of this Newport church: “Christ freely offered himself as a substitute to suffer and die in behalf of all men. Thus he became a perfect savior by whom all who will may be saved.” On page 198 we read: “The ordinances of the church are Baptism and the Lord's supper. Baptism is the first formal act of the Christian life.” Yet J. D. Tant had the gall to say that “All schools and creeds for the two hundred years immediately before Campbell taught baptism in order to remission.” If then I have caught Tant on another point which he avowed so loudly, **watch him drop this too!** Tant argued “a case in point,” since all the “Fathers” taught Baptismal Regeneration for 400 years after Christ, and all creeds for 200 years before Campbell taught Baptismal Regeneration, that Campbell could not have conceived the idea of salvation before Baptism! **But Tant admitted that the Baptists of Campbell's day did not believe in Baptismal Regeneration.** Baptists then were a very large denomination. Do you *suppose that some of their ideas might have gotten around close to Mr. Campbell?*

Dr. W. A. Jarrell

Mr. Tant introduces this Baptist brother as a “star witness”; that Mr. Campbell was “baptized for remission,” in-as-much as Dr. Jarrell says: “The Campbells, therefore, never were Baptists nor members of any Baptist church.” But Mr. Tant should be fair to his author! Dr. Jarrell had just been summing up his evidence, and his “therefore” refers to his point Eleven: “Campbellism is an off-shoot from the Presbyterian Church.” Then Jarrell goes right on below where Tant quoted, that this “disaffected, apostate Presbyterian Church,” wrote up a ‘declaration’ of their faith so as to deceive the Red Stone Baptist Association! On page 50 Dr. Jarrell says: “We thus see that Campbellism originated from the Presbyterians; that its origin is in no way, of the Baptist Church.” On page 49, Jarrell says, after quoting Campbell where he gave an account of his baptism by Matthias Luce: “Mr. Campbell omits, in this connection, to state that, near two years before, the Campbells had organized a new Church.” In summing up, point Fourteen, page 63, Dr. Jarrell says: “Having thus got a hold among Baptists, like his namesake Alexander the copper-smith, Alexander Campbell led off many from the faith (2 Tim.

4: 14-16).” Following this Mr. Tant quotes Jarrell: “Never let it be said again that the Campbells or Campbellites were ever any part of any Baptist or New Testament Church.” Dr. Jarrell then sums up point Fifteen: “The only sense, in which the Campbells were ‘excluded from the Baptists’ is in the exclusion of their followers from the Dover and other Associations, the exclusion of their converts—whenever and wherever done—from Baptist Churches. This was, practically, an exclusion of the Campbells, since it debarred them from communion-fellowship with Baptist Churches which they had obtained as apostate Presbyterians, by creeping into the Red Stone Association with such a ‘written declaration of belief’ as led the honest, unsuspecting souls, composing its body, to think they were receiving to their bosom one ‘of like faith and order’ to their own. Over this exclusion Mr. Campbell poured out his wrath, because it limited his opportunities of destroying the Church of Jesus Christ.” But, the point at issue is, was Campbell baptized in order to remission. Dr. Jarrell says on page 414: “If Campbellism is true, the father and founder of the Campbellite Church and many of the leading Campbellite preachers are in perdition. Why? Because they had been baptized with Baptist baptism and were not re-baptized.” So, your witness, Mr. Tant says your daddy Campbell had only Baptist baptism, and therefore went to hell according to your “Faith in design of baptism” doctrine! **You had best left Dr. W. A. Jarrell off!**

