

THE HALL-WILLIAMS DEBATE.

REMARKS BY MR. HENRY OVERBY, CHAIRMAN.

Mr. F. Clay, of the city of Henderson, had been selected, and accepted the invitation to serve as chairman of this meeting, but he was unable to be here this morning, and both parties to this discussion have requested me to act in his stead on this day. In the beginning I will simply read the questions that will be discussed during this meeting, and other arrangements that were agreed upon by the committee.

[Here followed the reading of the agreement and propositions, when Mr. Hall was called upon to open the discussion.]

FIRST PROPOSITION—FIRST SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's First Speech of One Hour.*)

BRETHREN, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I trust we all meet together this morning with feelings of proper gratitude to our Father in heaven for this very gracious privilege we are now permitted to enjoy. I may say for myself that to me it is a matter for personal congratulation and satisfaction that I am permitted to take part in the exercises that are now being opened. My first reason for this is because I believe in public debates. I believe that great good may result by an investigation of the teachings of the Scriptures, that questions of faith may be more clearly understood when contrasting views are presented, and that everybody in that way will be the better enabled to discover where the truth is. Where there are religious differences there ought to be not merely religious toleration, but religious investigation. We want to know the truth, because nothing but the truth can do us any good. I therefore take part, by the invitation of the brethren, in this public debate, without any uneasiness of conscience, and without any serious convictions of wrong, but in the assurance of the fact that I am doing what the Master and the apostles would have done under the same circumstances, and what they did do continually while they were in the world—engage in public contests and debates with those with whom they differed.

Another reason why I take so much pleasure in this debate is because I have had an anticipation since the year 1890 of a personal meeting with my Brother Williams. At that time, in the State of Arkansas, arrangements had been made for a debate between himself and myself, which failed to come off on account of an accident which rendered Brother Williams' failure to be present entirely excusable. From that time until now I have had a desire and hope that the time would come when we could meet together and talk over matters of differences between us as representatives of our respective churches.

Another reason why I take pleasure in this debate is because by it our attention will be directed to important subjects, Bible subjects, and subjects having

an important bearing upon our present and future lives. It is very important that we should have a proper understanding of such things as have a relationship to the soul, and the final destiny of men.

In this debate it may be possible that I have a small advantage over my brother on general principles. I am not sure that this is the case in this congregation, but I surmise that the larger portion of those who come to hear the debate are already in sympathy with my views. For that reason I wish to ask on the part of my brethren, those who now believe as I do, that you will give Brother Williams in the discussion of these subjects your most careful and honest attention. If we are not now holding the truth, we want to accept it. If the things we believe are not so, we want to believe the things that are so. The only way in which we may put ourselves on fairly safe ground is to rid ourselves of prejudice, rub out what we have previously learned if that be necessary, and learn anew if that be best; but at any cost, and any sort of sacrifice, let us accept the truth. I therefore bespeak for my brother from you the most careful, patient, honest and prayerful hearing that it is within your power to give.

It may be also that in this debate my brother has some advantages of me. He is probably an older man, and he has probably had larger experience, and he has devoted more special attention to the subjects we have under consideration, for some of these subjects I have never debated. In going over the territory it will be practically new ground to me. He is a man of large and varied experience in debating. He is no novice in the business; he is an adept in the art; he understands his subjects; he is reputed to be very scholarly, while I do not make any pretensions in that direction.

In respect to the questions in debate the rules of debate require us to stand on mutual ground. The questions to be debated are to be decided by you as the jurors. You are to render the verdict. For that reason I desire to ask that you will hear both sides carefully and honestly, and save your conclusions until after the testimony is all in, and then render your verdict in accordance with the facts as they may appear. I have said this much by way of preliminary remarks.

I am this morning to affirm this proposition: "The Scriptures teach that the kingdom of heaven was set up during the personal ministry of Christ on earth." That proposition needs but little defining; it is plainly stated; the issue is explicitly marked. My proposition asserts that the kingdom of heaven was set up during the personal ministry of Christ on earth. By the way of eliminating everything that may be contrary to the legitimate discussion of the subject in the minds of the people, I wish to take just a little time in calling attention to some misapprehensions that may arise in respect to the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven is presented in the Scriptures from different standpoints, and in order that we may not be confused, but may keep these standpoints separate from one another, we must discriminate between them. For instance, the Bible represents God's kingdom as being universal at the present time. He is the Governor among the nations. He exercises now universal authority. You will find this stated in the fourth chapter of Daniel, twenty-fifth verse, where Nebuchadnezzar had to learn the lesson of God's universal authority. Again in Psalm xxii: 28 we read, "For the kingdom is the Lord's and he is governor among the nations." God now exercises kingly jurisdiction over the affairs of this world. Now, my proposition is not pretending to say that this universal rulership of God was to be set up during the personal ministry of Christ. Please keep that in mind. I

am not claiming that this universal rulership began during the personal ministry of Christ.

Again, the kingdom of heaven was represented during the times of David and his successors, by the people of Israel. God regarded the Jews as his kingdom. They had authority which was exercised by divine appointment. It was God's kingdom because it was God's people—see II. Sam. v: 12. The kingdom was to be given to Solomon and to his seed, but you will find by reference to I. Kings ix: 3-7 that the Lord added a condition, and that condition was that he should be true to God, and not engage in any of the abominations of the heathen, in order that he might be exalted; and if he failed the kingdom was to be taken from him. That that kingdom failed on account of the sin of Solomon may be seen in I. Kings xi: 11, where we find the statement, "Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I command thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and give it unto thy servant."

Now I am not pretending to say that this Jewish kingdom was set up in the days of Christ; I am not pretending to say that the universal rulership of God began in the days of Christ. This kingdom was in danger of being taken from Solomon, and afterwards he failed to obey and it was taken away. But it was promised that there should come a time when it will be restored. The millennial age is coming, when the Son of man, in the majesty of his power, shall return the second time to the earth and exercise jurisdiction over the people of Israel. That will be at the beginning of the millennial age, and the end of the present dispensation. Now that there is such a promise made it is altogether probable will be admitted by our brother. If it should not be, however, we refer him to Ezekiel xxxviii: 21-28, as proof of the fact that there was made a promise of the return of the people of Israel. Then in Micah iv: 1-8 we have a statement of the millennial reign and glory, "But it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and all people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths, for the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." That event is to take place at the introduction of the millennial state, which is coming at the close of the present dispensation, and is therefore yet in the future. Notice, I do not say that the millennial reign of Christ, as a king, nor the millennial glory of his kingdom, was set up in Christ's time; but I say that there was a kingdom which is separate from this, which in the millennial age will be in its triumphant state, but which is now in its militant state, and which had its beginning in the personal ministry of Christ, and therefore in the days of Jesus, and under his direction.

While he was in the world he collected a people together, separated them from the remainder of mankind, delivered to them laws, appointed to them principles of government, and a mission, and he called that people thus separated and thus collected a kingdom, and he was their king and they were his servants; they were to obey the law; they were under his reign. The kingdom had its beginning at that time, according to the statement of my proposition. My brother denies that proposition. That makes our issue, and in its discussion there are three lines of argument, three phases of the subject, that I want to present.

In the first place I want to inquire whether or not the prophets ever made any promise that there would be an introduction of the kingdom at the time that Jesus should enter the world. We read in Ezek. xxi: 25-27, "And thou profane and wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, take off the crown: this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is and I will give it him." Here is a promise that the people of Israel, as a kingdom, was to be overturned; the new kingdom was not to be the same as the old one, but a reigning king should not be found until he came whose right it was, and it should be given to him. My point is that Christ at his first coming was the one to whom the promise looked as the one whose right it is to rule.

Now turn to Jeremiah xxxi: 31, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant what I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they break, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord." "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast. And it shall come to pass that like as I have watched over them to pluck up, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict; so will I watch over them to build and to plant, saith the Lord. In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten the sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge, but every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." That is very much in harmony with the statement made by John the Baptist, who was the forerunner of Christ, in Matt. iii: 9, when the people came claiming relationship to Abraham by virtue of their Jewish birth, he said, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." The time is ~~per~~ when the iniquities of the fathers shall be visited upon the children, but each man shall stand on his own responsibility. That is what Jeremiah said should be the case and that is what John the Baptist said had come to pass. Again, look further: "Every one shall die of his own iniquity . . . Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." Now there is a promise that in the new covenant the law of God shall be written in the heart, and not on tablets of stone; that it is to be spiritual in its character, that the kingdom is to be composed of those who are the people of God in heart, not merely by virtue of relation to Abraham. By comparison of the eighth of Hebrews with II. Cor. iii: 3, where Paul alludes to this same promise—"For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistles of Christ, ministered by us, written, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." Here is that promise fulfilled, Paul says, in the life of the Corinthians. Read in this connection Zech. vi: 12, 13, "And speak unto him saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne;

and the council of peace shall be between them both." The man who is called the "Branch" is Christ, and he is to grow up and increase; there is to be development in it, and he is to build the temple of the Lord, and to bear the glory, and sit and rule upon his throne, and be a priest upon his throne. He is not only a ruler, but a priest. Notice, we are discovering if these Scriptures point to Christ's first coming as the time when these events are to be fulfilled. Christ as a branch is to grow up, and be a priest, and become a ruler over the house of God, which is to be a spiritual house.

Read in this connection Zech. ix: 9: "Behold thy king cometh unto thee: he is just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass." Now remember that it is this same prophet, Zechariah, that has predicted the coming of the Branch, the setting up of the temple, and the establishment of the rule of the Branch when he has grown up in his priesthood, who also makes mention of the time when the king comes riding upon a colt. Now turn to Matt. xxi: 2: "And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem and were come to Bethpage, unto the mount of Olives; then sent Jesus two of his disciples, saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied and a colt with her; loose them and bring them unto me. And if any man say aught unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them and straightway he will send them. All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." The passage that I have read is by the Saviour himself identified as having its fulfillment in himself during his personal ministry. The announcement was "Behold thy *King* cometh," and he came to the temple to rebuild it, to establish it, and to become its ruler and priest. "Tell ye the daughter of Zion Behold thy King cometh, riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."

Now let us see if he is regarded as a king. Turn to Luke xix: 38, "Saying, Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord." That statement is made concerning Christ, who as king came in the name of the Lord, riding upon a colt, according to the statement of the prophet, taking charge of the people, ruling over them, his law ruling over them, his law written in their hearts, they his people, called out from the world. Does that look like the beginning of his kingdom?

Again, let us consider another prophecy. Turn to Isa. ix: 6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder." He is going to be a king. The responsibility of the government shall be on him. "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. And of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." This kingdom is a growth, a small beginning, but it will continue to develop until by and by it will ultimately exercise dominion from sea to sea, and there shall be no end of the increase of his government and peace. Let us compare that statement of the prophet Isaiah concerning Christ, who was to be a governor, and have the responsibility of government upon his shoulder, with what is said by the angel to Mary in Luke i: 30. "Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favor with God. And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. And he shall be great, and

shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Now turn to Matt. iv: 12-17: "Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee; and leaving Nazareth he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast in the borders of Zebulon and Nephthalim: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, "The land of Zebulon and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up." This was in the time of the personal ministry of Christ. "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." From what time? From the time that he began to go from one of these places to the other he began to preach that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, And that was in fulfillment of what? In fulfillment of a statement made by the same prophet, Isaiah, from whom we have read, and it is from the very chapter where it is said that the government shall be upon his shoulder. The angel said to Mary that the child, which was now born, and was the son of Mary, should ascend to the throne of David, and the child announces himself as king, and begins to preach the kingdom of heaven at hand in fulfillment of a statement out of the very chapter that says he shall have the government placed upon his shoulders.

Here are three of the prophets, Zechariah, Jeremiah, and Isaiah that all point the fulfillment of their predictions to the time of the personal ministry of Christ.

In Dan. ii: we have a record of a dream which Nebuchadnezzar had. As probably everybody is familiar with the dream, we only desire to call attention to parts of it. We read in the 35th verse, "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away and there was no place found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." The dream was of a great image, and a stone cut out of the mountain without hands, that ultimately rolled against the image and effected its destruction. Now in the conclusion of the interpretation of that dream he says, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it break in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure." Nebuchadnezzar represented the head of gold which was seen in the image; the Medeo-Persian empire represented another part of the image, the Macedonian empire represented still another part of the image, and the Roman empire. Now in connection with the Roman empire, which was the last of the universal kingdoms, which Daniel foresaw should have their place in this world, there was to be a divided state, and in this divided state there were elements of weakness and strength represented by a mixture of clay and iron in the feet and toes, and "In the days of these kings (this divided state) shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." When did the Roman empire begin its existence? Some hundreds of years before the advent

of Christ. When did it have its division represented by the two legs of the image? Some fifty years before Christ. When was the empire divided into kingdoms, some strong and some weak? In the very time of the advent of Christ this universal empire was in a state of division, in a state of separation, and it was at this very time that the prophet said, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom that shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." It was to be like a stone cut out of the mountain without hands. It was to have a small beginning. It was not to come in a state of magnificence and glory and supremacy, with ability at once to overthrow and destroy its enemies. Its beginning was like a stone out of the mountain without hands, that began to grow and roll and increase until ultimately it got to be larger than the mountain, and finally filled the whole earth. It was a progressive work that had a small beginning.

Let us take the New Testament and discover if there is any fulfillment of these things. In the opening chapters of the book of Matthew you will find a statement made by John the Baptist. Let us see if the prophet did not foretell the fact that a people was to be prepared. Listen, Isa, xl: 1-5 "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness. Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." To whom does that refer? If you will read Luke i: 13-17 you will find a very exact picture of its fulfillment. To whom did Isaiah refer? To John. What was he to do? Make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

Turn to Mark i: 1-5 and we read, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." In Luke i: 17 it is said, "He shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias."

Notice, we have the prediction by Daniel that in the days of these kings the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom; we have a prediction also made by Isaiah that at that same time John the Baptist, as a forerunner of Christ, shall go in advance to prepare his way and make ready a people for the king. Now in Matt. iii: 1-3 we read, "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." What does my proposition say? That the kingdom of heaven was set up during the personal ministry of Christ. When was the personal ministry of Christ? Immediately following John. What was he to do? Set up a kingdom. What was John to do? Make ready a people prepared for him. Was that people to consist of the Jewish nation? No, for if that was to be the case, they were already prepared, and he came to them and said, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. Bring forth fruits meet for repentance." The Lord wants a people; he is coming to be king; he is coming to show this world the supremacy of spiritual over merely temporal, and national things. "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." What is at hand? "The kingdom of

heaven is at hand." Who said it? John the Baptist. What did he know about it? He knew all about it, for he was there, and was there for that purpose.

Turn to Mark i: 14, 15, "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying—"listen, what did he say? "and saying, The time is fulfilled." What time? The time is fulfilled; it has come; it is here. What time? The time the prophets spoke about. "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven is at hand." What is at hand? "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Who said it? Jesus Christ. When did he say it? During his *personal ministry*. What does the proposition say? That in the time of the *personal ministry of Christ* he should set up a kingdom. Did he do it? Look further and we shall see if he did it.

"From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Is it the duty of all men to repent? It is. Has it always been their duty to repent? It has. Was it the duty of the Ninevites to repent? Yes. But I challenge my brother from the beginning of Genesis to find a place where God said "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," until this time. This is the first time the reason is ever given why men should repent because God's kingdom is here. You have got to have repentance as one of the things to enable you to enter the kingdom of heaven. Jesus said it during his personal ministry. He was preaching the kingdom of God. He had himself come and said that the kingdom of heaven was at hand because the time was fulfilled; now get ready for it. In the fourth chapter of Matthew it is said that Jesus went about all Galilee preaching the kingdom of God. What did he preach? The kingdom of God. Who preached it? Jesus Christ. When was that? During his *personal ministry*. What does my proposition say? That the kingdom of heaven was set up during the *personal ministry of Christ on earth*. Did Jesus preach it? He did. Is not that what I was to prove? What makes the brother contradict it?

In Matt. v: 8 we read, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for their's is the kingdom of heaven." Have they a kingdom? Yes. Who? The poor in spirit. Who said it? Jesus Christ. Did he know? Yes.

In Matt. vi: 31-33 we read, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." What things? Material things of life; the things you are now seeking after. You are after money, after fame, after position. Are these the most important things? No; "Seek first the kingdom of God." What! Is that there? Yes; that is the reason you are called on to seek it. What does my proposition say? During the personal ministry of Christ. What does Christ say? Seek it first; get right down and prepare yourselves for it. Were the other things present then? Yes; then the kingdom was present likewise.

In Matt. ix: 35—"And Jesus went out about all the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." Jesus did? Yes. Preached the gospel of the kingdom? Yes. Saying the time was fulfilled? Yes. And the kingdom of heaven was at hand? Yes. Wasn't it at hand? He said it was.

Matt. x: 5-8: "These twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded them, saying, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and as ye go, preach saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." What must they say? "The king-

dom of heaven is at hand." Here are twelve men. By and by there are seventy more who go out and preach the same thing. John the Baptist came and said "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Jesus Christ came and said "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." By and by he sends out twelve apostles and they say, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." They were preaching the kingdom? Yes. A membership in the kingdom? Yes, and they were inviting others to get ready to enter the kingdom.

Matt. xii: 27—"And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges. But if I by the spirit of God cast out devils, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." Who said that? Jesus. When? During his personal ministry. What did he say? "If I cast out devils by the spirit of God, and my brother will not deny that he did that, well, then what? *Then the kingdom of God is come unto you.* Just as certain as that he cast out devils by the spirit of God, *the kingdom of God had come.*

Luke xi: 30: "If I by the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt"—Listen to that, *No doubt*—"The kingdom of God is come upon you." Who said that there was no doubt? Jesus Christ. If he had been alive in this age of the world, he would have said that there was some doubt, for my brother here disputes it. Is there any doubt about it? Jesus said there wasn't. My proposition, if anything could be proven by the plain positive language of the Scriptures, seems to be made out.

But again in Matt. xiii: 24: "Another parable put he forth unto them saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field." This man sowed good seed. Is it the time for sowing? Yes, there is a sowing time and a reaping time. It begins like a little stone, like seed sown, like mustard seed, for God's word says so. When did the time for this small beginning come? When Jesus Christ came and selected the twelve whom he also named apostles and with whom he deposited authority to cast out devils, heal the sick, and to preach the kingdom of heaven at hand. It was a "little flock." It was not a vast multitude; it was like a rock out of a mountain, like a grain of mustard seed, but it grew and enlarged from twelve into seventy others, then into a hundred and twenty others, then three thousand, then five thousand, until the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands fills the whole earth.