Dr. J. R. Graves

This is another Baptist “star witness” introduced by Mr. Tant to disprove my proposition. So we will now see about this witness! I say again Mr. Tant should fairly represent his authors. Tant goes to page 193 of *Tri-Lemma* by Dr. Graves, down toward the bottom, underneath the heading, “The whole sect is manifestly and confessedly without Christian Baptism,” and Mr. Tant quotes the following: “According to all the principles that characterize Baptists, neither Alexander Campbell nor his father was scripturally baptized.” Then Mr. Tant jumps back to page 192, where Dr. Graves is quoting from *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, written by Mr. Campbell's son-in-law, Mr. Richardson, page 396: “Alexander had stipulated with Elder Luce that the ceremony should be performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament.” J. D. Tant gives all this together, running from page to page, as the very words of J. R. Graves! Further on Tant quoted from the *Memoirs*, and you can catch him in his misrepresentation of Graves by comparing the two citations! Then J. D. Tant has the cheek to say: “Graves claims their baptism was unscriptural because it was performed precisely after ‘Apostolic pattern.’” Graves is thus, by a cunning ruse of Tant's made to contradict himself. Dr. Graves did say: “Neither Alexander Campbell nor his father was scripturally baptized, according to all the principles that characterize Baptists!” For what reason? Dr. Graves says: “Mr. Luce had no authority from Christ or a Christian Church to baptize Mr. Campbell as he did, and therefore the act was null and void.” On page 191 Dr. Graves says: “After his failure in his attempt at reformation” (among the Presbyterians) “he decided to unite with the Baptists *not because he was one in principle* but because he regarded them as ‘being favorable to his views of reform.’ Accordingly, in 1812, he was immersed by Elder Luce, a Baptist minister without the action or authority of any Baptist Church, and contrary to invariable and recognized law and usage of Baptist churches.” On page 194 Dr. Graves says: “But Mr. Campbell refused to give any evidence of sins remitted or regeneration of heart, for he had no such evidence to give.” This covers all of Tant's points, “there was no Baptist church present, no Baptist vote and no experience of grace”; but does Dr. Graves, Mr. Tant's witness say that Mr. Campbell was “baptized in order to remission”? Right in between the two statements from Dr. Graves, which Tant jammed together as one, making Dr. Graves say just what he did not say, is the following from Graves: “Mr. Campbell and his father continued members of the Brush Run Society, which

Contradicts
disproves
argument on
the Everseds
(pg. 23).

he had organized previous to his immersion by Mr. Luce, until the next year, when it, with all the Campbells, upon the presentation of a satisfactory creed or confession, were received as a Baptist Church into the Red Stone Baptist Association. **Not until 1823 did Mr. Campbell commence putting forth his peculiar views of baptism in order to the remission of sins, and his new system of Christianity, and in 1827 the Baptists expelled him and all who embraced his unscriptural views.** So, according to this witness, which Tant introduced to disprove my affirmative, Campbell was baptized 11½ years before he “*commenced putting forth his views, baptism in order to remission.*” *This takes Graves from Tant, and leaves “poor Tant” stranded!* But on page 195, Dr. Graves says: “Mr. Luce never immersed him for any such purpose. No Baptist Church or Baptist minister ever baptized to bring the blood of Christ in contact with the conscience of his subject. or to procure for him the remission of sins or regeneration of his heart. **Mr. Campbell himself at this time, 1812, did not know or believe any such doctrine.** He had never thought of it in his wildest imagination. **It was years after his baptism before his preaching or writings were tainted by this heretical conception.**” So much for this witness! Tant says: “Dr. Jarrell and Dr. Graves says Campbell did not have Baptist Baptism.” Weigh what I have given from both these men, and see if Mr. Tant told the truth about their position! Tant says further concerning Jarrell and Graves: “But both claim that his baptism was precisely after the pattern given in the New Testament.” Neither said such a thing! So Tant “makes one out of whole cloth”! Read carefully what they both said, and judge for yourself! Tant makes two other like references to these two men, as glaring and as false as anything can be! “As Graves and Jarrell both claim Campbell had the New Testament pattern, which they claim is not according to Baptist doctrine,” is about the sum of both those untrue statements! *Shame on a man who will be caught and exposed like this!*

The closest thing found is Thomas Helwig's Declaration of Faith. However, it is too small to support the Baptist position on baptism.

A Funny Thing!

Mr. Tant says: “The Baptists, who formulated their creed in 1611, chapter 30” (quite a big creed!), “section 1” (Boy, it is so big it had to be divided up into sections!), “teach that baptism engrafts into Christ, into remission of sins.” Tant now surrenders his 1812 theory and says “the church was restored in 1611.” If they immersed, and that too, “in order to remission”; then the church was restored in 1611; for Tant says that that was why the church was restored in 1812! So Tant has not only “slipped back” from 1827 as the date of restoration, to 1812, but now has “slid back” 201 years before that date, to 1611! But this “Baptist Creed” must be a “stray relic,” because Mr. Tant neither put it in quotations, nor did he give the Book and page telling its “whereabouts”!