In the thirty-first verse of this chapter we read, "Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field: which, indeed, is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof."

Another parable spake he unto them: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman hid in three measures of meal, till all was leavened." What is like unto leaven? *The kingdom of heaven.* It is like what? *Like leaven.* *The kingdom is like leaven?* Yes. How do you know? Jesus said it was. Do you believe it? I do, and the Baptists do for that very reason. I want to show you that the church and kingdom was the same thing in Christ's time.

In Matt. xvi: 18 we read, "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Now, in the next verse we read, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom." The keys of what? The keys of the kingdom. Who does

that? Jesus. To whom does he deliver these keys? To Peter. What do the keys belong to? The kingdom. Have they a kingdom? Yes, the Saviour said they had one; John the Baptist said they had one; the twelve said so, and they all preached it. What do you have keys for unless you have a door to lock? And you can't have a door unless you have a house of some kind? And if you have no kingdom why do you want to lock it up? Why shut anybody out or shut anybody in from a place that does not exist? The keys are the very last things to be furnished. They wait till every carpenter, every workman has gone away, *then they lock up* the house and give the keys to the proper person. Have we a kingdom? Yes. Is it complete, ready to be shut up or to be opened? Yes. Who did it? Jesus Christ. Who said the time was fulfilled? Jesus said it. "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," and here the kingdom is.

In John i. it is said that "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." Was he the God of heaven? He was. Who thought it not robbery to be called equal with God? Jesus did; he represented God, and Daniel said, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Did he do it? Daniel said he would; Jesus said himself that I have established it, set it up, sent forth heralds, ordained men that they should go out and preach that the kingdom of heaven is at hand, that the time is fulfilled, and that men should repent and get ready to enter the kingdom.

In Matt. xi: 11-15 we read: "Verily I say unto you, *Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven*"—least in what? The kingdom of heaven. I would like to know what this had reference to if there was no kingdom of heaven in existence at that time. "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force. How could they take by force that which did not exist.

Luke xvi: 16 we have this language also from Christ: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it." That is a striking statement. I hold in my hand a Bible, and right here there is a blank leaf in it—there is a division. What makes that division? This part of it before that blank leaf is the law and the prophets. *This part after the blank leaf is the kingdom of God. Here is "John"* at the first of the New Testament. From that time on Jesus himself said that "from the days of John men entered the kingdom" and when was John? From the first page that follows that blank leaf—"And from the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of heaven is preached, and every man presseth into it." Do you believe it? Baptists do. "From the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence." What suffereth violence? The kingdom of heaven. When was that? In the days of the *personal ministry* of Christ. Who said it. Jesus said it. Do you believe Jesus Christ? I would like to ask a question—Can the kingdom of heaven suffer violence when it has no existence? Somebody reports this morning that the Christadelphian church at Fulton has been torn down, destroyed. You ask, who was its pastor? It had none. Who were the members of it? It didn't have any. Who had charge of it? Nobody. Where was the building? There wasn't any. Well, how could a church be destroyed that had no members, no pastor, no organization, no officials and no

meeting house? Now if there was no kingdom of heaven in the days of Christ how could it suffer violence? If he spoke the truth my proposition is established; if he did not, it does not make any difference whether the proposition is true or false.

Let us see again; In Matt. xxi: 31 we read, "Verily I say unto you that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Who said that? Jesus said it. During his personal ministry? Yes; said that the publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of God? Yes. Did they do it? He says they did. How could they if there was no kingdom of God? My brother in denying my proposition says that Jesus Christ did not set up his kingdom, then did the publicans and harlots go into anything? Yes; what was it? The kingdom of God, Jesus said. What does my proposition say? That the kingdom of heaven was set up in the days of the personal ministry of Christ on earth. I quote passages spoken in the very time that my proposition says that the kingdom of heaven was set up, and the passages say that men were treating it with violence, that men were pressing into it, that the publicans and harlots were entering it. Wasn't it in existence then?

Then the forty-third verse of this same chapter, "Therefore, I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." What is going to be taken from them? The kingdom of God. All the privileges belonging to righteousness and a spiritual reign, they shall have none of them, but it shall be given to a people bringing forth the fruit of it. Christ came to take the privileges away from them, and give them to the Gentiles. They were not bringing forth the fruits thereof, and Jesus said, I will take it away from you and give it to them. When did he say it? During his personal ministry.

Turn to Matt. xxiii: 13, "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." How is that? The Pharisees and Sadducees would not go into what? The kingdom. Is there a kingdom then? Yes. Ought they to go into it? Yes. Didn't they go in? No. Was it the kingdom of heaven he was talking about? Yes. Did any one else try to go in? Yes. Would'nt they let them enter? No. It occurs to me that that passage of Scripture plainly states that the kingdom of heaven was in existence. A spiritually prepared material had already been arranged by John the Baptist, who came preaching to man to repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and Jesus tells us in so many repeated statements that the kingdom is at hand for people to go unto it, and there were people keeping other folks out of it. Is there any reason then to believe there was a kingdom? Christ said there was; John announced its coming; the twelve apostles were sent to preach it; Christ said that there was no doubt about it, and the Baptists believed it—Do you believe it?

In Mark ix: 1-7 we read, "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here which will not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." How long in the future would it be ere that time when the kingdom of God would come? Certainly not long. When did it take place? Listen, in the very next verse, "And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James and John, and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves, and he was transfigured before them. And his raiment became shining exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on

earth can white them. And there appeared unto them"—who? Elias and Moses. Where did they come from? They died away back yonder in the past. What were they doing back there? They came back to meet Christ. They represented the glorified state like Jesus when he took on his glorified form. "There be some standing here that shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Just the kingdom of God come? No. But the kingdom of God *come with power*. It was revealed to them in transfiguration when Christ put on the glorified character, took on his heavenly robes, and had these departed spirits come back and join with him in the exhibition. Here is an exhibition of the kingdom as it is in power, and you have seen it before you died. When Peter referred to it he said it was a revelation of his royal majesty. He manifested his royal character as king, not as the babe of Bethlehem, not as the humble servant, not as the meek and lowly Lamb of God, but they saw him as he will be at the end of the ages, when this glorious manifestation shall occur. Did they see the kingdom of God come with power? They had been in it in its struggling state, when it suffered violence, and the violent took it by force, and here they were given a glimpse of it as it should be in the triumphant state, ruling the world.

In Luke x: 8, 9 we read, "And into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you, and heal the sick and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." Did Jesus tell them to say that? He did. Was it true? Yes. Are the Baptists right, then in believing that the kingdom of God in the days of Christ had to come near the people? Christ taught it and we believe his words.

When he was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo here, or lo there, for the kingdom of God is within you," or, as the margin reads, which is doubtless the correct rendering, "the kingdom of God is among you." He was talking to the wicked Pharisees, and the kingdom of God was not in them, but in their midst, it was among them, its king was here, its courtiers are here, its ordinances are here, its servants are here, it was in their midst. Jesus said it, Baptists believe it, my proposition affirms it. Is it a fact? We shall see.

In John xviii: 6 we read, "My kingdom is not of this world," that is, not of this order of things, not of this nature. "If my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight that I would not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence." Pilate therefore said unto him, "Art thou a king then?" The Diaglott renders his answer, in these words, "I am a king." That is the answer Jesus made according to the Diaglott—"I am a king." Who said it? Jesus. Was it during his personal ministry? Yes. Was he a king? Yes. Had he a kingdom? Yes. Did people enter into it? Yes. Did others refuse to enter and also keep those who would enter from going in? Yes. Was the kingdom in its glorified state? No. In what state was it? In the mustard seed state, that had to grow; in the state of the little stone that Daniel saw cut out of the mountain, in the state of a government put on his shoulder that should increase. That is the beginning of the fulfillment of prophecy. Christ is here as what? As king. And has what? A kingdom. During what? Either the New Testament Scriptures are confusing in their teachings, or else our brother will have a tremendous job on his hands to explain what they do mean. This is

exactly the statement of my proposition, which says that the Scriptures teach that the kingdom of heaven was set up during the ministry of Christ. I have examined the testimony during his personal ministry, I have found him to be a king, I have found a kingdom which he said suffereth violence and into which some people were entering, and others were not entering, but were hindering those who would enter. Now let us see if we can find the exact date when it was set up. In Luke vi: 13 we read where he called unto his twelve disciples, and gave them power over unclean spirits, and sent them out to preach the gospel. Now turn to I. Cor. xii: 28, "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing." Whom did he put in first? Apostles. Who said it? Paul. When did he do it? When he selected twelve men, whom he also called apostles. As to the relation of the church to the kingdom of heaven we read in Matt. xvii: 18, "And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Here he uses the word church and kingdom interchangeably and makes the church the same as the kingdom of heaven. He says that on this rock I will build my church and then in the next verse he says I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The church is composed of men and women who are in a spiritual state and have become God's servants. That is the kingdom Jesus said that is now in existence and that shall continue to exist until we hear the announcement of the angel of the return or our Lord in regal splendor, and then we see him come with all his saints with him to reign in victory and triumph during his millennial reign. [Time called.]

FIRST PROPOSITION—FIRST SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams First Speech of One Hour.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—It is not necessary for me to offer any preliminary remarks; my friend has said enough in this respect. Perhaps it is necessary for me to reply to some things he said in starting out in relation to myself. He referred to sometime in the past when arrangements had been made for a debate in the State of Arkansaw, and when he thought I had failed to appear on account of an accident that overtook me at that time. There is a misunderstanding about this somehow. I never understood that there was ever an arrangement made for me to meet Mr. Hall in the State of Arkansaw for a debate. I never failed to meet him in any debate that was ever arranged for. He has made this statement before, and we have made inquiries about it. I have examined my copy books to see if there were any letters referring to it, but there were none. Now I will tell you all about this matter. I received a letter from Mr. Hall ordering a number of copies of my books. I remember in that letter he closes like this, "Hoping that I shall be benefitted by the reading of these books," etc. When the books were sent I closed my letter in similar words, "Hoping that you may be benefitted by reading these books," etc. When I wrote that letter and when I received his letter I did not know who he was, I did not know he was a representative of the Baptist Church. Soon after that I received a letter

from my friends in Arkansaw asking me if it was possible for me to go there to meet Mr. Hall in debate. Then it occurred to my mind why he ordered the books. I answered yes, but my friends in Arkansaw say that arrangements were never made. I wrote them this morning asking them to make sure whether there were any Christadelphians in Arkansaw that had made such arrangements. If they did they did not inform me. I never made such an engagement to meet a man in my life and failed to meet him—never in my life. At the same time, if I had had such an arrangement with Mr. Hall at the time I met with the accident referred to, my reason for not being there would have been a good one. But I must protest against his circulating a rumor that I failed to meet him in that debate after making such an arrangement or appointment.

My friend possibly has complimented me greater than I deserve; so far as my reputation as a scholar is concerned I know nothing of that. If I have such a reputation it is not one I have claimed. I am not coming here as a scholar, I make no boast of scholarship, I am willing to meet him on equal footing so far as scholarship is concerned. The question before us is not a question of scholarship as such a term is commonly used, but the question here is one of believing what the Scriptures teach on this subject and I have come before you to defend what I believe to be the truth in opposition to what I believe to be a pernicious error.

Now in regard to the question of the kingdom of God, you will notice my friend has in the proposition these words, that the kingdom of heaven was set up during the personal ministry of Christ. Notice these words, "set up," the kingdom of heaven was set up in the days of Christ. With that I take issue. In the numerous portions of Scripture quoted have you noticed that it says the kingdom of heaven was preached, *preached*? If it could have been read in these verses that the kingdom of heaven was "*set up*," instead of preached, then of course my friend would have proved his proposition; but he has never found these words except in the book of Daniel where the verse he read has no application to the personal ministry of Christ. In the various portions of Scripture you will notice all the way through that it is not a question of setting up the kingdom, but a question of preaching or make known the kingdom of God to those to whom Jesus came.

Let us notice the difference between the preaching of the kingdom and the setting up of the kingdom. Any great enterprise in which men may embark is first preached. For instance, suppose you were to start a company for building an electric railway from here to the city of Henderson. You call it the Electric Line. You give it a name before you commence it. You call it the Electric Line from Henderson to Zion. Suppose I came here and overheard men on the street corners talking about the Electric Line; I ask you, "Where is your Electric Line?" You answer, "It is the electric line we are going to build from Zion to Henderson." "Well, why are you calling it the electric line before you have built it, before you have located the ground, before you have the stock subscribed, before you have laid the lines?" "Because we have the plan and the plan is now preached and we expect to have it completed—"set up"—at the appointed time. We are making it known, we are preaching it, we are sending out men to talk to different capitalists in the county. We call it the Electric Line and we are sending out men to make it known as such, and as they preach it they meet with a great deal of opposition, and men ill-treat them. Therefore the Electric Line "*suffers violence*" in its preached form, not in its completed form? So the king-

dom of God suffered violence, but when it is established as a matter of fact there will be no power on earth that will be able to treat it with violence, because, as we shall show, that kingdom will come in such power and might that it will break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms and it shall stand forever. I simply refer to this hurriedly in starting out, and we will now go back and deal with the Scriptures he has referred to.

My friend has referred us to Matt. v: 5, where Jesus said, "Blessed are the poor in spirit for their's is the kingdom of heaven." Now he thinks he has the kingdom of heaven in existence. If you will turn and look in the margin of your Bibles you will find this is A. D. 31, just about the beginning of the ministry of our Lord. My friend thinks because he has these words, "Their's is the kingdom of heaven," that the kingdom of heaven must have been set up there and then. If the kingdom of heaven had an actual existence at that time then the New Testament contradicts itself. Now let me call your attention to words found in Mark xv: 43, "Joseph of Arimathaea, an honorable counsellor, which also *waited for the kingdom of God.*" Now what have we here? Joseph of Arimethae waiting for the kingdom of God, and yet away back at the beginning of the ministry of our Lord our friend would have us believe that the kingdom of God had come and was already established. How is it that here is a righteous man waiting for the kingdom to come? Why was Joseph waiting for the kingdom to come if it had come three years and a-half before this time?

Now in regard to the kingdom of heaven being at hand, if my friend could have read instead of the words "at hand" the kingdom of heaven is "set up," he would have proved his point. John preached, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Christ came afterwards and preached, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," and he preached the *gospel* of the kingdom all through his ministry. The quotation was given us just before my friend took his seat, "The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God—is set up—and every man presseth into it." Is that how it reads? If it read that way, my friend would have proved his proposition. But it reads this way, "The law and the prophets were until John, since that time *the kingdom of God is preached*"—heralded, made known. The ministry of John and of Christ was to preach or make known the kingdom of God into which when the proper time arrived they should all enter.

When Jesus delivers to Peter the keys of the kingdom of God, my friend thinks the kingdom must have been there or else it was of no use to give the keys. The key placed in the hands of the apostles was the gospel which makes known to men the things concerning the kingdom. They have a key that will admit them to the kingdom of God. Were they in the kingdom at the time the keys were given to Peter? Let us see what Peter says on this subject. I will invite your attention to the words of Peter in speaking of this same thing in his second Epistle, i: 5—"And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance soberness; and to soberness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather brethren, give heed to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things ye shall never fall: for

so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Whom is he writing to? Members of the Church. Now you brethren are in the church; strive to make your calling and election sure. What for? For if ye do these things ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. So that Peter who held the keys of the kingdom here declares that the entrance into that kingdom was still future and that declaration was several years after the death and resurrection of Christ.

The apostle James in speaking of the same subject declares, "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs—not inheritors—of the kingdom which he hath—"set up"—as my friend would have you believe? No, but heirs of the kingdom which he hath *promised* to them that love him. It was promised in the gospel, and the men who preached it received evil treatment at the hands of their enemies, but that was the kingdom in the preached phase, not the set up phase, as my friend would have you believe. The kingdom instead of being an established fact was a kingdom *promised* to those who were the faithful followers of Christ.

Now the apostle Paul in writing to his son in the gospel, Timothy, says, in the second chapter of the second letter, verse 15, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Then in chapter iv: 1 he declares that Christ shall come to judge the quick and the dead. When shall he judge the quick and the dead? "At his appearing and his kingdom." When then is the kingdom to be established or set up? At Christ's appearing. And when is that appearing and the establishment of the kingdom to take place? When he comes to judge the quick and the dead. O, but Paul, you are making a mistake; our friend Mr. Hall comes in here and tells us that we are now in the kingdom, that it was set up over eighteen hundred years ago and we do not have to wait for Christ to appear, for his second coming, Paul, because at his first coming, our friend Mr. Hall tells us, the kingdom was set up, established as a matter of fact and they were all in the kingdom of heaven then.

Now listen to what Jesus says in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand and the goats on his left. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." In what sense was it prepared from the foundation of the world? It was prepared as a plan, just as we have illustrated in the case of the electric railway from Zion to Henderson. It was prepared as a plan first, but the railway was not built or established until, possibly, years after. So the kingdom was prepared from the foundation of the world and when John preached the gospel of the kingdom, and when Christ preached the gospel of the kingdom, they were preaching a kingdom that should afterwards actually be set up or established, but it will not be established until the time when the Son of man shall come in his glory and all his holy angels with him; then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. Then this kingdom will be an established fact when the Son of man has come in his glory and has taken the throne of his father David promised to him,

and when he is to be king over all the earth, to whom every knee is to bow and every tongue is to confess. Now he invites all his faithful ones and then they shall be granted an abundant entrance into his everlasting kingdom.

Now there is another thought to which I wish to call particular attention here. The phrase "at hand" seems to be one over which my friend stumbles somewhat. The kingdom of heaven is at hand, what can it mean? John said the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Then, he thinks, it was close by, the time to actually establish it or set it up. Let me call your attention to a parable my friend did not allude to, in Luke xix: 10: "And as they heard these things he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." Now this is A. D. 33. Let us suppose that our friend, Mr. Hall, had been in the company of these disciples, and here they are thinking that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He would have said, You are mistaken; the kingdom of God was set up a year or two ago and we have been in it all this time and you do not seem to know it. You think the kingdom of God is about to appear, and because when Jesus commenced his ministry he said, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for their's is the kingdom of heaven," I, Mr. Hall, think the kingdom of God must have been in existence then because of that word "is." If they were in the kingdom of God in A. D. 31, how was it that in A. D. 33 they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear? Now, perhaps, we shall find the Saviour telling them, as Mr. Hall would, You are mistaken in this, my followers and disciples, in thinking that the kingdom of God should immediately appear, because it is already established. But what does he say? "He said, therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return * * * And it came to pass that when he was returned, having received the kingdom." Now, my friends, as common-sense men and women, doesn't this teach you that the nobleman is Christ, and that the going away into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom is Christ going to heaven to receive his kingdom? It follows then that the kingdom had not been set up and could not be given to his disciples until he returned. Therefore he says, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all his holy angels with him then shall he sit on the throne of his glory." What coming is this? He had completed his first coming and his return is next in order. and when he returns then shall he sit on the throne of his glory, and it is then he shall invite his disciples and faithful ones to sit down in and inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. This nobleman who was going away called his ten servants and delivered to them ten pounds and said, "Occupy till I come." That was the command to the faithful church. I am going to my Father in heaven to receive the title deeds to my kingdom. When I return I shall call you again; therefore, occupy till I come. When he was returned—not before he left, mark the words, but when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him and he reckoned with them, and he appointed the faithful ones authority over ten cities, and over five cities, etc He gives them their positions in the everlasting kingdom he comes to establish.

Now in relation to the kingdom of God being at hand. This is a comparative phrase; it is not definite; it does not define any particular time. There are other instances which illustrate this. The apostle Peter, second epistle, chapter iv, verse 7, says, "The end of all things is at hand." What did he mean by this? All

things have not ended yet. Now let us make a comparison. In the Scriptures we are taught that there is to be a great world week, a week of seven days, each day of which is a thousand years in length. Let us take this and compare it with a week as we ordinarily understand it. Suppose we were contemplating the arrival on the seventh day of a friend, some one we were anxiously waiting for and hoping to see—we must also discriminate between the language of hope and language used in a mathematical sense. When we use the language of hope we get as near to that for which we are hoping as possible. We pass along, Monday goes by, Tuesday goes by, Wednesday goes by, and Thursday comes. Now we are down in the fourth day of the week; we have only two more days and then our friend will be along. We can say, He is at hand. Now when our Saviour appeared on the earth, it was, according to Usher's chronology, in the year 4004; so we had got along to the fifth day in the great world's week. We have only, comparatively speaking, a short time to wait until the realization of the grand hope of all the prophets of Israel. It is the one hope that Christ and the apostles were preaching as close by. Wait a little longer, hope exclaims, it will soon be here. Make allowance for the fact that the larger part of the week had passed away, then you can easily understand why the apostle should say hopefully, "The end of all things is at hand." The kingdom of God is at hand when Christ shall come in his splendor to flood the world with his glory as the waters flood the mighty deep.

My friend has taken up some time to prove that Christ was a king. We take no issue on this; he was a king. He was born king. "Where is he that was born king of the Jews?" But for him to be a king and for him to be actually reigning in his kingdom are two things. Now it was as king and nobleman that he went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom. Before he sets up that kingdom, he receives it. So the prophet says, "In that day shall the Lord be king over all the earth."—Zech. xiv: 9.

As to the question whether Christ established his kingdom when he was here, let me call your attention to Matt. x: 34. If Christ came then to establish his kingdom, it has failed of its object. What is the object of setting up the kingdom of God? What is the purpose of its establishment in the earth? There must be an object in view and it is for us to consider what that is. I think I may safely say that the kingdom of God is a kingdom of peace. Let me refer to Isa. ix: 6: "For unto us a child is born, a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called—what? The Prince of peace. When Christ then becomes king and reigns as king, his kingdom will be a kingdom of peace, for when he was born the angels declared there should be "Peace on earth, good will among men; glory to God in the highest." The object, therefore, of Christ's coming to reign and establish his kingdom upon earth is to bring peace on earth and good will among men. Take the prayer we often repeat: "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy *kingdom come*, thy will be done in earth as in heaven." I do not know whether our friend utters this prayer or not; but if he does I should like to ask him why he is praying for God's kingdom to come when he believes that the kingdom was set up during the personal ministry of Christ on the earth; notwithstanding the supposed fact must we still pray for its coming? "Thy kingdom come." What for? That his will may be done in earth as it is in heaven. Now I ask you, Did the kingdom of God which our friend has talked about, which is the Baptist church, did it cause God's will to be done on earth as it is in heaven? Look back to the supposed establish-

ment of the Baptist church, if it was established at that time, or from the time of the establishment of the church of Christ, did it bring peace on earth and good will among men? Now let us look at what the Saviour says in Matt. x: 34: 'Think not that I am come to send peace upon earth. I came not to send peace but a sword.' But Mr. Hall says you came to set up the kingdom of God, and is not the kingdom of God intended to bring peace on earth? If you are come to set up a kingdom that will bring a sword, it will make the earth worse than it ever was. Yet my friend has quoted the text from Isaiah and applied it to the first coming of Christ: "Of the increase of his government *and peace* there shall be no end, upon the throne of David to order it and establish it." If Christ took the throne of his father, David, did he establish peace on the earth when he came the first time? If so, why did he say, "I came not to bring peace but a sword?"

Now this is sufficient to show you that the portions of Scripture that my friend has quoted in relation to the kingdom of God suffering violence, being at hand, being nigh you, etc., must not be used in such a way as to set them in array against all the Scriptures which go to prove that the establishment of the kingdom of God is a glorious event that is to bring peace on the earth.

We must now follow our friend back to the prophecy of Daniel, second chapter. Here is called to our attention the dream of king Nebuchadnezzar, in which he saw a great image whose head was of gold, his breast and arms of silver, his body and sides of brass, his legs of iron and his feet part of iron and part of clay. My friend has this followed down very correctly in tracing the image in an historical sense until he has come down to the time of Christ. There he made a mistake. Now let us notice the outlines of this remarkable dream. We are agreed that the first king here represented is the king of Babylon. "Thou art this head of gold." We are agreed that the next kingdom is the kingdom of Media-Persia, that the third kingdom is the kingdom of Macedonia, and that the fourth kingdom is the kingdom or the empire of the Romans. But this is the first time I ever heard a man say that the Roman empire was a divided empire before Christ came and when he came. I had always thought, and all historians I had ever read, everybody who had ever studied anything about the Roman empire had said that Rome was in the ascendancy of its glory at the time Christ was here on the earth. My friend refers back to the beginning of Rome about seven hundred or ten hundred years before Christ, but that is not the question; the question is when the Roman empire succeeded the Macedonian empire, when it became a universal empire. You remember the fourth beast of the seventh chapter of Daniel that represents the same thing as the legs of the image, that this beast should bear rule over all the earth, which means that its rule should be universal. Its universality did not fully come into existence until about sixty-seven years before Christ, and the division of the Roman empire into eastern and western Rome did not take place until three centuries later, to say nothing of the division into ten kingdoms and the mixture of clay and iron, which did not take place until the Goths and Vandals overran Rome. Again it is declared in history that its decline did not commence until the invasion of the northern hordes that caused the clay to be mixed with the iron. Perhaps my friend will explain. You see his theory requires that he should have the Roman empire divided into ten parts when Christ appeared the first time. But unfortunately for him, Daniel seems to anticipate, or rather the God of heaven, his claim. Let us see.

Here are four great beasts come out of the sea. The first is like a lion, the

second is like a bear, the third is like a leopard, and the fourth is a great and terrible beast. Now there are ten horns on this Roman or fourth beast, and then Daniel says, "I saw that another, a little horn, came up, having eyes and a mouth, and he shall think to change times and laws, and they (the saints) shall be given into his hands for a time, times and the dividing of time. I think my friend will agree with me here that this little horn power, having eyes and a mouth speaking great swelling words against the Most High—I say, I think he will agree with me that this was the Papal power, headed by the pope of Rome, that system that has drenched the very earth with the blood of the saints. This will bring us down at least to A. D. 530, yes, to 610, before this man of sin arises and gains his temporal power. Now he was to prevail against the saints for a time, times and the dividing of time, or 1,260 long years. Then Daniel says, after he had thus prevailed that "the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." Then he adds, "And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." That is what will take place when Christ comes.

Now we will go back to the image, and you have first to come down to the fourth great empire represented by iron; you then have a division into two parts and then a subdivision into ten parts. Remember the prophet tells us that in this the Most High revealeth to his servants what shall be in the "latter days." Here is a metal image representing the kingdoms of men standing on its feet ready for the battle of Armagedden. Now what takes place? "In the days of *these kings* shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Here you have the words "set up," but not until you come to the end of Gentile times when the kingdoms of men become a great military giant. How shall Christ set up his kingdom? By coming along quietly and preaching the gospel and building a church? In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up the Baptist Church? which shall break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of the world and the Baptist Church shall stand forever? That is how it ought to be according to my friend, but that is dwarfing the Word of God. Coming along quietly and preaching the gospel to them? No, no. "Thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands that smote the image upon its feet that were of iron and of clay and brake it in pieces." It will come with might and with power. It is not human hands that you are looking at here. It is cut out of the mountain without hands, and comes with terrible power and force with which it will smite the image on the feet. How hard does it strike it? Was it just the peaceful preaching of the gospel by the followers of Christ to whom he said, "He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword," and "If a man smite thee on one cheek turn to him the other also," and "if they persecute you in one city flee unto another? Is there any analogy between that stone coming with force and power to smite the image and break it in pieces and grinding it to powder till the wind blows it away and the quiet preaching of the gospel? Did the establishment of the church in the first century of the Christian era break in pieces the kingdoms of men? Did not the Saviour tell us there should be wars and rumors of wars, nation lifting up sword against nation? Then he seems to say, "I will make matters more clear to you in a parable. Here is a fig tree: it is shooting forth its branches and you know that summer is nigh; now you can learn from this, when ye see these things begin to come to pass, that *the kingdom of God is nigh at hand*. When you have come along down through the history of human events in which you have

wars and rumors of wars, nation lifting up sword against nation, you see the fig tree shooting forth its leaves, as a parable to show you that summer is nigh; according to that sign when you see these things I am telling you about, know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand; not that it was established nineteen hundred years ago. "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass until all these things be fulfilled." He commenced by foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem and her people scattered through the earth, and that there should be wars and rumors of wars, and he brought us down to the signs of these times and to a generation that shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled and the kingdom appear. Yet my friend puts this back nineteen hundred years ago before ever Jerusalem was destroyed, and consequently he is applying to the first coming of Christ what belongs to the second coming.

We have been referred to II. Sam. vii. where we have words that my friend possibly overlooked; at least he did not refer to them, but I must do so in order to show you the mistake he has made here. The tenth verse of the chapter says: "Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and I will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more as beforetime." Now the children of wickedness have afflicted Israel as you all know, and they are still a scattered people, but here a promise is recorded that God will appoint them a place and that He will established them there and they shall never be moved. In that prophecy he says, "I will set up thy seed after thee which shall proceed out of thy bowels and I will establish his kingdom." Is that Solomon? Why, Solomon was already a grown man at this time ready to take the throne, and here he says, "And when thy days are fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee." Who is this? If you will run down a little further to the nineteenth verse you will find the Psalmist saying, "But thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house—when? during the reign of Solomon? no, but "for a great while to come." How far down in the future? we may ask. My friend will say, at the first coming of Christ. Let us see. Turn with me to the second chapter of Acts of the apostles and there you will find Peter explaining what this covenant made with David signifies. "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David that he is both dead and buried and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath unto him that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up—Solomon? No, not Solomon, but he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. When? during the ministry of Christ upon earth? My friend says so, but what does Peter say? He, seeing this before spake of the *resurrection of Christ*. What does that mean? David had seen that God would raise up Christ *from the dead* to sit upon David's throne, but my friend has Christ upon David's throne before ever Christ died; he has Christ establishing his kingdom before his death, but David did not understand it so; "David foreseeing that God would raise up Christ to sit on his, David's, throne saw that in order for this to take place Christ must be raised from the dead, for when Christ exercises his authority as King no man, no nation, all the nations of the earth combined cannot take Christ and put him in the tomb. It was when he appeared as a Lamb that he died, but when he comes as the "Lion of the tribe of Judah to sit on the throne of David" do you think that all the powers of the earth combined will be able to take his life? No, indeed. He shall smite the image on its feet and shall grind it to powder.

This kingdom was "not to be left to other people." Here my friend skipped over. It was not to be given to the apostles in the flesh, for they would die and leave it to others. It was not to be given to the officers of the Baptist Church, for they would die and leave it to others. It was to be given to the immortal saints and consequently will not be left to other people; the same people who commence to reign will reign continually. It follows therefore that the time Christ is to take the throne of David is after the resurrection, not before. Turn to the Acts xv: 14—"Simeon hath declared how God at the *first* did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name." Now I will ask you, When did the time come for visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for Jehovah's name? I suppose my friend will agree with me that it was at the house of Cornelius and Simeon had been telling them about this; therefore we agree that at the time when Peter went to the house of Cornelius after Christ had died and rose again and gone to heaven. Simeon had declared then how God at the *first* did visit the Gentiles to take out from them a people of his name, and to this agree the words of the prophets as it is written, "*After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down.*" After this—after what? After visiting the Gentiles. Did he visit the Gentiles before his death? Did he visit the Gentiles during his personal ministry? No; he said, "Go not in the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." It was not until after his death that he sent the apostles to visit the Gentiles—"After this, Christ says, "I will return and I will build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof and I will *set it up.*" There you have a setting up, and there you have the very words "set it up." What for? That the residue of men might seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles, or all the nations, upon whom my name is called. So if you want to know when Christ will take the throne of his father David you have it there, after the times of the Gentiles, not before he died.

In addition to this we have it declared that when the Son of man shall come there is to be a restitution of all things. Peter asks the question, "Behold we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging"—judging what? Judging the twelve tribes of Israel. When? At the time of the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory. When shall the Son of man sit on the throne of his glory? In Matt. xxv: 31 we have the answer: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit on the throne of his glory. Now my friend says that he sat on the throne of his glory nineteen hundred years at least before this. The Saviour says you cannot rule the twelve tribes of Israel until the Son of man is on the throne of his glory, and the Son of man is not going to take the throne of his glory until he comes and all the holy angels with him, and it is not until then that he says, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." This takes you down to the end of the times of the Gentiles: After this, I will return, and I will build my father David's throne, of which it is said in the days of Zedekiah, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is and I will give it him." Now my friend quoted this verse and applied it to the first coming and said that the throne of David was

established in the first century of the Christian-era. If so you ought to find it on Mount Zion now and the King reigning there. Another prophecy my friend quoted was, "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and it shall be exalted above the hills and many people shall flow unto it. And many people shall come and say, Come and let us go up the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths, for the law shall go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Did that take place in the first century? Let us see. Let us get the rest of it. "And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Did that follow the establishment of the church at the first coming of Christ? [*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—SECOND SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's First Speech of One-half Hour.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The first thing I wish to call your attention to in beginning the discussion this afternoon is the matter of the reference to the previous arrangement for a debate between myself and Brother Williams, July, 1890, at Beebranch, Arkansas. I intimated to you this morning that I was disappointed in that arrangement for the debate and that I had been hoping that the time would come when hope deferred would ultimately be realized, and that it was now being realized. My brother announces that he never had any arrangements for a debate with me in Arkansas in 1890 or any other time and that my statement was an incorrect statement. This statement had already been published and denied in Brother Williams' paper and a good many people who read that paper had an idea that I had told a falsehood about it. I mentioned it this morning on purpose that the facts in the case might be brought out in the presence of Brother Williams and the people. I had no direct correspondence with Brother Williams in reference to that debate I did have a correspondence with Brother Ford at Beebranch, Ark., who through correspondence with Christadelphians at Beebranch arranged for a debate, submitted the proposition and notified me that Brother Williams had been selected. Now I hold in my hands some affidavits. I am not willing you should take my bare testimony. (Here Mr. Hall produced several affidavits to the effect that some of the Baptist papers and several Baptists had reported that a debate had been arranged at that time and place, and after some further explanatory remarks on that subject he proceeded to the discussion of the proposition.)

Now we come to an examination of the subject. I do not know just how these two speeches you heard this morning struck you, but they struck me this way, if an unbeliever had been present and had heard both sides, he would have said that either Hall has made the Bible out false or Mr. Williams has made it out false; they both proved their propositions by the Bible, and their propositions contradict each other. The only ground on which he could deny that such was the case, it may, Brother Williams, be a bare possibility that it happens that the

proposition contradicts some of your interpretations of the Scriptures, and in that case no great harm would be done. I want to call attention to some of the points made by the brother. In the first place I turn to the New Testament. When I set my stakes, or I allowed the Holy Spirit to do so, I took His guidance, I let Him point me to the places where the prophets foretold the things that should come to pass; I turned to the places where I had a right to expect the fulfillment of these prophecies. I found where John the Baptist quoted the very words of the prophets and declared that these words were then fulfilled. Here is the kingdom; it has come. The prophets predicted it; John the Baptist declared it; Christ said it; the apostles preached it; here it is and I believe it. My brother comes to me and says, "Here, you are making a great mistake in all that because that simply means the preaching of the kingdom, not the presence of it, the preaching of it, not the thing itself." And he gave this illustration: you undertake to build an electric railroad from Zion to Henderson. You outline your plans and arrange your monopolies and you send out men to promote the scheme and men are called to take stock in it. And then they persecute these preachers; that is taking the railroad by violence. So John and Christ just preached about the kingdom and sent out the apostles to preach about it; and they took the preachers and treated them badly and that was taking the kingdom and treating it badly. This was his illustration and I rather like it. Illustrations usually have two edges; they cut both ways. Granting the force of the illustrations; here is the announcement of the coming of a railroad, and preachers are sent out to call people to come and take stock in it, and that is the last of it; the whole thing is a failure. How will that apply to the kingdom? John the Baptist was sent to call the people to take stock in a plan for a kingdom. He was sent to announce to the people that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Repent, I have got the bonds, I want your signatures. The kingdom is at hand and I am here preaching the way to enter it. Carrying out the illustration, they treated the kingdom with violence. They treated John the Baptist with considerable violence when they took off his head. By and by Jesus came. He did not say I am come to tell you there is going to be a kingdom of heaven, but he said, "As sure as I cast out devils by the finger of God, without a doubt the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you, and I am here to tell you it has come." Instead of coming to tell you about a kingdom that was coming, the thing is already constructed, the plan is completed, the tracks are laid, the train is in motion, are you on board? He looked into the faces of the Pharisees and said, "The Publicans and harlots go into the kingdom before you. Some are entering the kingdom and some will not go in. Jesus said so.

There is another thing about that illustration: when these men came to announce the railroad, that the time was fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, the railroad is built, you say they were just chimerical expressions; there isn't any railroad in it, and all these expressions are just as unreal as if we should say that a railroad had been built and some men had been riding on it and others would not ride when there had not been a solitary foot of land leveled off and not a rail had been laid. Then these expressions would be falsehoods. Jesus Christ came saying the kingdom of heaven was at hand and men were taking it with violence and without doubt the kingdom of God had come, and yet there wasn't a thing in it. Then I would like to know what part of the Scriptures we would be allowed to believe and accept as true.