“Bible Proof”

Mr. Tant makes a number of references to the New Testament, citing Acts 2:38, Mark 16:16, Acts 22:16 and Gal. 3:27. He cannot sustain his position by the word of God. I have offered to deny the following proposition, if he wishes to try his hand on the Bible:

Proposition: “*The Scriptures teach that baptism in water, to a proper subject, is for (in order to) the remission of past sins.*”

If Mr. Tant refuses to sign up for this debate on the Bible, it will show that his brag and blow about proving things by the Bible has all been knocked out of him in this debate on “Campbell's Baptism.” I will not sum up my evidence given in my first Article, for Tant did not attempt a reply. So reader, just remember that J. D. Tant did not try to disprove my evidence; and go back and read it for yourself. Mr. Tant, please attempt an answer to my question at the close of my first affirmative!

TANT'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Elder Smith is very positive to remind me that I cannot make any new arguments. And why should I want to make any new arguments until the ones I have made have been answered?

I want to inform Elder Smith that I am in no way interested in what Campbell did or taught. There will be thousands of people in heaven who never heard of Campbell. As my salvation does not depend on what Campbell did or taught I am no more interested in him than I am in any other great man.

I was at a loss to know why Smith wanted to debate this question with me, but since he has challenged me to meet him on baptism for remission of sins (which challenge I gladly accept), I can see through it now!

In my past debate with Smith at Oakland Baptist Church he seemed unable to meet the gospel knockout drops I gave him in every talk I made. Smith spent most of his time in telling how he cleaned up on Thompson and what kind of a debater Thompson was, and what kind of a liar.

In my second debate with Smith at Springdale, he spent half his time in telling what Tant said at Oakland, and how he demoralized Tant there! Now he challenges me for a written debate, hoping I may say something in this debate that he can use his surplus time on in our oral debate, and get by as a great debater among the Baptists. But such does not interest me.

In Smith's second reply to me he takes up seven pages, about 4500 words, to show that Tant, Thompson, and Chism are all liars, and then goes to T. R. Burnett's doggerel (which is false along all lines) to help him out! But what does all that have to do with Campbell's baptism?

I showed from a number of early writers, Barnabas, Hermas, Tertullian, and others, and could have quoted from twenty more if necessary, for all without exception taught baptism as a condition of salvation. I showed that Campbell was familiar with all their writings and could not mistake their position. It would be useless to go over their works again.

I then showed that the creeds of all churches for two hundred years before Campbell's day taught baptism as a condition of salvation. Campbell was familiar with their writings. I then showed that Dr. J. R. Graves, Dr. W. A. Jarrell, the leading Baptist preachers of the South, both denied that Campbell was ever a Baptist or that he ever had Baptist baptism. As all know that Baptists deny baptism for the remission of sins, and Graves and Jarrell both claim he did not have that kind of baptism, and there being only one other kind, namely baptism for the remission of sins; then the only thing to decide is to let Campbell tell his own tale!

I find that Philip was teaching and baptizing under the last commission which plainly says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And Campbell says he would only accept baptism upon the simple confession the Eunuch made, and Luce agreed to give that kind of baptism declaring at the time it was contrary to Baptist doctrine. In the next place I learned that just before Campbell was baptized he made a talk in defense of his baptism and actually quoted Acts 2:38 in defense of his act. I then turn to Acts 2:38 and find Peter demanded them not only to repent but to be baptized for the remission of sins. As Alexander Campbell quoted that command and then made the scriptural confession and was baptized for the remission of sins, or that he

might be saved as Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This is proof sufficient! Most anyone would be surprised that Smith would deny Campbell being baptized for the remission of sins, if they did not know he denied the Bible also. But as he wants Tant to affirm that Baptism is for the remission of sins (and Tant will affirm it), and after he reads the very thing in so many words in the Bible: and Tant is not an infidel because he believes just what the Bible says; but Smith says he will deny it, which shows that he is in accord with all Baptist preachers who deny the plain statements of God's word!