There is another point the brother referred to in this place. The kingdom of heaven is at hand, and the poor are in the kingdom. Yours is the kingdom. Jesus said this at the beginning of his ministry, and yet away out beyond at the end of that ministry there was a man by the name of Joseph of Arimathea waiting for the kingdom of God. He said that if the kingdom had been really established then Joseph could not have been waiting for it. You fall into confusion for lack of discrimination. If the brother had made a note of the different kingdoms spoken of, to which I called attention in my first speech, he would not have fallen into this difficulty. When the kingdom of Israel had been overthrown on account of the disobedience of Solomon, when there was not in all the land any priest to offer sacrifices at the altar, yet there had been a promise that the kingdom should be restored and the Jews were looking for the fulfillment of that promise at the coming of their Messiah. With this thought in mind there is no confusion for Joseph who was a Jew for the kingdom, for he was waiting for the restoration of the Jewish kingdom, which he understood to be the kingdom of God. He had not yet appreciated the fact that Jesus Christ must first inaugurate a kingdom that must suffer violence and the violent take it by force. My brother is as badly confused on the subject as was Joseph of Arimathea, but there is at least one point of difference between them in favor of Joseph; if Joseph had had the same idea that he has about the kingdom he would not have been waiting for it away back there.

Then that expression about the kingdom being at hand. John said it was at hand and Jesus said it was at hand; can both be true when they were not speaking at the same date? John represents the material being prepared and Jesus represents the kingdom having come, a king having charge of the prepared material, and others having the keys of the kingdom to open the door to the kingdom. See, he says, we find how that is to be done, and he tells us that if we add to our faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity, we will have our lives preserved and an abundant entrance shall be ministered to us into his everlasting kingdom. He says that shows the time when the kingdom is to be opened. No it don't, it shows the time when the everlasting state of glory is reached. The kingdom was to be set up by Christ and Peter was given the keys with which to open the doors of the kingdom or Church. There is coming a time when this church which began as a little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, like a little leaven hid in three measures of meal, like a grain of mustard seed—the time is coming when the kingdom will manifest itself in power like it did when Christ and Moses and Elijah appeared in their glorified characters, and it is that everlasting glorified state of which Peter speaks and into which those who are faithful shall have an abundant entrance.

Then he referred to what the apostle said about Christ judging the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom, but Paul doesn't even hint at the idea that when he comes in judgment it is to set up a kingdom. When he comes in his glory it will not be to set up a kingdom, but it shall be the triumphant manifestation of a kingdom already set up.

Then he quoted from Matthew about when the Son of man shall come in his glory and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he separates the good from the bad and says to those on his right hand, "Inherit the kingdom"—that I

am going to set up? Did he say, inherit the kingdom about to be set up, or inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world? Prepared when? A way back through all the past ages, and now come and see it in its glorious triumph. I am coming to manifest a triumphant kingdom, but not to set up a kingdom.

Then he came to the parable of the nobleman, sometimes called the parable of the talents. A nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. Here is an intimation of the fact that the kingdom could not have already been given to Christ. There is a state of the kingdom which has not yet come. God has promised it to his Son. That is the state in which the kingdom will rule over all. It is now in conflict with the things of this life. It is now engaged in warfare. It is the church militant. It is the time of the upbuilding of the empire of the cross, but there is coming a time when Christ shall no more be presented to the world as the suffering victim of the cross, but when all his enemies shall see him crowned with divine power. That state of the kingdom he went away to receive and is to return with it, but not to set it up. Before he gets back here he has got his kingdom and is reigning in glory with it.

Let us see further if Christ does not show that the kingdom is already here. "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father has appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom"—Luke xxii: 29, 30. Here the promise is that they shall eat and drink at his table in his kingdom. Where is this fulfilled? In connection with the Lord's supper. Have we eaten at his table? Yes, then it is in the kingdom that Christ has appointed, just as he also is to receive a kingdom.

He refers to the expression in Matt. x: 34, and says that the kingdom of Christ is to be a kingdom of peace, while I represent it to be a kingdom of war. When the introduction of the gospel came, did it bring peace? No; have you had wars and rumors of wars since that time? Yes; then the kingdom has failed, for it is represented to be a kingdom of peace, and we have not had any peace yet. The kingdom that the Lord Jesus established was on the principle of peace. It was to gain the power among men by peaceable means. It was to bring peace to everybody. Jesus said, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you." He said unto his disciples, "In the world ye shall have tribulations but in me ye shall have peace." The declaration of the apostle Paul is, "Therefore being justified through our Lord Jesus Christ, we have peace with God." The kingdom of Christ was to be a kingdom of peace to those who accept of Christ, but it was to be a kingdom of war to all that would be opposed to Christ. The very connections that the brother read, "I came not to send peace, but a sword;" I came for the purpose of overthrowing war and establishing peace by the power of the truth. I would like to ask whether my brother believes that the kingdom is to be established without conflict. From the statement made this morning that the kingdom is to be ultimately established on the return of Christ, he quoted Daniel on that subject and he says that it is to break in pieces and consume all these other kingdoms. That is what that kingdom of peace is to do. It is war until the last enemy is destroyed.

The brother says that I am the first man he ever met who said that there was any division in the Roman empire at the time of Christ. This is a history of the world by Ridpath (produces book). In volume I. page 814 we read, "The world

was divided into two parts, the East and the West. Antonius took the former, and Octavianus the latter; and to make the settlement final, Octavia, the sister of the Cæsar, was married to Antonius. So he and Octavianus then went to Rome, and the pacification was properly celebrated with games and festivals." This was thirty-eight years before Christ. Let us look a little farther: On page 824 he says, "The home districts, however, of the empire, under the name of senatorial provinces were allowed to remain under control of that body from which they derived their name; while the outlying regions, known as imperial provinces, fell to the exclusive government of the emperor. Into the former divisions of the state proconsuls were sent a governor after the old republican method, while to the latter executive officers were assigned by the appointment of the Cæsar." Here are distinct divisions of the Roman empire, and while they were agreed just as the legs of a man are agreed in the body of a man—Daniel never represented the legs as being in conflict. The toes on a foot are not in conflict, but they are in a state of division. [*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—SECOND SESSSION.

(*Mr. Williams' First Half Hour Speech.*)

GENTLEMEN, MODERATORS, AND FRIENDS :

I will reply first of all to what our friend has just said. I would like to have him state before this audience whether he believes that the rupture between the emperor and the senate referred to is known in history as a division of the Roman empire in two parts, eastern and western Rome. I would like to have him show where Rome was divided into ten kingdoms. It is not a question between the emperor and the senate; there were always disputes of kings and emperors of that kind, but when you take Gibbon's history there you have a division of the Roman empire into eastern and western Rome, and then its division into ten different kingdoms, and after that there arose another king represented in Daniel in the seventh chapter by a horn having eyes and a mouth, speaking great words of blasphemy, changing times and laws, and the saints were given into its hands for a time, times, and the dividing of time, and not until *after this* does the time come for the saints to possess the kingdom. Then what does Daniel say about that kingdom? Does he say it is a little insignificant church, that would suffer violence? What does he say about the kingdom that shall be established in the hands of the saints when the time comes for the saints to possess the kingdom? This is what he says: "And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and all dominions shall serve and obey him." So that the kingdom that is to be given to the saints of the Most High is one that is to be an everlasting kingdom in all the earth and all dominions in the earth at that time are to be subjected to Christ. He is represented as the Ancient of days and he comes in his power and glory as described in the seventh chapter of the book of Daniel, verses 13, 14.

Now in regard to the question of the ten toes: Our friend says they were not in conflict one with another; he has overlooked the statement of the prophet

who declares that the iron shall be mixed with miry clay and that the kingdom shall be partly strong and *partly broken*; that is, the intermingling of clay with the iron means that the empire shall contain both the strength of the iron mingled with the weakness of clay. It shall be broken up and divided into pieces represented by the toes of the image. And this took place by the various invasions of the northern hordes who, long after Christ's personal ministry, intermingled themselves with the Roman people. In this we have the introduction of the clay into the iron and the weakening of the empire, and the consequence is we have what Gibbon calls the "decline of the Roman empire." He never dreamed of writing about the decline of the Roman empire before Christ appeared in his ministry, but that decline took place after Christ went to heaven and the divided condition of Europe today is proof of that declension. *Then* it is that the stone shall smite the image on its feet and break it to powder and the stone *then* becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. Daniel's interpretation is that *in the days of these kings*—after the subdivision of the Roman empire and the intermingling of the clay element with the iron—in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. Where shall he set it up? On the whole earth. Not that he sets up a little insignificant Baptist church in the first century. That did not fill the whole earth and has not filled it yet, but wars and rumors of wars were predicted and shall continue until this state of things shall cease, and then the kingdom shall be set up.

Now our friend has called attention to the portion of scripture in Luke xxii: 39: "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father has appointed unto me a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." My friend would have us believe that the kingdom was then set up and that they were there sitting down in the kingdom, and the kingdom had been in existence from the beginning of Christ's ministry; and yet it is said right here, "I *appoint* unto you a kingdom," and Jesus says this just previous to his death. If the kingdom had been set up three and a half years before—our friend has not yet fixed the exact date—why does Christ say at this time, "I *appoint* unto you a kingdom?" "Even as my Father has *appointed* unto me a kingdom—not given to me yet, not actually set up, but he has appointed it to me, so that when the appointed kingdom is set up what will take place? "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and *sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.*" Now then had the disciples been ruling the twelve tribes of Israel? Has the church been ruling the twelve tribes? Did the apostles sit on twelve thrones and rule over the twelve tribes of Israel? My friend knows very well that the twelve tribes are a scattered people today. He knows that the twelve apostles never ruled over them, that the twelve apostles died, and yet it says that when the kingdom is given to the saints it "shall not be left to other people." Suppose now that the kingdom was given to the apostles and disciples of the Lord; they all died: then who took the kingdom? "Other people." I suppose my friend thinks he is one of the officers in the kingdom today. When he dies he will have to leave it to others—in the Baptist church! But when this kingdom is given to the apostles and to all the saints, it is given to them in the immortal state, and no death shall overtake them for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"—I. Cor. xv:50. All the churches of Christ are made up of flesh and blood men and women; but when flesh and blood is changed to immortality, when the apostles and saints are raised from the dead, then they are

to be immortal and the kingdom is given into their hands and it shall never be left to other people, because their lives shall last as long as the kingdom, and that shall never end.

But perhaps my friend has overlooked a point; possibly he has failed to "discriminate" in reading this portion. Let us go back a little and see. In the same *chapter, seventh verse, we read that they were assembled in an upper room where they were partaking of the passover*—Why, I am astonished to think that a man can imagine that those few, poor disciples assembled in that upper room to partake of the passover constituted the kingdom of God! But what does the Saviour say about it on that very occasion? "For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof *until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.*" Now my friend says that the kingdom of God was there already, but the Saviour shows that we break bread and drink the wine to "show forth his death *until ye come.*" There he says, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God *shall come.*" When shall that kingdom of God come? He tells us it shall come when these things shall have their fulfillment; then you, my twelve apostles, shall sit upon twelve thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel; and that, he says, will be "in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory"—Matt. xix: 18.

Now my friend seems to ridicule the idea of entering into a kingdom before the kingdom is set up, and yet there were hundreds of men entered into the enterprise of the great Union Pacific Railroad before it was built. Suppose we were now back to the time when the message was sent through the length and breadth of the land that we were going to have a great railway from the east to the west, and when the heralds of the enterprise were talking of it, you should ask them, "What do you mean by the Union Pacific Railroad? There is no Union Pacific Railroad." Oh, yes there is, they would say—not actually, but as a plan. You ask how that plan is getting along, and they reply that men are "pressing" into it by the hundreds. Pressing into what? Why into this enterprise of the Union Pacific Railroad. And yet this is before there is actually any Union Pacific Railroad in existence as a reality. So you must have men interested in any enterprise before it becomes an established fact. Then when you see the trains rushing from the east to the west there you have the *fulfillment* of the enterprise, and the men who believed in it and worked for it before it was in existence now become partakers in its realization when that which was at first but a plan has become a reality. So the kingdom of God has been heralded to a lost world. God has sent out the good news that he is going ere long to establish a kingdom on earth that will break in pieces the kingdoms of men. When he sends out his messengers how is the kingdom of God received? Men are "pressing into it." They believe in it, they hope for its realization, and when the time comes to realize their hope then Peter says they shall have an abundant entrance into that kingdom.

My friend struck on this verse: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Has he forgotten that his proposition is that *the kingdom was set up during the personal ministry of Christ*? If the preparation of it from the foundation of the world was the setting up of the kingdom, then it was set up long before the personal ministry of Christ. In what sense was it prepared before the foundation of the world? It was prepared in the purpose of God and afterwards heralded to the world and will be a reality when Christ shall come to establish it as the kingdom and when

all men shall ascribe "glory to God in the highest" because there is peace on earth. This is why my friend ought to pray "Thy kingdom come." It seems he has just as many kingdoms as his convenience would call for. Sometimes he says he is talking about the kingdom of Israel, sometimes about the kingdom of God—how many kingdoms of God do we have in the gospel? We have one faith, one hope, *one gospel*, and that gospel has reference to the kingdom that God is to set up. We go back to the beginning and we find that God redeemed Israel out of the land of Egypt and took them into the land of promise and after a little while he gave them David as their king and David reigned over the twelve tribes of Israel. In speaking of this kingdom David says, "Of all my sons, for God has given me many sons, he has chosen Solomon my son to sit on the throne of the *kingdom of the Lord over Israel*." There you have an account of the establishment of the kingdom of the Lord. God selected the territory, he redeemed the people, he gave them a king. You have all the elements that enter into a kingdom. What became of that kingdom? In the days of Zedekiah it is said, "Thou profane and wicked prince of Israel whose day is come when iniquity shall have an end. Take off the crown, remove the diadem, this shall not be the same. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more UNTIL *he comes whose right it is and I will give it him*"—Ezek. xxi: 25-27. The last overturn was in A. D. 70 when Jerusalem, the metropolis of that kingdom was desolated by Titus, and the prophet adds that from the last overturn, "It shall be no more until"—when? "Untill he come whose right it is." Who is that? We read, "After this *I will return*, and build *again* the tabernacle of David *that is fallen down*, and I will raise up the ruins that the residue of men might seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called"—Acts xv: 16, 17. Here we have the time of the establishment of that kingdom.

Now let us go back to the prophecy of Isaiah for a few minutes. My friend seems to think—I judge by the way he applies this passage—that because a prophecy reads right along that the events succeed each other. On one occasion the Saviour quotes from Isaiah and there gives us a specimen of "rightly dividing the word of truth." You remember how he quoted, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and the recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, and he closed the book and he gave it again to the minister and sat down. And he began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears"—Luke iv: 18-20. If you go back to the prophecy in Isa. lxi, you will find that the very next word that follows where he left off is the conjunction "and," so that he stopped in the very middle of a sentence. How do you account for this? Because if he had read further along he could not have said, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears" for the next words are "and the year of vengeance of our God"—a matter that pertains to the second coming of Christ. Therefore he cut the prophecy right in two and applied one portion to the first coming and the second part to the second coming. Let us apply this principle to a prophecy my friend quoted from the same prophet—"For unto us a child is born, a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, *upon the throne of David* and upon his king

dom." Where shall we find the "discrimination" here? Christ was born, the son was given, but the government is not yet upon his shoulder. He is to be the Prince of Peace, but he says, "I am not come now to bring peace, but a sword;" I will come, however, to make bare the holy arm of Jehovah, in the eyes of all nation. Now we must take the prophecy in the light of other scriptures. When will he come as a Prince of Peace to execute judgment and righteousness upon the throne of David? Our friend says that Christ took the throne of David eighteen hundred years ago, yet the very verses he quotes in Luke i: 32, 33 are against him. "Thou shalt conceive and bring forth a son, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David and he shall reign over"—the church?—Is that it? Let my friend look to the testimony. "He shall reign over the *house of Jacob forever*." Now who is the house of Jacob? Everybody will say the twelve tribes of Israel, and the throne of David is to be given to Christ that he may reign over the house of Jacob. He came to the house of Jacob, "he came to his own and his own received him not"—John i: 11; and the result was that they were "led away captive into all nations"—Luke xxi: 24. Therefore the time when Christ is to take the throne of his father David and reign over the house of Jacob is at his second coming, not at his first, "and then of his *kingdom*"—not his church—"there shall be no end." Therefore we say that the church is only a preparatory system, preparing us for the kingdom of God. "Hearken, my beloved brethren," says James, you who constitute the church, "hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and *heirs*"—not possessors—"of the kingdom which he hath *promised*?"—James ii: 5. You are now in the church but not in the kingdom. As long as you are in the church you have to pass through tribulation; when you have entered the kingdom you have passed out of tribulation. God hath appointed you a kingdom, and when that appointment is carried out then you will enter into the everlasting kingdom.

My friend referred to the parable of the nobleman, What is it Jesus endeavored to show by this parable?" They thought that the kingdom would immediately appear," therefore he spoke this parable unto them to show that it *would not* immediately appear. Why should Joseph of Arimaethea wait for the kingdom of God if that would not come for eighteen hundred years? our friend asks. I ask you to turn and read of the Corinthians and others who were waiting for the coming of the Lord. Eighteen hundred years have passed and he has not come yet. We do not suppose that Joseph knew that the kingdom was eighteen hundred years distant, but however that may be, it stands there that after Christ was dead, Joseph was *waiting for the kingdom of God*.

The thief on the cross knew the truth on this question. He said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Before that kingdom for which they were waiting should be an established fact he must go into heaven and receive from the Father the title deeds, and when he had received the kingdom he would return and call his servants together.

Now before my time is up I want to say a word about this debate question. You have noticed carefully what Mr. Hall has said. If he had sent me those papers I would have believed every word they say. But here is where the point is: It has been said that I failed to keep the appointment in this debate because of an accident that happened to me, whereas I never knew a word about any arrangement having been made. Now so far as this man Ford is concerned, he was not the man to arrange for a debate at Beebranch; it should have been made by

brother Lively, or brother Martin, or brother Coleman or brother Walsh. Whatever this "brother Ford" may have done I was absolutely ignorant of, and if I had made the arrangement and the accident had not overtaken me I would surely have gone. But Mr. Hall is not to blame in this case and I will ask you to exonerate me also from all blame.