I shall be glad to affirm just as Smith stated on baptism and shall want two days on it, and shall be glad for Smith to affirm same length of time the Baptist doctrine of total depravity or the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion. I should also be glad for Smith to find a place in his country where my brethren and the Landmark Baptists want the debate, and let us agree on some time which does not conflict with my already dated time, and I'll be there.

As I have gone up there almost a thousand miles to meet Smith in two debates, I would be glad to locate this debate near my home; but my part of Texas is much like Heaven, as we have no Landmark Baptists here, and have to go up there to find them.

END OF THE DEBATE

Thrasher Publications
1705 Sandra Street S.W., Decatur, AL 35601

- Allen—Grime Debate** on the church
James A. Allen (Christian) and J. H. Grime (Baptist)
- Bogard—McPherson Debate** on miraculous healing
Ben M. Bogard (Baptist) and Aimee Semple McPherson (Foursquare Gospel)
- Calhoun—Kurfecs Discussion** on instrumental music in the worship
H. L. Calhoun (Christian) and M. C. Kurfecs (Christian)
- Dancer—Lindsey Debate** on the Christian and war
J. F. Dancer, Jr. (Christian) and Ellis Lindsey (Christian)
- Falls—Speakman Debate** on miracles today
Drew E. Falls (Christian) and Lunmic Speakman (Pentecostal)
- Falls—Storment Debate** on the coverings of 1 Corinthians 11
Drew E. Falls (Christian) and Keith Storment (Christian)
- Falls—Welch Debate** on the coverings of 1 Corinthians 11
Drew E. Falls (Christian) and D. L. Welch (Pentecostal)
- Harding—White Discussion** on trust in God
James A. Harding (Christian) and L. S. White (Christian)
- Madrigal—Mayo Debate** on the necessity of water baptism
Dan Mayo (Baptist) and John R. Madrigal (Christian)
- McCay—Porter Debate** on the communion cup
G. Earl McCay (Christian) and Rue Porter (Christian)
- McDonald—Stevens Debate** on orphan homes
Thomas McDonald (Christian) and Grover Stevens (Christian)
- O'Neal—Hicks Debate** on church-sponsored recreational activities
Thomas G. O'Neal (Christian) and Olan Hicks (Christian)
- Porter—Dugger Debate** on the Sabbath and the Lord's Day
W. Curtis Porter (Christian) and Andrew N. Dugger (Church of God (Seventh Day))
- Scambler—Langley Debate** on the truth of Christianity
T. H. Scambler (Christian) and J. S. Langley (Rationist)
- Tant—Frost Debate** on instrumental music and societies
J. D. Tant (Christian) and W. G. Frost (Christian)
- Tant—Harding Debate** on rebaptism
J. D. Tant (Christian) and James A. Harding (Christian)
- Tant—Smith Debate** on Alexander Campbell's baptism
J. D. Tant (Christian) and C. A. Smith (Baptist)
- Thrasher—Barr Debate** on the identity of the New Testament church
Vernon L. Barr (Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Coleman Debate** on the Lord's Supper
Pat S. Coleman (Pentecostal) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Forsythe Debate** on the church of Christ
Richard W. Forsythe (Pentecostal) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Garrett Debate** on unconditional salvation and the possibility of apostasy
Eddie K. Garrett (Primitive Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Green Debate** on the Christian and civil government
Ken Green (Christian) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Mayo Debate** on the impossibility of apostasy
Dan Mayo (Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Owens Debate** on everlasting punishment for the wicked
Lester Owens (Seventh Day Adventist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Thrasher—Welch Debate** on the formula of words used in baptism
D. L. Welch (Pentecostal) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)
- Trice—Bagby Debate** on the design and action of baptism
W. H. Trice (Christian) and J. T. Bagby (Methodist)
- Warnock—Williams Discussion** on weddings and funerals in the meetinghouse
Weldon E. Warnock (Christian) and Ralph D. Williams (Christian)
- Wiley—Miller Debate** on the cup in the Lord's Supper
W. S. Wiley (Christian) and E. H. Miller (Christian)

17064
5.00