[*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—SECOND SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

BRETHREN, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I have no doubt that everybody present has been able to discern one fact that is quite prominent in this debate: that is that my brother says comparatively, I may say almost absolutely, no attention to the line of Scriptures I quoted this morning by the way of argument. There were in the neighborhood of twenty-five or thirty passages which I quoted which have not as yet received passing notice. Instead of this my brother undertakes to make an affirmative out of his negative, endeavoring to establish the idea that there is to be a kingdom which is to be set up on the return of the Saviour to this world. I believe at the return of Christ there will be a millennium—a glorious reign of Christ in literal, personal presence among men, that the people of Israel will be restored to their land, and that they will not be removed any more. I believe that the promise made to Solomon will be literally and actually fulfilled, but I do not believe that that is the setting up or the inauguration of the kingdom; and there is not a solitary passage from Genesis to Revelation that says this is the case. If the brother will read one I will confess myself mistaken on the subject.

It is not worth while to darken counsel by words. So far as he has expressed himself and so far as the passages he quotes are concerned, I believe every one of them. That there is to be a return of the Lord in glory and judgment, coming in triumph to his people, to assert his rightful sway as the Lord of the earth, in universal empire, I believe, but it will be the consummation of that struggling kingdom that is already organized; it will not be the constitution of a new one, but the triumph of the old. It will not be the setting up of what never had an existence, but the manifestation of what has long been prepared. Jesus Christ told us, to which I have called your attention many times, and to which the brother has not paid any attention, that the kingdom would increase and grow, that it would have a small beginning, but that "of the increase of his government and peace there should be no end." Daniel declares that it was to be as a stone that would grow and enlarge and fill the whole earth. Is not that beginning small? Jesus calls it a mustard seed, which is the least of all seeds, and yet it grows until it gets to be a tree the largest upon earth. What is it that is like a mustard seed? The kingdom of heaven. Who said that? Jesus Christ said it. I say therefore in the illustration of the kingdom which the word of the Lord gives, it has a small beginning, it is a little flock; it is ultimately to triumph. All those passages the brother has given to us twice, and it is not needful to track

him over the same ground again and again, when the same thoughts were presented by him again and again.

He speaks of the introduction of the millennial reign, when Christ comes to be glorified among his people, and the kingdom shall be given to the saints of the Most High in its everlasting triumph. I believe it; Baptists believe it. God's word teaches it; but God's word also teaches that the kingdom had its beginning in the days of Christ. Christ said that without doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you, is in your midst; it is not of this world, it is not a material kingdom, but is the glorious kingdom of Christ reigning in your heart, working out in the life, controlling in your fellowship, taking its place visibly and outwardly in church organization, until it becomes the reign of Christ.

The brother says I have got too many kingdoms, but I have only the number the Bible gives—the universal reign of God; the kingdom of the Jews, the kingdom of heaven, and the millennial reign of Christ. I have got just as many as the book has. My brother has undertaken to set up another that the book does not give.

I want you to know that "Brother Hall" does pray the Lord's prayer. What does the Lord's prayer say? "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name." To whom is this prayer addressed? To our Father in heaven. And what is the next petition? "*Thy* kingdom come." Do I pray for Christ's kingdom to come? It is here already. Christ never told his disciples to pray for his kingdom to come, but for the *Father's* kingdom to come. Turn to the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians where it says that Christ must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and the last enemy is death; and when death, the last enemy, is destroyed then he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father. What kingdom is that? The Father's kingdom. "*Thy* kingdom come." Thy? That his "will may be done in earth as it is in heaven." That is the glorified reign that shall give all things into the hands of God. The very time you say Christ is to set up a kingdom is the time when Christ says he will give it up and will not have any.

The brother called attention to the reference I made to eating and drinking in the kingdom. He said there was one passage in that connection that I overlooked, when they were in that upper room, and Christ said he would not drink any more of the fruit of the vine until these things were fulfilled in the kingdom of God. What things? The things that the ordinance represented. It represents "my body broken," "my blood shed;" it represents the atonement, the accomplishment of God's plan in the redemption. "I will not any more drink of the fruit of the vine until these things are fulfilled in the kingdom of God." My brother ought to make it read, Until they shall be fulfilled to get the kingdom ready. He will never have a chance to commune with the Lord until in the kingdom, when these things shall be accomplished, and that will be too late.

My brother is death on railroads. The entire line of argument I presented this forenoon be answered by a railroad from here to Henderson. This afternoon he lengthens it out to reach to San Francisco, but he says that this Pacific railroad was on precisely the same line as the other; that is, it had men who went out preaching the doctrines of that railroad. I would just as soon accept the idea of a big railroad as a little one, and I say, your idea is correct; your illustration is a good one. They did send out men to preach the kingdom. But if you should never build the railroad, wouldn't the thing be a fraud? Surely it would. John the Baptist came and said, "*The kingdom of heaven is at hand; I am here*

to tell you. Do not say we have already got stock in the kingdom, we are Jews and the seed of Abraham. Repent, you have got to show new fruit to get into this thing." John came and said, "I am making ready a people prepared for the Lord, preparing for the building of the track. The thing is going to run, it is going to carry passengers. Jesus Christ came and what did he say? We are making a people ready? No. When we got through with John the Baptist we got through making a people ready; the people were made ready, the material was prepared. Did Jesus Christ make a kingdom of it? He did. Did anybody enter that kingdom? Jesus said, "The publicans and harlots went in." Jesus said, "The law and the prophets were until John; since then the kingdom of heaven is preached and every man presseth into it." John preached it and Christ came and said, "Without doubt the kingdom of God is with you, won't you get aboard, take passage.

Well, that question of the kingdom being prepared from the foundation of the world, which my brother says is different from my proposition. My proposition says that the kingdom was set up in the days of Christ, but if it is too late for us, then it is too late for you. You are farther behind than I am. Nineteen hundred years at least have gone, and there may be nineteen hundred years yet. I have got that much the start. The kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world was the kingdom which Christ inaugurated, which he set up in the time of his ministry. The work was accomplished, the time was fulfilled, get on board the train, the railroad is built and is in operation, the thing is here, the kingdom which was prepared and ordained of God from the foundation of the world is now fulfilled in my ministry and we are here.

Simeon said that the Lord had visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name. "After this," he declares, "I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down, and will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." Ah, my brother has found a "set it up." "Bro. Hall could not find a 'set it up' though he has it in his proposition." The brother forgot that I did find it. I found where Christ chose the twelve disciples, whom he also called apostles, and then I turned to where Paul says that God has "set in" the church first apostles. Paul's "set in" is Daniel's "set up." Both have the "set" in it, and the brother has got the "set" here; let us see what it says: "I will build again the tabernacle of David." Is tabernacle the same as throne? What is tabernacle? It is a place of service. It is a recognition of the fact that they would again become a worshipping people. They had denied God and had gone away from him, and were to be overthrown, overthrown, overthrown—three times, my brother says, and the last time was seventy years after Jerusalem was destroyed—

Mr. Williams (interrupting)—Seventy years after Jerusalem was destroyed?

Mr. Hall—Yes; wasn't it?

Mr. Williams—Seventy years after the birth of Christ when Jerusalem was destroyed.

Mr. Hall (resuming)—That repetition is merely an emphasis of the prophet's. Jesus says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you," but he does not expect you to find two places for the fulfillment of the "verily," where he repeats it. When God says "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it;" it is destruction. Overturning is all it ever got and all it ever will get. The declaration of the Saviour himself is, "The law and the prophets were until John, since then the kingdom of heaven is preached and every man presseth into it." "He taketh away the first that he

may establish the second." The thing is done overturned; good gone. God says so, and there is no assumption about it.

Now a point or two about that kingdom of Daniel's. The brother says that the kingdom Daniel speaks of is to be a universal kingdom that Christ is to set up. Was it always a universal kingdom? The kingdom Christ sets up will have a beginning. It is as a little stone, and is to grow until by and by it fills the earth. It accomplishes its victory by the conquest of truth, and it is a victory of a long series of ages. My brother says that we find in this image iron mixed with clay—things that could not be united—and it therefore must refer to the decline and fall of the Roman empire. When Daniel saw this image overthrown it was not in a declining condition. It had universal dominion. There is no intimation in the prophecy of any decline. The kingdom of God was to strike it in its glory when it was upright on its feet. It was to begin at its feet and to continue until all these kingdoms were broken to pieces. The kingdom of God is today the most potent barrier which the kingdoms of this world have. The kingdom of God, so far as it regulates the relations of man to man, is republican. Christ said that among the Gentiles the great ones of earth exercised authority over you but with you it shall not be so. "He that is greatest among you, let him be your servant." That very principle is undermining kingdoms, it has dethroned kings, has overturned empires, it is making its inroads until the republics of earth are in the ascendancy. We have not only the republic of America, the republic of France, the republic of Switzerland, but we have in England the tendency to the overturn of the aristocracy. The principles of Christian truth, of freedom and equality shall utterly overthrow and consume until there will not be a vestige of human tyranny left on earth. The kingdom of Jesus Christ struck the Roman empire when it was in the zenith of its glory.

These are all the points the brother called attention to. You will observe that I have left my line of affirmation; I have turned from my affirmative to follow him. I never like to go into a debate with a man who will not debate. I have affirmed a proposition and proved it. I have called upon the brother to meet it. He has endeavored to overthrow the whole thing by a short line of railroad; then by a long line of railroad. He will find that I am after him, and I will stay after him, and if he will not debate with me I will debate with him.

I want to know if Jesus Christ really has a throne. I have found him to be a king and the brother admits it, and now I want to know about the throne—not David's literal throne, but that which is represented by David's throne as a type. I will turn to some passages to prove it. Acts ii: 29—"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, he, seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted." Is he lifted up? Is he exalted? Peter says he is. "And having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he had shed forth this which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made

that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." Is he Lord? Is he on the throne? Has God fulfilled His promise? Is it a fact? If it is your claim is gone. If it is not God's word is mistaken.

Acts v: 30—"The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour." Any more than a Saviour? Yes, a prince. What is that? A man who has authority. A prince sits on a throne. It is God's word says it and Baptists believe it. [*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—SECOND SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams' second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

MR. WILLIAMS QUESTIONS MR. HALL.

QUESTION: In relation to the last text you have quoted; it says there, "This same Jesus whom ye have crucified hath God made both Lord and Christ," does it say there that God hath placed Christ on David's throne?—**ANSWER:** No sir.

It simply says that God had made him Lord and Christ?—That is right.

After Jesus had gone, having taken his seat at God's right hand, didn't he say this, "To him that overcometh *will* I grant to sit with me on *my* throne even as I also overcame and *am* set down with my Father on *his* throne?—That is right.

Isn't there a difference here between the Father's throne and Christ's throne?—No, sir; same throne.

Whose throne was he on in heaven?—Same throne.

Then why does he say, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him. *then* shall he sit upon the throne of *his* glory"? What throne is that?—The throne of his glory, the throne he will exhibit before the children of men.

Is he on this throne of his glory now?—Not in the presence of men, but in the presence of the angels.

Take the words as they are: He says "To him that overcometh will I give to sit with me on *my* throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in *his* throne." That, the last-named, is in heaven, isn't it?—Yes sir.

There is going to be another throne, "the throne of *his* glory," which he will give the overcomers to sit on, isn't there?—I do not see it.

Does he say, "After this," referring to the times of the Gentiles, "I will *return* and build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down?" Is that tabernacle of David rebuilt yet?—No sir.

Will it be when Christ comes?—Yes sir.

What throne was it that went into ruins?—It does not say David's throne went into ruins.

Doesn't it refer to David's throne in the language of the prophet to Zedekiah—"I will overturn, etc.?—There isn't any promise that the throne shall be raised up.

Then Christ is not going to receive the throne of his father David?—Yes.

When will that be?—At the second coming.

Then the promise the angel made to Mary was not fulfilled when Christ was here the first time?—I think so.

Then why do you say it is going to be fulfilled at Christ's second coming?—Because there is to be a second fulfillment of it. David's throne represented authority over the house of Israel; when he comes the second time it will also represent authority over the whole earth.

In the promise made by the angel to Mary, it is said, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Who constitute the house of Jacob?—Spiritual people.

It does not say spiritual people, does it?—Not in that place but in others.

Where does it say that the house of Jacob is spiritual?—I do not recall any passage that makes that statement, yet the house of Jacob was the house of the Jews.

It says "the house of Jacob," and you do not recall anywhere that it says that the house of Jacob was spiritual?—Hold on there, we must interpret one passage by another passage. The house of Jacob is recognized as the people of Israel; the house of Jacob would be the house of Israel; and Paul says "they are not all Israel that are of Israel." That is spiritual Israel; there is spiritual Jacob.

But when it says that the two sticks shall become one stick in the hand of the prophet; is that the literal house of Jacob?—Yes; that involves the people of Israel, all of them.

What house of Jacob was divided into two parts?—The nation of Israel.

Then it says the same national people shall become one nation in the land of Israel?—I believe that.

Who is to be their king?—Christ.

What throne will he occupy? Will it not be the throne of David?—Not literally.

You are quibbling on that. Inasmuch as Christ is to be king of the Jews, that is, national Israel united into one nation, why do you say there never will be a literal restoration of the kingdom of Israel?—You misunderstood me; I said there never would be a restoration of the national kingdom with the laws written on tables of stone.

You think there will be a restoration of Israel as a nation, but the only difference will be their laws will not be written on stone?—That is one difference.

When do you believe Christ will be king over restored Israel?—At the opening of the millennial age.

Therefore he is not now reigning over the house of Jacob?—Not in that sense, but in the sense of being the governor over the spiritual people.

Wasn't David's throne overturned?—His literal throne.

Will it not be restored?—Not that literal throne.

Well, if you mean the literal chair, that is not in dispute. Now I want to ask another question; you said awhile ago that you could repeat the Lord's prayer. Will you tell me the difference between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God?—Christ exercises personal jurisdiction over his people: he is their king and they will reign with him and he with them a thousand years; at which time he delivers the sovereignty into the hands of the Father who becomes identified with him.

Do you believe that the kingdom of God you pray for is not to come until *the end* of the millennial reign?—That is right.

That being the case, the kingdom of God has not yet come, why then have you been quoting this testimony. "The law and the prophets were until John, since then the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it?" Now you say the kingdom of God has not come and will not come till the end of the millennial age and yet they were pressing into it?—The expressions, "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," "everlasting kingdom," are all different expressions representing the personal and present reign of Christ in the sense in which he is God's representative. He is doing the will of the Father; God's will is being done on earth wherever Christ is obeyed.

In all the earth?—Wherever Christ is obeyed.

Then you think the kingdom of God has come?—In that sense; please mark the distinction.

As a matter of fact, has the kingdom of God come or not?—In that sense.

I have been showing that the kingdom of God is yet to come and you have been trying to show that the kingdom of God is already set up; why then do you continue to pray, "Thy kingdom come?"—Do you think it necessary for me to explain that again? The congregation understood it.

In the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, third verse, Jesus set a little child in the midst of his *disciples* and said unto them, "Except ye be converted and become as this little child ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God." If they were in the kingdom of God then why did he say this to them?—I think the disciples were here addressed as representatives of their fellowmen. Jesus does not anywhere say of them specifically that they had not been converted, because in John xv. he tells us that they were already in him.

In the passage referred to they had been disputing about who should be greatest in the kingdom of God, and their "conversion" was to be from that high-minded ambition. Except ye be converted from high-mindedness ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Does not this imply that they were not then in the kingdom of God?—I think not.

They were in the kingdom of God, and yet he threatens that if they were not converted they should not enter the kingdom?—I think that language is not applicable to the disciples.

Were they already in the kingdom?—They were.

Why then does he thus threaten them that they should not enter the kingdom?—They represented the whole human family, and man has got to have a new birth. They were commissioned to repeat his doctrine, to preach it to the others and the very first thing is a new birth in order to enter the kingdom.

You say they were in the kingdom of God, and Christ says unless they were converted they could not enter the kingdom. Now I will ask you another question. Jesus said that of all that had been born of women there had not arisen a greater than John the Baptist, and yet he said that he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John; do you think the Saviour meant by this that he that is least in the church is greater than John the Baptist?—Yes.

And yet John was the greatest born of women?—Yes; he had greater advantages.

It does not say "he had greater advantages." In what sense is the least in the church greater than the greatest born of women?—He has the privilege of communion with Christ as his Lord. John was simply sent to prepare the material for the kingdom, and the least of them that were in the kingdom were greater than he.

John was never in the kingdom?—No sir.

Were there any of the disciples of Christ that were greater than John?—John had the advantage of heralding the railroad but not of riding on it.

Is it not a fact that when we enter the kingdom of God, glorified immortals, that the least there will be incomparably greater than the greatest in the flesh, or this life?—I think so; John will be in that crowd.

Do you not think that was what the Saviour meant, that the least one in the immortal state will be greater than John was here?—I think that is more or less vague.

Very well, then; you think that although the Saviour said that John was the greatest born of women, yet the least disciple in the church is greater than he?—Yes sir.

Are you satisfied with that answer?—Yes.

I am surprised at your being so easily satisfied?—I think I have surprised you several times today.

It is said that “the kingdom of heaven shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof”—taken from whom?—From the Jews.

Was it the same kingdom of heaven that was taken from the Jews that was given to the church?—It was the kingdom of heaven you quoted about a little while ago, that was given to Solomon.

Then the old kingdom of Israel was the kingdom of heaven?—Yes sir.

Then was *this* Jewish kingdom taken from the Jews and given to the church?—In the sense in which the Jews represented God’s authority it was taken from the Jews and given to the church.

Was it this Jewish kingdom that the disciples were looking for?—It was the glorified state of that kingdom.

I think you said a little while ago that Joseph of Arimathea was looking for this kingdom?—Yes sir.

And that this kingdom was to be taken from the Jews and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof? [*Time called.*]

(*By mistake of Moderators Mr. Williams had exceeded his fifteen minutes questioning, and was therefore only entitled to the rest of the half-hour for speech.*)

[*Mr. Williams*—We have fifteen minutes for an address. It is understood, of course, that the questioning is a matter of choice, if the gentleman wishes to question me he has the right.

Mr. Hall—I decline to ask any questions when he is in the negative, as I do not regard a brother in the negative as being in a position to be questioned. I give him perfect liberty, however, to freely question me.

Mr. Williams—There is no inconsistency whatever in questioning a negative. If you put a witness on the stand the lawyer will cross-question that witness for the defense as well as for the plaintiff. This system is the “Socratic method” and the rule is that questions shall be asked on both sides. Inasmuch as the one on the negative is not here simply to prove a negative, he is not only on the negative but on the affirmative. Therefore when my friend complains that I have gone to the affirmative, it is my right to show another side, the side I regard as the better side. You may now count my time.]

MR. WILLIAMS RESUMES.

I was questioning my friend on John the Baptist, and now let us use a little common sense here in relation to what the Saviour says. He says that of all that were born of women none were greater than John. Does he not honor John the Baptist in this? Here is one who came in the spirit and power of Elias. Here is one whom the Saviour regards as equalling any one belonging to the human race. Now then he adds that he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. Are you willing to believe that the lowest, the least, the most insignificant person who is, ever was, or ever will be in the church is greater than John the Baptist? If you will simply stop now and reason upon that verse alone you will see that the kingdom of God is not the church. When the kingdom is established and the saints respond to the invitation, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," then it is said that the righteous shall *shine forth* in the kingdom. The apostle speaking of this time, said, "As one star differeth from another in glory, . . . so also is the resurrection of the dead." The prophet Daniel said, "At that time . . . they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." So you see that the man of the most exalted position here is less than the least there, in the kingdom of God. What then is the force of the Saviour's words? The least in that glorious kingdom is greater than John the Baptist is now. When comparing the present with the future, when comparing the present state with the glory that shall be revealed, the least among the immortals is greater than the greatest born of women. Therefore he was not talking about the most insignificant member of the church and saying that he was greater than John the Baptist, for surely he would not have said such a thing as that.

Now my friend complains that I have not followed him. I think that I have followed him sufficiently to show that the portions of scripture he has quoted *appear*, superficially viewed, to contradict the passages I have quoted. We read that Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." It is at the seventh trumpet that the resurrection of the dead takes place, when it is said that "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ"—Rev. xi. So it is not until the end of the Gentile times, when Christ comes the second time, that the kingdom of God will be established on the earth. And yet we read that the kingdom of God is come nigh you; that the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it. How can this apparent contradiction be explained? When our friend quoted the text, "The kingdom of heaven is within you," he corrected the translation, because, he said, this was spoken to the scribes and pharisees who were whited sepulchers, full of rottenness and dead men's bones. So he said that it should read, "The kingdom of heaven is among you." Now as my friend has been saying very much about "In this sense," and "in that sense," let us see in what sense we shall understand this; he has given us the privilege of considering in what sense we shall understand the words, "Say not, lo here or lo there, for behold the kingdom of God is among you." What was among them? If my friend will take the Diaglott rendering here too he will have this explained—"The royal Majesty of the heavens is among you." At that time they were looking for the coming of the royal Majesty of the heavens; and the kingdom of Christ was among them, in their

very midst, in the sense that the King had come. King is often used synonymously with kingdom. Let me prove this. In the case of Nebuchadnezzar, it is said, "Thou art this head of gold . . . And after thee shall arise another kingdom—yes, another *kingdom*—so we see the words king and kingdom are used synonymously. So in that sense there was the kingdom in the germ. There was *Christ*, preaching among them and accepted among them as the kingdom in the germ.

But my friend has harped upon the parable of the leaven. His proposition is that the kingdom was *set up* during the personal ministry of Christ, although in his last speech he seems willing to admit that it was not until after his resurrection, yet he went on to show how men could press into the kingdom before Christ died. Let us look into this. In what sense did they press into it? In the sense that I have illustrated; not in its established sense, but in its gospel phase. It is preached for men to receive, for men to believe, for men to identify themselves with, but the very men who identify themselves with it are the ones who are seeking an entrance into it. They are adding to their faith virtue, and all the Christian graces enumerated by Peter, "For so an abundant entrance *shall* be ministered unto them *into* his everlasting kingdom, at the time that Christ shall come to judge them first before they are received into the kingdom.

Now going back to the leaven. The kingdom of heaven is likened unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal. Why do you place leaven in meal? It is to get bread. When you have put in the leaven, and raised your dough and kneaded it and placed it in the oven and baked it, then you have completed your work. So in the process of setting up the kingdom of God, you must have your loaf before the work is complete. Let the gospel be the leaven, let it be working among those who have the gospel, but you do not have the loaf of bread until it is complete. When will the leaven find its completeness in becoming a loaf of bread? Not until the gospel has taken out a people for his name, prepared, when Christ comes, to reign with him in his kingdom. Then that kingdom shall be actually a fact and you will have the loaf of bread. But my friend gets the loaf of bread too soon. He has the church as one kingdom; then when Christ comes, he has another kingdom. [*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—THIRD SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's First Half Hour Speech*).

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I trust we all meet this morning with feelings of profound gratitude to our heavenly Father for his care over us in the past night and the favorable circumstances surrounding us today. I am glad to see so many people listening so patiently to what is being said. It is certainly a compliment to your interest in these matters to find you willing to sit on these uncomfortable seats for two hours at a time to listen to a discussion of these great questions. I trust you are eliminating from your minds anything like prejudice, the result of previous bias, and that you are preparing yourselves to carefully weigh the arguments and look into the meaning of the scriptures that may be presented with a desire to know the truth that the truth may make you perfectly free.

The proposition that has now been debated for a portion of our time has been read in your hearing: "The Scriptures teach that the kingdom of heaven was set up during the personal ministry of Christ on earth." I endeavored to affirm and prove that proposition in one hour's speech yesterday forenoon, and I think I may say without being charged with any misrepresentation in the case that since that time we have been debating a different proposition. My brother has been practically in the affirmative since the first speech and I have been practically in the negative. He saw fit to leave the line of argument I presented and as yet the most of it is untouched, and present before you a line of argument looking to a future time of setting up a kingdom, and in order to have what would at least appear to be a debate, I left my affirmative and my line of argument and went out in pursuit of the brother. I have examined every scripture presented by him, except one or two he presented in his last fifteen minutes' talk yesterday afternoon, to see if there is any intimation of the setting up of a kingdom in the future, and I now boldly announce to you my conclusion that there has not been presented by the brother one single passage that contains any intimation that the kingdom is to be set up or inaugurated as a distinctly new organization at the second coming of Christ. Further than that, I have, I think, impressed upon your minds, at least it is clearly impressed upon my mind, that every passage presented by the brother has its direct fulfillment in the introduction of the millennial age, at which time the present kingdom that was inaugurated during Christ's ministry and under his immediate direction as a result of his first coming, will reach its glorious triumph, that its enemies will be overthrown, when the truth will be victorious, when those who have been loyally fighting the battles of the kingdom here will rejoice in the day of its triumph. Instead of the inauguration of a new organization it is the consummation of the designs and purposes that were inaugurated in the beginning of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now let me call attention to the two or three points that were presented in the brother's talk yesterday afternoon and the way will be clear and we shall be able to proceed further with our own affirmative line of argument. He called attention to Luke xvii: 20, where the Saviour said to the Pharisees when they inquired when the kingdom of God should appear, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here, or Lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." We both agreed that that is an incorrect rendering of the passage, that it should be, "The kingdom of God is in your midst." My argument was that this indicated the kingdom of God to be present. My brother's reply was that it seemed to him to indicate that the Royal Majesty of the heavens was present, Jesus himself was present and he announced himself as the Royal Majesty of the heavens, the Saviour of the world himself had now come and was present. I do not believe that that is the correct meaning of the passage, yet I am willing to accept that interpretation of it, yet it does not modify the fact that the kingdom of heaven was also present for Jesus was then the head and representative of it. Both the Royal Majesty of the heavens as the head and representative of the kingdom, and the members of it were then present and were also in their midst. Christ in his royal character was there and Christ's kingdom in its membership was also there. So this interpretation does not in the least modify or weaken the argument.

The next position was with reference to the woman who took the leaven

and put it in three measures of meal. He said that it is well understood that when women take leaven and put it in meal it is for the purpose of preparing it for bread, and that the idea of Christ was that the kingdom of heaven was like the complete loaf; that the leaven was now at work, but that we could not have any bread until Christ comes the second time. The unfortunate thing for that argument is that Jesus Christ never said that the kingdom of heaven was like bread, but like the yeast, like the leaven getting the bread ready; that is now being done, and the kingdom of heaven is now present working with the leaven. But then, as a matter of fact, I really believe we have the essential, vital element of the bread now. "I am the true bread; if any man eat of me he shall never die." That is getting bread now, even from his standpoint.

One other point; the brother says, in Daniel's interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, that he said the kingdom of heaven should not be left to other people, but it should stand forever; that that meant that the kingdom could not be inaugurated until the new order of things, because this generation is mortal, and if there is to be a permanent people possessing a permanent kingdom this must bring us to the immortal state; hence there cannot be a kingdom staying with the same people until the new dispensation is introduced, since there will not be immortal beings manifested until that time. This is a mistaken view of Daniel's language, for Daniel is making a comparison of the kingdom of God with other kingdoms that had preceded it. The Babylonian empire did not pass from one people to another until the Babylonians themselves passed out; when the Medo-Persians took it until they passed out. The kingdom did not stay with the same generation of people, but it stayed with successive generations of the same sort of people until they were conquered and it passed into other hands. Now on the same principle the kingdom Christ is going to establish shall never be delivered to other people, from the fact that there will be a succession of the very same sort of people with the same characteristics in all ages of the world. These other kingdoms passed from generation to generation, but the generations themselves stopped, but this will never be true of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. It began, if you will, with the Baptists. This proposition, of course, does not involve any reference to the Baptist church as such, yet the brother has made two references to them. If the kingdom began with the Baptists or with the Christadelphians and there would be no change of people; there would be the same faith, the same doctrines, that is a perpetuity of the people. Dr. Thomas inaugurated the Christadelphian movement about the year 1847. The generation that then lived has passed away, but Christadelphianism has not passed away. The people have continued and they are here yet. They talk the same creed their ecclesiastical leaders gave them at the beginning; that is what Daniel is talking about, not a race of beings that would never pass away, but a succession of peoples of the same sort that shall hold that kingdom forever.

Now this takes in every point, so far as I know, without the omission of a single one. If I have omitted one, and the brother will call attention to it, I will give the subject attention in the next speech. I have presented a series of arguments proving that the kingdom of God was set up during the personal ministry of Christ. Now as Christ has gone from the earth I want to see if he left a kingdom; I want to see if he regarded it as such, if his disciples so regarded it. Let us turn to Acts i: 1, "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was taken up,

after that he, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen; to whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." That is after his resurrection and he is still talking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, the same things he talked about before, and he gave instructions, he repeated instructions and enlarged upon them concerning the kingdom of heaven. Let us see if we have anything of that sort in the writings of the apostles. Turn to Col. i: 13, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." Who said it? Paul. Translated us into what? Into the kingdom of his dear Son. Was that during Christ's personal ministry? No, but succeeding it by a few years. Then was there a kingdom of Christ into which the people could be translated? If there was not, then the language surely belies itself. Look again; Col. iv: 11, "These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God which have been a comfort unto me." That word "unto," my brother, is a translation of the preposition *eis*, which, in its primary meaning, is "into." The translation would express, "These are my fellowworkers into the kingdom of God." They are helping me to bring men and women into the kingdom of God. It could not be done if there had been no kingdom then in existence.

In Heb. xii: 28 we read, "Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved"—have done what? Received a kingdom which cannot be moved. "Let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." What do you want to do? Reverence God. How? In godly fear. Why? Because we have received a kingdom which cannot be moved. That gives the motive for serving God. It is the same principle by which John and Christ urged repentance and belief in the gospel, because the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Worship God with godly fear because you have received the kingdom. John and Christ said, get ready for the kingdom; Paul said, Now you have received it show spiritual reverence and fear. There is the kingdom promised by the prophets, prepared for by John, organized by Christ, received by the apostles and rendered the occasion for serving God in godly fear.

"I, John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos"—Rev. i: 9, What is that John? "I am your brother and companion in tribulation." When do you have your tribulation? Now. When you are here in this world? Yes. And you say you have companions in it; are they companions in anything else? Yes, in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. If the tribulation is now and the companionship is also in the present is not the kingdom now also? The tribulation, the companionship and the kingdom are all in the present. There is a kingdom, and men are in it and laboring for its good and for its advancement.

Now here are scriptures that directly point to a kingdom as established and existing and into which men are translated; into which others are being put and wherein they have companionship one with another, both in tribulation and in the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. It looks to me as if this points out a kingdom with such clearness as not possibly to be misunderstood. I went back to the days of the prophets. I had them tell me even the name of the forerunner of the Christ, and his mission in preparing a people for him. I had them tell me

about the kingdom of Christ, that the government should be upon his shoulder, that it should increase in strength and in peace without end. I had them tell me how he would enter Jerusalem. I found him, according to the promise, riding on a colt with a forerunner before him according to promise. I found Jesus Christ coming and taking charge of the material that had been prepared, leading it out before the people and making it public and permanent by ordinances and doctrines standing out before them visibly and tangibly. I saw this same people persecuted and treated with violence. What is this that is prepared and organized and thus treated with violence? It is the kingdom of God, the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of heaven. Who said it? Jesus. Did he say it was a kingdom? Yes. When did it have its beginning? In the material prepared for him. Then I come to Revelation, and Hebrews and Colossians and Acts, after these things have all transpired and Jesus has gone back to heaven, and I say to these inspired men, Will you give me a pointer? Tell me what you know about the kingdom. And they say the kingdom has been received, that they have been translated into it, and that we are workers together and companions together in its joys and in its tribulations. Is there a kingdom?

Now another point. You remember that the brother said yesterday that he would admit that Jesus was a king, but he denied that Christ has now a throne. I always admire a man who boldly makes denial of what he does not believe. Now let the word of God decide it. Let me repeat a passage I called your attention to yesterday afternoon: Acts ii: 36—"Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." My contention is that the word "Lord" indicates his royal majesty. He could not be Lord unless he had dominion. He is both Christ the Saviour and Lord, the reigning authority. The conclusion of the apostle Peter is (Acts v: 31), "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be both a prince and a Saviour." Not only does he save, but he rules. It is the office of a prince to exercise kingly authority, and it is the office of a lord. Christ is both prince and Lord, both Saviour and Christ. He is redeeming the children of men at the same time that he is ruling the children of men.

But again, in Heb. i: 8: "But unto the Son he saith (that is to Christ), Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." Who is it that says that? The royal God, the infinite One. Says it to whom? To His Son. What does he say? "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Has he a throne? God said he had. Does that mean Christ? He said it to the Son, and Christ is the Son. Then Christ has a throne and is occupying that throne and has a scepter that represents his authority. What! does he exercise authority? "A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." There he is on his throne and he exercises dominion over his kingdom. The apostle declares that such is the case.

Again, I want to show you the royal fellowship Christ has with the Father in the dominion of this earth. It is God, remember, who administers through Christ. When, therefore, God talked about the kingdom with the Jews, it is a kingdom in which He had something to do. When He talks of a universal kingdom over the earth it is a kingdom in which Christ has something to do, and when He talks about a kingdom in this world, established during his personal ministry there is a manifestation of the same divine essence and character.

When the time of the ultimate triumph and introduction of the millennial reign shall come both God the Father and God the Son are represented in it. Let us see. Heb. i: 2; 3: "Who being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person and upholding all things also by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High." Acts viii: "But he being full of the Holy Ghost (speaking of Stephen) looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing on the right hand of God." The right hand of authority and of honor, on the throne with his Father. Stephen saw him standing there after he had gone back to heaven.

Again in Heb. viii: 1—"Now of the things of which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such a High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." There they are, sitting side by side one with the other both on the throne.

Now let us turn to Rev. iii: 21—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne." Here is an apparent distinction between the two thrones, yet it is only an apparent distinction. The throne is owned jointly and one is not discriminated from the other. When Christ is made God's minister to rule in the earth, that will be his throne—the same throne he is on now.

Rev. viii: 16: "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them." He is occupying a place as a Lamb in the midst of the throne, side by side with his Father.

Rev. xxii: 1: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb." They are both there. They both own the throne and are seated on it. Christ is on that throne, Let us see if he is crowned.

Heb. ii: 9: "But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." Who was writing? Turn to Psalm xlv:3:—"Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most Mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. * * * Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. The scepter of thy kingdom is a right scepter." Paul said that applied to Christ; that he is the one crowned going forth to conquer, conquest and victory. That sword indicates war, and the brother said the kingdom of God is a kingdom of peace. The Bible says it is a kingdom of conquest.

Now let us see if he had any of this authority while he was here on the earth. After his resurrection we read, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations." Why are they to go? Because all power in heaven and earth is given unto him. Now there is regal authority, there is royal majesty.

Again in Matt. xi: 20: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father."

Again in Rom. xiv: 9 we read, "To this end Christ both died and rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living." He is the Sovereign of the universe. He takes dominion over all, and as such he is represented as being a king and having a kingdom. He is the representative and revelation of the Father, for no man knoweth the Father save he to whom he is revealed. [*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—THIRD SESSION.

(Mr. William's First Half-Hour Speech.)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS AND RESPECTED FRIENDS:—All that our friend has been saying in relation to the power and authority and dominion of Christ I perfectly agree with him on. We never denied that Christ was Lord or that he was Christ. This question we talked of yesterday and it was admitted on both sides. But this is not the issue. That he is exalted at the right hand of the Father no one denies, that he is there waiting until his enemies are made his footstool we all believe; and Christadelphians believe that God shall send Jesus Christ and that when he comes, at that time, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; but the issue is this: What throne has God promised Christ, to give him for his own throne so that he might be Lord and King over all the earth? We have seen that the throne promised Christ was overturned in the days of Zedekiah, and that it is still overturned. Now *that throne* was promised Christ by the angel when he said to Mary, "He (Jesus) shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." We have shown that Christ says that it is after the times of the Gentiles that he will return and will build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down, and will build again the ruins thereof and will set it up. It is when the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him that he shall sit upon the throne of his glory. Give Christ all the honor and glory and power you please, we admit it. He has power now if necessary to establish this kingdom that is promised. It is not a question of power; it is a question as to when God has decided that the kingdom shall be set up. Consequently, when the disciples asked after his resurrection, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" his answer was, "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." The restoration of the kingdom to Israel was the hope of the disciples and the Saviour told them that the Father had put it in his own power to restore again the kingdom to Israel and that it was not for them to know the times and seasons. After Christ, therefore, had gone to heaven and had taken his seat at the right hand of the Father, he said, "To him that overcometh *will* I grant to sit with me on *my* throne even as I also overcame and *am* set down with my Father on *his* throne." "*My* throne—that is the throne—the throne of my father David promised to me that I will sit upon when I come in my glory and all the holy angels with me. That is one throne. "Even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father on *his*, the Father's, throne now, but only until his enemies are made his footstool. "Sit thou at my right hand until thine enemies are made thy footstool." Then, Peter says, "God *shall send* Jesus Christ whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things." There will be no restitution, then, until Christ comes; then Christ says that he shall sit on the throne of his glory, the throne of his father David. Then he will not only be a king, a royal majesty, but a *reigning* king. To what extent will he reign? Zechariah says that "The Lord in that day shall be king over all the earth," and it is recorded that "to him every knee shall bow and every tongue confess," and

"the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." When that takes place it will be in the last or seventh trumpet, which is the time of the resurrection of the dead. If you turn to Rev. xi: 15, you will find it is in the days of the voice of the *seventh* angel when he begins to sound and the seventh trumpet is the last trumpet, and this is when Paul places the resurrection of the dead. Consequently the kingdom does not come until Christ comes, and we come to the seventh trumpet and the resurrection of the dead.

But I will follow now a few of the points my friend has referred to—not all of them, because they are repetitious; he has been over this before, therefore it will not be necessary for me to follow him in detail. He says that I have taken the affirmative and that he has been obliged to leave his side of it and to follow me. That is a frank confession. I told him before we started this discussion that I did not expect to be merely a negative. If I did not have a better side to present than his I would not come here to tear his down. I therefore answered the points he made and then proceeded to show what the kingdom of God is and when it will be established. He confesses now that he has forsaken his own affirmative, and yesterday he said, "I am after him." How far did he follow me? He actually admitted that he believed that Christ would return personally from heaven, restore the twelve tribes of Israel to Palestine, give the twelve apostles twelve thrones to reign over the twelve tribes of Israel. I will ask you, Baptist friends in Zion, is not this what Christadelphians have been teaching for years past in this place and what you have been opposing? Now my friend says he has left his side to follow me. What have all your churches in this county been objecting to and finding fault with the Christadelphians for? What was it for? We have been presenting the literal return of Christ to the earth, the literal establishment of the kingdom here and that the Lord should be king over all the earth and to him every knee should bow and his kingdom would be universal in the earth, not in heaven. I do not know what my friend is going to do now with all those whom he has sent off to heaven and who are to enjoy eternal bliss there. He will have to readjust his theory after thus admitting our position. When that kingdom is given to the saints of the Most High *under* the whole heaven, he will have to bring all those saints he has sent off to heaven back here again. They will have to come down here and reign on the earth. From his standpoint that would be a degradation, I should think. But now he admits the very point I was making, that is, that Christ was here as a representative of the kingdom. If the kingdom itself had been there it would not have been necessary for the representative of the kingdom to be there. The King being among them, the kingdom was there, not actually set up, but represented in the King in germ, and that is actually what I said.

I follow along to the question of the leaven. He said the kingdom of heaven is like leaven only; according to that all he is ever going to have is leaven, and if he is satisfied with leaven he shall have it, but we want that leaven to be brought forth into bread; we like a leaven that will work and leaven the whole lump and afterwards be presented as bread of life to the nations to bring "peace to the earth and good-will among men." And the leavening process will go on and that will not take place until the kingdom of God is set up upon the ruins of the kingdoms of men.

Then he proceeds to criticise what I have said in relation to the words of Daniel, that the kingdom shall not be left to other people, He says it does not

mean that the kingdom shall not be left to other Christians and generations. But notice, Daniel shows us that the time is coming when the saints are to possess the kingdom, and he refers us to the *coming of the ancient days* (Dan. vii: 13-18) in glory, and when the saints are there they have passed through tribulation, and consequently they have come to the time when they are to sing the song of the redeemed: "Thou hast redeemed us out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests and we shall *reign on the earth*" (Rev. v: 9, 10). Being immortal, then, the kingdom shall not be taken from them and given to their successors; it will always remain in the hands of the same people. O, my friend says, it does not mean that; it shall not be succeeded by any other kingdom. Yet he has been ringing in your ears that the kingdom of God suffereth violence and the violent *take it* by force. If the kingdom had been *set up* from the days of John the Baptist, why, according to this text the violent took it by force; therefore the kingdom is now in the hands of the violent, and its enemies have taken it by force, according to your own text.

Now we come to the text that I have been waiting for for some time, Col. i: 12. At last it has come. Our friend has quoted a text in which the word "into" occurs, and he tells us that the word there is the Greek word *eis* "into." Let him look at the passage and read to verse 17—"All things were created by him and *for* him," and he will find that the word "for" is from the Greek preposition *eis*. Now let us take the Emphatic Diaglott—"God has changed you *for* the kingdom of the Son of his love." We have been changed—those who are in the Church of Christ—*for*, or in order to, the kingdom of God. When will they enter that kingdom? Peter says that "if ye do these things ye shall never fall, for so an abundant entrance *shall* be ministered unto you into his everlasting kingdom." We have therefore been changed, converted, made worthy for the kingdom, and he will say to us, "Come ye blessed to my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." O, my friend would say, You are too late to ask me to enter the kingdom now; I have been in the kingdom from long ago.

Then we come to the text, "Receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved." This was after Christ ascended to heaven. If we *received* the kingdom when Christ commenced his ministry, from the days of John the Baptist, why are we still *receiving* it? But it was not here as actually set up. If it was here in the form of a church, you would not say, "We are *receiving* a church." We are now receiving doctrines concerning the kingdom of God and making known what is to be set up at the coming of Christ. Consequently when Paul says we receiving a kingdom, he meant in the gospel form, and we are waiting for it as an actual possession.

Then he comes to the text, "I, John, your companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." He says he was in tribulation; was he in the kingdom? If he was in tribulation and in the kingdom at the same time, there wasn't any advantage in being in the kingdom, if the kingdom did not save him from tribulation. What is said in regard to those who "*through* much tribulation must enter the kingdom?" When you have passed through tribulation and entered the kingdom you are not in tribulation in the kingdom, are you? If so, what is the use of getting there? The tribulation is *now*, but the kingdom is *future*. When we have passed out of our tribulation and have entered the kingdom there will be no more tribulation for us there. O, but it says, "I,

John, your companion in tribulation and in the kingdom." And our friend says that if the tribulation is now the kingdom must be now. Let us see. He does not seem to "discriminate" between mathematical and patriotic language. Suppose here is a general preparing his soldiers for what they have to do on the battlefield. Suppose he should say, "I, your comrade at home and on the field of battle." Would that mean that he was at home and on the battlefield at the same time? Is he at home now? Yes, then, according to our friend, he must be on the battlefield now. Do you not see what John is pointing to? It is the language of hope to strengthen their hearts. They were passing through tribulation now. I will be with you, your companion *now* and in the eternal ages, now and in the glorious kingdom of God. This then is what the apostle meant, but my friend must have it all now when they were being martyred by the thousands at the hands of the Roman tyranny. There would be no advantage in being in the kingdom of God if that were the case.

Now in regard to what is said in the book of Revelation, when he saw Christ on the throne and all the saints around him; John symbolically saw the resurrection of the dead, small and great. If you will turn to the first part of the book it is said, "I will show thee things which shall be *hereafter*. John was to see the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, and when the new heavens shall dawn on this dark, benighted earth the kingdom of God shall have come.

This is my last speech in which I shall be allowed to bring forward any new matter and therefore I will give a few moments to the question of the kingdom of heaven being at hand. I will refer you to I. Pet. iv: 5-7 where it is said that Christ is *ready* to judge the quick and the dead, yet that is to be "at his appearing and kingdom," and eighteen hundred years have passed and the quick and the dead are not yet judged. "The end of all things is at hand." The end of all things will not come until Christ appears. My friend's construction of the words, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," cannot mean anything to him but that it is close by, but the Saviour showed the disciples that it could *not* "immediately appear," for he must go to heaven first and receive for himself a kingdom and return. In Rom. xiii: 12 it is said, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." What day? The glorious day of the Lord that shall dawn on the world is at hand, and yet eighteen hundred years have passed since Paul uttered these words. The darkest Roman night was coming upon them, when Roman tyranny was to imbrue its hands in the blood of thousands, yet Paul said, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." That is the language of hope. "The Lord is at hand," but the Lord has not returned yet. Paul uttered these words after the Lord had gone to heaven. In Heb. x: 25 we have "the day approaching." It is approaching; it will be here after awhile, but it is not here yet. James v; 8, "Be patient brethren * * * for the coming of the Lord *draweth nigh*." Has he come yet? No, and eighteen hundred years have passed away. There again you have the language of hope. and as we explained in starting out, inasmuch as they spoke these words in the last part of the world's great week they could truthfully say in comparing the future with the time passed that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, that the Lord was at hand, and that the end of all things was at hand. Let my friend tell us how the coming of the Lord drew nigh in the days of James and then he will be able to understand the texts he has quoted of John coming and preparing the way of Christ.

Again, I will call attention to II. Tim. iv:18, "The Lord shall deliver me from

every evil work, and will *preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom.*" "Preserve me unto," and yet my friend says we are in it. The text my friend quoted spoke of fellowworkers *unto* the kingdom. When Paul was about to die, he said, "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead at his *appearing and kingdom.*" Therefore he said, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course; henceforth there is a crown of righteousness laid up for me, which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me at that day." When? When I die and go to heaven? No, no. What day is it Paul? "And not to me only but unto all them also that love *his appearing.*" Therefore he prays that God will *preserve him unto his heavenly kingdom.*

In John iii: 5 we read, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God;" and "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"—I. Cor. xv:50. If the kingdom of God is the church the church is composed of flesh and blood men and women, is it not? Therefore if they are in the kingdom or inheriting the kingdom they are there before they have been born of the spirit. The Saviour says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and that is a literal fact; and when you are born of the spirit, instead of being flesh you will be spirit. Now to make the matter clear he says, "The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the spirit." Until you become like that you cannot enter the kingdom of God. Now if you are in the church you are in the church as flesh and blood men or women. The Saviour says you cannot enter the kingdom until you are spirit instead of flesh. Can you come and go like the angels? No. Then you are not born of the spirit and you cannot enter the kingdom of God. If we take their testimony we shall see how clearly the scriptures teach us that we are being *preserved unto his heavenly kingdom*, that we are waiting for the kingdom; that the kingdom is not yet set up and cannot be until Christ shall return to the earth.

I want to say a word in relation to the historical matter. Our friend has boldly stood up here before this audience and said that the Roman empire was divided about fifty years before the first coming of Christ. He found it necessary to do this, because he used the words, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Now that is a heavenly kingdom, a kingdom of God. "In the days of these kings"—what kings? the kings of the divided Roman empire. All historians will tell you, Gibbon will tell you, that Rome was not divided until after the death of Christ about two hundred years, and was not divided into ten parts until several centuries later. My friend saw this fact would not do for him, so he undertakes to show that Rome was divided before Christ came the first time. All the history he gives shows only a little quarrel between the emperor and the senate. It is unnecessary to go to history in detail, however, we need not go out of the Bible, and therefore I will call your attention to Luke ii: 1, "And it came to pass in those days that a decree went out from Cæsar Augustus that *all the world* should be taxed." Here is a man that has the power over all the world—Cæsar Augustus. When was this? Just the time that Mary took her journey up to Jerusalem to be enrolled for the taxes, Cæsar Augustus having power to tax all the world when Jesus was born. Rome was not yet divided into two nor ten parts. In the "*latter days*" it is to stand on its feet as a great military image. It is then that the stone comes and smites it and becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. [*Time called.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION—THIRD SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's second half-hour for either a speech, or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I desire to call attention to the points made by the brother just in the line he has presented them. In the first place I begin by noticing that he admits Christ is exalted and shares the divine throne according to the propositions I have proved to you. If that is Christadelphian faith then I wish to notify the brother that he has gone over to the side where the Baptists always stood many, many years before ever Christadelphians were on the earth. Yesterday he admitted that Christ is King; today he admits that he is exalted as Lord and Prince and has all authority given into his hands. Now we have got the king and authority and a scepter of righteousness in his hand.

The next point the brother has suggested is on what throne will the disciples be permitted to sit when they are promoted to sit with him in his throne. This regards the exaltation Jesus Christ shall enjoy in the presence of the universe at the introduction of the millennial reign. He will not literally sit on a literal throne, but the word throne refers to his royal dignity and the declaration of the apostle is that every eye shall see him, every knee shall bow to him and every tongue confess. When will it be? At the time of his appearing. We believe in the millennium; we believe in the second coming of Christ; we believe that he will then be manifested to men in his glorious character as they have never seen him before. It will not be a separate throne but a manifestation of the throne and kingdom set up here. It will be an expression of Christ as the Son, a manifestation of God through him as the world never saw him.

Again the brother said that it was at the time of the sounding of the last trumpet that the kingdoms of the world are to become his kingdom. That is not the time when he is coming to set up his kingdom; that is the time when all other kingdoms will disappear and he will be triumphant—the very thing I preached to you in the start.

He said he had a right to set up an opposite line of argument. Of course he had, but his first duty was to reply to the line of argument presented. He said I left my line of argument to follow him. Correct; I did do that to get the mists out of the way so the people would understand the subject. I find to some extent I have failed, for the brother is in the same misty atmosphere this morning. He says I have followed him. I admit the Jews are to be returned to the literal land of Israel and David, and that they are to be again established as a nation. He says that that is the doctrine the Christadelphians have been preaching all through the country and all these Baptist people have been repudiating it as false. I have never heard a solitary Baptist in this country say a word about it. I am going to make a declaration right now that there is not a single Baptist here or anywhere else that denies that the Jews are to be returned to their land. Here is the point they have been denying, that at that time there is going to be an introduction of the kingdom of Christ.

Mr. Williams—Do you give that as a challenge in relation to Baptist writers?

Mr. Hall—I want to ask if there is a Baptist in this audience who does not

believe that the Jews will return to Canaan; if there is, let him stand up. You say they are afraid to stand up? We are not afraid of what we believe.

Fred Wittenbraker (Rising on the platform)—I am the pastor of three Baptist churches in Henderson, Ky., and so far as my information is concerned there has never been a denial of the doctrine.

Mr. Hall (Resuming)—I expect you had better take that back. You missed the mark there. In the first speech I made yesterday that was one of my points. I have broken the ice and you have gone in head and heels.

But he says, I do not know what you will do with the saints in heaven. You will hear lots of that by and by. I expect the brother has got tired of this proposition and wants to get on to the other. There isn't any danger but what it will be all right. It will be in a glorified state and the saints will be all right here.

In reference to Luke vii: 20, where Christ speaks of the kingdom being in their midst, the brother said I admitted that Christ was a representative of the kingdom, which I did; and he said that if the kingdom was present it did not need any representative. A kingdom always has its representatives. We wouldn't in any community talk about the existence of a kingdom and no man to represent it. He was speaking to the Pharisees, in the presence of his disciples, his students, who were listening to what he had to say, and to them he could say, Look and see, here is the kingdom in your midst, and I am telling you about it.

The brother says that I will be satisfied with the leaven, but he wants the loaf, the cooked bread, and thinks that I am satisfied to leave it just with the leaven. I am abundantly satisfied to have it exactly as Jesus put it, and that is just as far as Jesus Christ went with it. He never said a solitary word about bread. My friend is hungry and looks as if he needed it. Jesus Christ stopped with the leaven and I stop with Christ. If my brother is not willing to stay with Christ let him go on with the Christadelphians.

He said if the kingdom of heaven was in existence in the days of Christ then the violent took it by force and it is now in the hands of the violent. That does not modify the proposition. I say they could not take a thing by force that does not exist, and there will be no violence here to take it when Jesus Christ comes the second time; the violent, you have told us, are going to be scattered like the chaff before the wind; so that the taking of the kingdom by force must be in the present. That was really a good suggestion to me. I am glad you made it.

Then we come to Colossians i: 14, where we have the preposition *eis*. The brother said if I would read verse 16, "All things were created by him and for him,"—the very next sentence, I would have the word rendered "for;" hence we are changed for the kingdom. Did the Diaglott render that for? Is it a fact that the Diaglott renders that word *for*? Do you know why? Because the Diaglott man is of the brother's faith. It is a mistranslation of the sentence.

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." That is good. Please notice; you have got to have that spirit nature before you can enter the kingdom. Correct. He says that flesh and blood does not inherit the kingdom of God. Correct, because corruption does not inherit incorruption. Jesus said "MY kingdom is not of this world." When people came to John he told them "Think not to say within yourselves we have Abraham to our father." That sort did not enter into this kingdom. Every man of you has got to bring forth fruit meet for repentance, a change of heart, born of the water and the Spirit, born from above. They are both the same thing.

A man cannot get into the church without being born again; a man cannot get into the kingdom of God without being born again. That is what Jesus taught—a new birth.

“Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom.” He said if I had been present I would have said, We done got that away back yonder. What does it mean? He says it means that we are receiving the doctrines concerning the kingdom. But didn’t we get the doctrines away back yonder? Christ taught them. They had been getting ready for that railroad away back yonder. They had received that. Your argument means just as much against your position as against mine. What does it mean? It means that the apostle Paul represented to the Jews, who were there for the first time receiving it, that the kingdom of God had come; that the royal majesty had appeared, that the whole thing was in working order; prepare for it; get into it. We are receiving the kingdom today, brother, in the very same sense, growing into an holy temple of the Lord. The world is still receiving it and will until the last enemy is overcome.

Then the brother says there is no advantage in being in the kindom because we have got to enter the kingdom through great tribulations; we have got them continually to face. What advantage is it for a man to be in the kingdom and still have tribulation? I will tell you: there are two phases of this kingdom; one is the earthly, the militant phase, and the other is the heavenly triumphant phase. The kingdom is now in conflict, subject to violence; those in it are being persecuted, suffering tribulation; and it is through this tribulation which we now endure in this militant condition of the kingdom that we are to enter into its triumphant state. “In the world ye shall have tribulation, but in me ye shall have peace.”

Then the brother said something about partnership in the kingdom, companionship in tribulation and also in the kingdom. He said does that mean companionship in tribulation now and also in the kingdom now? Could not a man say, “I am your comrade at home and also in the army?” But that would represent that his home and the camp were both in existence at the same time. He could not be a comrade at home and in camp unless both were in existence at the same time.

Mr. Williams—I said battle field.

The battle represents the interests of his home. The man fights for that which represents his home and country. A man could say, “I am your comrade at home and on the battle field ” both representing the interests of his nation. For instance, a man in camp writes to his brother, “I am your comrade in battle and at home. I represent as you do the interests of the country because I stand for both.” There is the country and the home both existing at once. The tribulation and the kingdom both exist at the same time. The brother could not form a sentence to save his life without having both things in existence at the same time. That being the case he has lost his entire argument on the subject.

The end of all things is at hand.” You know I met that argument yesterday. John said it was at hand and it was then there. I showed that the expression may have the significance of the thing being present. Let us look a little further and see if the argument is going to fit the position I have taken on the subject. Jesus Christ said, “The time is fulfilled.” What time? The prophet had spoken of the coming of God’s Son who was to be born of a woman and grow up and the government should be upon his shoulders. Jesus came saying, “The

time is fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, repent therefore and believe the gospel." The meaning of this phrase "at hand" is to be governed by circumstances. When Jesus came to the disciples he said, "He that betrayeth me is at hand." There may be occasions where it implies time, but there are others where it don't; and one of these is where Jesus says, "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

II. Tim. iv: 18; "Preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." Is there to be a heavenly kingdom? Yes, a glorious, triumphant state of reward, and Paul desired to be preserved until that time, that very time the brother quoted where he said there is laid up a crown of righteousness to be given to the victors when the conflicts of the world are over.

My brother tells us that Gibbon says so and so about it, but has taken care not to bring Gibbon on the stage. Will you permit me to state that Gibbon tells us that it was eleven hundred years from the time of Rome's decline until its fall, yet the brother wants to make a specific date. I quoted you from a book that fifty years before the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ there was a division of the whole world into two parts, consisting of republican and imperial Rome. It had the element of strength and weakness, the mixture of iron and clay, strength and lack of strength both represented in that very same thing. This decline and fall of the Roman empire nullifies the prophecy entirely. This image is to be in its prime, its full stature when the kingdom is set up. He quotes from Luke where he says that the whole world was taxed by the imperial edict of Augustus, because Augustus represented the royal system and the senate represented the republican system; the senate submitted to his decree and the world was taxed. Rome ruled the world. The division was not antagonistic any more than there is antagonism in the legs of a man. They are joined together in one person, there is one head. Yet at that very time in that divided state there were the elements of weakness and strength. It is the democratic principle which is undermining all empires. The principles of democracy, human equality and freedom are found in the teachings of Christ, and whenever you let these rule you at once undermine every form of tyranny the world over. That is what the war in Cuba is about. It is this spirit of republicanism in the nations of the earth that will ultimately overthrow all kingdoms. It is the very spirit of the gospel of Christ manifested, if you please, in Baptist churches, where no regal authority is given into any man's hands.

I have taken pains to go over every point the brother has made, every Scripture he has presented lest somebody should say I have not answered him. I challenged the brother to find from Genesis to Revelation where it says a solitary word to prove that the kingdom is yet to be set up. In this last speech he says, "I accept your challenge," and gives us Dan. ii: 44. Now the Roman empire was at the time of the birth of Christ divided into different provinces. We have Herod in Judea, and King Agrippa, and it was in the very days of these kings that the God of heaven did set up a kingdom. Listen will you. He has also told us that Gibbon says the decline and fall of the Roman empire began about five hundred years after Christ. I would like to know when these ten kings are to be restored. They are dead and gone. He has put off the setting up of the kingdom until there isn't any Roman empire nor any ten kings. * * * Now to have any kingdom set up in the days of these kings it would have to be at the first coming of Christ or not at all.

First I said there were four kingdoms, the universal kingdom of God, then the kingdom of the Jews, then the return of the Jews to their own land in the millennial age and then the kingdom of Jesus Christ. I started out with this distinction and have tried to make it plain to your minds. My brother has been working all the time on the millennial kingdom. He thinks that this is the time the kingdom of Christ is to be set up. That is a mistake. Christ came here and built a kingdom of his own. I showed this from the prophets, Zech. vi: 12, which speaks of the branch which should grow up out of his place and build the temple of the Lord, and I found the New Testament scriptures which showed that this referred to Christ. I quoted Isa. ix: 6 which speaks of the child born and that the government should be upon his shoulders, and of the increase of his government and peace there should be no end. This shows that it was to begin small and grow. Then in Dan. ii: 44 of the stone cut out of the mountain without hands. It was smaller than the mountain. That was the kingdom in its beginning. The brother says it refers to the second coming. If this is so, how could Daniel's little stone cut out of the mountain without hands represent it?

In Matt. xiii: 31 I find that the kingdom is compared to a grain of mustard seed, compared to a little leaven put into three measures of meal until all was leavened, then to sowing time, and by and by came the reaping time. I proved from the prophets that the church or the kingdom of Christ would have a small beginning. I proved from the prophets that Christ was to be a king and that he should have a forerunner to prepare the way before him. I turned to the New Testament and found John the Baptist according to prophecy going before him to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. I saw Christ receiving baptism at his hands, then selecting his disciples whom he also called apostles. Then I turned to Corinthians and found that God has set some in the church, first apostles. Paul says God is at work, God is setting people in the church. I turn to Matthew xvi: and I find that the church and the kingdom are referred to as the same thing—"On this rock I will build my church," set up, organize. Now what is this thing that is built, organized, set up? Christ turns to Peter and says, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom." This shows the church and the kingdom are the same thing. Then I show next that the kingdom was in actual existence. Jesus said that no doubt the kingdom of God had come unto them. The Pharisees shut up the kingdom of God; the publicans and harlots entered into the kingdom of God before them; the law and the prophets were until John and from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven has been preached. John is announced in the first chapter of Mark as the forerunner of Christ. He prepared the material out of which to organize the kingdom. You remember when they selected a man to take the office of Judas he must be a man that had been with them from the baptism of John. Further than this, I have shown you that the kingdom existed after Christ's death. "He hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." "We are fellow workers unto (into) the kingdom of God." John had companionship in tribulation and in the kingdom. Then I found Christ a king, exalted, a prince, Lord, etc.

Now in the closing remarks I would like to call attention to some syllogistic expressions. Logic means as much as the Bible when logic speaks the truth.

- 1st. Men could not treat with violence a non-existing organization.
- 2nd. Men did treat with violence the kingdom of heaven.

Conclusion: Therefore the kingdom of heaven was an existing organization.
 Again: It would be unjust for Jesus to rebuke the Pharisees for not entering a non-existing organization:
 Jesus Christ did rebuke the Pharisees for not entering the kingdom of heaven.
 Therefore the kingdom of heaven was an existing organization.
 [Time called.] Extension allowed by Mr. Williams.
 Again: The publicans and harlots could not enter a non-existing organization.
 The publicans and harlots did enter the kingdom of heaven.
 Therefore the kingdom of heaven was an existing organization.
 Again: Jesus could not truthfully say a non-existing organization had come upon them.
 Jesus did say the kingdom of God had come upon them.
 Therefore the kingdom of God was an existing organization.
 Again: The kingdom in its glory could not be represented as a small stone, a seed, or leaven;
 The kingdom is represented as a stone, a small seed and leaven;
 Therefore the kingdom exists before it attains to its glorious state.

FIRST PROPOSITION—THIRD SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams' second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

MR. WILLIAMS QUESTIONS MR. HALL.

Mr. Williams: Question—In Matthew xxiii, the passage you have called our attention to; it is said, in the parable of the marriage feast, “And he sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding;” was that the sending forth of the apostles to preach the gospel? *Mr. Hall:* Answer—Possibly so.

They went forth to bid to the wedding and they would not come; who would not come?—The people to whom they delivered the message.

To whom did the apostles go with this message *first*?—To the Jews.

They would not come?—I think, however, that parable represents not only the Jews but all people throughout all the ages.

Which part of “all people” was it said, “We will not have this man to reign over us?—The Jews.

Now a little further on it says, “Go ye, therefore, into the highways, and as many as ye shall find bid to the marriage.” What do you consider the highways to be?—Public places.

In contrast with the Jews?—Possibly so.

Didn't the Saviour say, “Go *not* in the way of the Gentiles?” Is it not a fact that they went to the house of Israel *first*, and *afterwards* Paul says, “We turn to the Gentiles?—Yes.

That was then sending the disciples to the highways?—I think that word “highways” is capable of a larger interpretation than that.

Who were they?—All who were called.

Then “highways” include all classes—Jews and Gentiles?—Yes.

Then coming to the 10th verse, “So! those servants went out into the high-

ways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both good and bad; and the wedding was furnished with guests." What does this represent?—I think that is being done now.

When does the king come in to see the guests?—I think that probably represents the introduction of the millenium.

Is it not a fact that the disciples are sent out to gather Jews and Gentiles to the marriage supper?—I believe that.

And the marriage does not take place until the Lord comes?—We read, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom."

When he comes to the marriage there are guests assembled there for the wedding?—Yes.

Among those guests there is one not having on a wedding garment; what does he represent?—That portion of the human family not prepared.

Are we in the judgment before the king returns to view the guests?—I do not think so.

Then in that case what is going on now is the inviting of the guests to the wedding?—Very well.

Then when Christ comes will men be invited still?—No sir.

But if the wedding were a matter of fact now you would not be gathering the guests?—No sir.

Does not the Saviour compare the kingdom of God to this wedding? Yes.

If the kingdom was set up in the first century why are you still gathering guests to the wedding?—We are at it now.

In your first speech you referred us to Jer. xxxi. As you complain that I do not follow you I will now refer to this. You commenced reading at the 27th verse: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man and with the seed of beasts." Who are they—those that are sown with the seed of man and the seed of beast?—They are the redeemed.

But it says, "I will sow the *house of Israel and the house of Judah*. Are they not Judah and Israel nationally?—I think it involves them and more than that. The language is highly typical.

Does it not say Judah and Israel? Did you ever find those terms applied to the church? Is it not a fact that he is speaking here only of Judah and Israel?—I think the Scriptures very plainly teach that all those who are children of faith become children of Abraham.

Judah and Israel have been scattered?—Certainly.

Then it says, further, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with *their fathers* in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the *land of Egypt*." Who are they?—They are Judah and Israel.

The nation?—Yes.

"Not according to the covenant I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt:" Is that the church?—No; that is Judah and Israel.

This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel—the same house of Israel and Judah?—Very well.

The covenant that he makes is as follows: "I will put my law in their hearts

and write it in their inward parts." That is what Paul quotes in Heb. viii: and which you applied to the church and not to the national house of Israel?—To both.

Why apply it to both when it says Judah and Israel?—I hope you will give me a chance to answer.

Paul in quoting from this says, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Isn't that the national house of Israel and Judah?—Yes sir; but not with them only.

It is to be with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, *whose fathers brake the covenant and were redeemed from Egypt.* Was that the church?—No sir.

That text does not apply to the church then. Another question: Dan. viii: I will ask you if the four beasts Daniel saw in vision did not represent the same four empires that were represented by the metallic image?—I really could not say.

Does not Daniel tell us that the first was Babylon, the next the kingdom of the Medes and Persians and the third the kingdom of Grecia?—Possibly so.

You have told us that Nebuchadnezzar's image represented Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia and Rome?—Yes.

Daniel tells us that these four beasts represent four kingdoms. In describing the Roman empire he says, "It shall bear rule over all the earth." It is represented as a beast that is strong and has iron teeth; that you understand to be the Roman empire?—May be.

When do you understand the Roman empire entered upon the greatness of its strength?—Just before the coming of Christ.

Was it strong enough when Christ was born for its emperor to have power to tax the whole world?—It certainly had that power.

It was manifesting its iron teeth at that time?—I think so.

You tell us that the image having feet and toes was not intended to represent weakness; I will ask you when the clay was mixed with the iron was it not intended to show a decline in strength?—Yes.

Will you tell me when the Roman empire began to break up in parts?—About the time Christ came: Judah was one of the provinces.

In the fifteenth verse of the seventh chapter down to the twentieth verse we read "of the ten horns that were in his head and of the other that came up, before whom three fell, even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them; *until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High.*" Will you tell me what your idea is about this eleventh hour?—I have no definite idea about what that represents.

What power arose that changed times and laws, and wore out the saints and blasphemed God?—Nero did that.

Nero was an emperor of undivided Rome; we have come down to the time that Rome was divided into ten parts, and another power arose and three fell before it. Will you tell me who this blasphemous power was?—I do not know.

I will tell you, then, it is the pope of Rome. Paul says he should oppose himself and exalt himself above all that is called God. I will ask you, when did the pope of Rome gain temporal power?—Did Daniel say it was the pope of Rome?

Daniel described him in the very same way Paul does. Paul says that

there *shall* be a falling away *first* and that man of sin shall be revealed, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God. He has done that?—That was the spirit of iniquity that had already begun to work, the antichrist. [*Time called.*]

(*Mr. Williams' Second Speech of Fifteen Minutes.*)

We have already referred to Jer. xxxi: 27-33 and we learn from this that it is Judah and Israel who are the subjects of what the prophets says. Now as our friend has admitted that that prophecy refers to national Israel his argument on that applying to the church has come to an end.

We now come to the question of Zech. vi: 12, 13. This passage our friend referred to in his first speech. I can scarcely see how he can apply it to the church in any sense. I will refer to Chap. i: 16. Let us see what the prophet is speaking about: "Therefore thus saith the Lord, I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies: my house shalt be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts." Now I claim that has reference to the restoration of Israel and the rebuilding of Jerusalem, when it is said: "The law shall go forth from Mount Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Now we come to the 20th verse: "And the Lord showed me four carpenters. Then said I, What come these to do? And he spake, saying, These are the horns that have scattered Judah so that no man did lift up his head; but these are come to fray them, to cast out the horns of the Gentiles." So you see this has reference to Judah and not the church. In chapter ii: 10, "Sing and rejoice O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee; saith the Lord." Then in the 12th verse, "And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land and shall choose Jerusalem again." This does not refer to the church but to national Israel, whose restoration the prophet Zechariah is presenting. Now we follow along to the verse our friend has quoted. When the Lord shall return to Judah then shall he build the temple of the Lord which is described in Ezekiel. "And speak unto him saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH, and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne." Now the question is, What throne is that, and when will Christ take that throne? We will follow along in the same book so we may be sure we are referring to the same thing: "And he shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Then in the 16th verse: "And they that are afar off shall come and build the temple of the Lord." The restoration, then, of national Israel is the subject all the way through, when Christ will be a king upon his throne. King of what? King of the church? A king of the Jews. Our friend referred to the Saviour's confession before Pilate that he was a king, but he did not notice that the question involved was that he was king of the Jews, he that should "rule my people Israel." Then in chapter viii: 23, "And it shall come to pass in those days that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold on the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." The restoration of the kingdom to Israel, therefore, is the subject of which the prophet is speaking. We come along now to chapter xiv: 1: "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle." Jerusalem is involved again. Then in the fourth verse, "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before

Jerusalem on the east." It is when all nations are gathered against Jerusalem that Christ comes and his feet stand on the mount of Olives. Was that his first coming? Let us see: "And the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof . . . And the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with thee." Then in the ninth verse, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth *in that day.*" So this portion of the prophecy of Zechariah refers entirely to the kingdom I have been talking about and not to the church our friend has talked so much about.

We have been referred to the case of the transfiguration where it is said, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death until they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." I cannot see why our friend should have referred to this, for he quoted verses to try to prove that the kingdom of God had existed from the time of John the Baptist—"The law and the prophets were until John, since then the kingdom of God is preached." I have been trying to distinguish between the *preaching* of the kingdom and the *setting up* of the kingdom, but he will have it set up since the days of John the Baptist. He quoted first, "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent and believe the gospel." Yes, but he is defeated in that. If he could have read, "The time is fulfilled for the kingdom of heaven to be *set up*," his proposition would be sustained, but those words are not there. Now in relation to the transfiguration, the Saviour says they should see the kingdom of God come with power. According to my friend the kingdom of God had been in existence for two years any how.

Mr. Hall—They should see it *coming with power.*

Mr. Williams—One thing at a time: "There are some standing here that shall not taste of death until they shall see the *kingdom of God come.*" I saw what you were doing; you need not think you are going to steal a march on me in that way. He quoted this first to prove that the kingdom of God must be in existence before they could see it, and then he switched off and showed that the kingdom of God would not come with power until away down in the future. Jesus said, "See that ye tell not the *vision* to any man until the Son of man be risen from the dead. In what sense did they see the kingdom of God then? In vision. Christ is transfigured and made to appear as he will be when his kingdom is established and he reigning as king in all the earth. Moses is there to represent the dead raised; Elias is there to represent those who will be alive and remain until the coming of the Lord. Therefore you have three classes; hence he showed them in vision the coming of the glorious kingdom. They had been preaching it and he gave them a glimpse of it on the mount of transfiguration, as it will be when set up.

"And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my *church.*" That word in the Greek is *ecclesia* and is never translated kingdom; which is from the word *basilea*; two distinct words. "The gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it." Though they die they shall come forth. "And I give will unto thee the keys of the kingdom." What is meant by the giving of the keys? The kingdom of God was the great plan of Jehovah; the apostles in the gospel age were to open out and make known to men the purposed establishment of the kingdom of God in the earth, so that men might believe it and obey it and prepare themselves for the glorious kingdom; so that when Christ comes he might say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of world." My friend would have you believe all the way through that "Upon this rock I will build my church" has reference to the *setting up of*

the kingdom. When the kingdom of God is set up no "violence will take it by force." The text I have quoted shows that in the days of these kings, which kings do not come into existence until long after the death of Christ—the Most High maketh known what shall be in the *latter days*, when this division takes place and the kings of the earth organize themselves into a great image, it is then that Christ comes as a stone to smite the image on its feet and break it to pieces and grind it to powder and the wind blows it away, and the stone becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. Therefore Daniel says, "In the days of these kings," and these kings were not in existence when my friend says the kingdom was set up. Here you find from the very book he has given me—it is a very brief history—the whole history of the world in this small book! Where in this book do you have the Roman empire divided? Not until you come away down here (showing chart in Ridpath's History), away down this side of the death of Christ to the time of the invasion of the Goths and other hordes. In the days of these kings, the kings that did not come into existence until after Christ had left the earth, but will in "the latter days," shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, and it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand forever.

We will refer next to I. Cor. xv: Our friend says that where I said the kingdom is *set up*, there it will be *given up*. Verse 23—"Every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, and afterwards they that are Christ's *at his coming*." Christ was in heaven when Paul spoke these words. "He must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet. "When the Son of man *shall come* in his glory and all the holy angels with him then shall he sit on the throne of his glory." So the apostle says, "Afterwards,"—after the salvation of them that are Christ's *at his coming*, and it is when he comes that he takes to himself his great power and reigns, and then he reigns until the last enemy, death, is destroyed; it is *then*, when the thousand years' reign of Christ have passed away, that he *delivers up* the kingdom to God the Father. So then this very text begins the reign of Christ at his coming in harmony with all the other testimonies.

And now in conclusion what have we? We have shown that the way in which the kingdom of God could suffer violence was in its preached phase, that when it is established in actuality no violence can take it by force, that it is the hope of Israel, that Christ is to be the ruler of Israel, the King of the Jews, that it will be in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory that the twelve apostles shall eat and drink with him in his kingdom and sit on thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel. [*Time called.*]